

Gerard Attree

30th June 2024

Section 62A Applications Team
The Planning Inspectorate
3rd Floor
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Application reference number S62A/2024/0050.

Planning Application 24/02509/PINS, 59 Langton Road Bristol.

Dear Sirs,

I refer to the above planning application and letter provided by Stokes Morgan planning dated 18th June 2024 in relation to the change of use for up to 8 people. I am writing to formally express my objections to the proposed development and I am a neighbour living adjacent to the development site, and I have significant concerns regarding both the development itself and its potential impact on the well-being and amenity of the surrounding area, including my own home and those of other residents. I have outlined these concerns in detail in this objection letter.

I note within the said letter provided by Stoke Morgan planning, they refer to several proposals and comments to support the planning application, and I would comment as follows.

Firstly, reference is made to “minor” demolition to the existing garage, and I would refer to the work already carried out to the property where significant demolition was undertaken to the rear of the property and despite having written to both the property owner and the builder requesting sight of a structural survey or pre demolition inspection to confirm the work was being completed to a proper design with minimal impact on the surrounding properties, I have never received a copy, despite being assured by the builder I would, or a response from the property owner who has failed to engage with me directly during the construction work to discuss and allay concerns over the current renovation of the property.

Having lived in the road for over 25 years I am aware of the garage in question that has been identified for “minor” demolition, and feel this comment is used in the very loosest of terms and would ask for further information as to what is meant by “minor”. As in my experience and given the original garage has been there during my 25+ years, any works involved when converting this garage into a habitable room would no doubt include, making sure the walls and roof are sound, the existing floor may need to be levelled or indeed removed and replaced, damp-proofed and proper wall insulation and roof insulation, as well as windows & doors. Therefore, I do not believe the applicant to have provided sufficient detail regarding what is meant by “minor” demolition.

Regarding the dormer roof extensions referred in the planning letter, due to the height of this extension being raised to the level of our external bedroom wall we are now experiencing an increase in noise pollution which occurs at varying times during day and night. Further occupants having to access the main property from the proposed garage conversion would also lead to an increase noise levels as they move between the proposed extension and main property at varying times day and night, which cannot be properly controlled by the property owner.

In the section entitled Planning analysis, it refers to the occupancy increasing by two people, a further 25% increase in people living in the property which will have an impact on the number of likely visitors, with potential for an increase in noise due to a higher density of occupants and further strain on parking in the immediate area.

It also refers to a cycle store, which I also understand as part of the original planning application, the property owner referred to enforcing this as a car free development, something that has not happened as we have started to see an increase in the number of cars associated with tenants to the property. I also note the comments made about a quieter space away from the main house and the application rejecting any comings and goings being harmful to the area, which I find are subjective comments.

Under highway safety and parking, we have already noticed an increase of cars in the street since the property owner has started renting rooms, more than one car as outlined by Stokes Morgan. I require regular access to my garage due to the unsocial hours that my job dictates, and I am now challenged with trying to find ways and means to have access to my garage and ensure my car is not blocked in. Since number 59 has become a HMO, and as a result of the increased number of people now living at the property it is noticeable the increased amount of additional vehicles parking in the street and the blocking of my garage has become somewhat of a regular occurrence to which I am finding my anxiety and stress levels have increased significantly.

I would also remind you there is an active planning application already submitted to introduce traffic calming measures for the school and this will result in the loss of several parking spaces in the immediate area. I can also assure you the Church is very active daily with clubs and various nightly group activities plus weddings and events which also adds further pressures on parking within the street and surrounding roads through the day and into late evenings. An increase in the number of people renting at number 59 will only lead to further parking problems as already experienced with current tenants.

The letter makes reference to school drop off/pick up being only a short period of the day and not a parking issue, I can assure as commented above we regularly experience after school activities that also impact parking a varying times of the day and into the evening, especially as there is no on-site parking for staff who often work into the evenings leaving their cars parked in Langton Road and surrounding streets.

Again, comments made on behalf of the applicant regarding the church activities and school being used by local people and likely to walk are also subjective to this matter.

I also note within the section under planning balance and conclusion, the application refers to social and health benefits. I can assure you that since this property has been redeveloped, what was a close-knit community with a great feeling of togetherness is being torn apart due to the intense pressure being applied by the property owner to increase the number of occupants. We have neighbours who are considering selling and moving due to the increase in occupancy and noise experienced from number 59.

Our own personal wellbeing, stress, and anxiety continue to be negatively impacted by the increase in noise pollution, the sustained pressures applied by the property owner with looking to increase the number of occupants living in a property that is totally out of character with the street, and a financial desire to sweat this particular asset to the maximum by increasing the number of tenants at every opportunity.

The proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing property in the vicinity and leads to the loss of family homes when houses are converted into HMOs, therefore, I strongly object to this planning application and urge you to refuse it.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Gerard Attree.

Gerard Attree Msc (Eng) MICT MIQ MIMMM

