

From: Matt & Jess [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2024 8:35 PM
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to planning application 24/02509/PINS - further information

Dear Applications Team,

Further to our earlier email objection to planning application 24/02509/PINS, we wanted to address two additional points:

1) Over intensification of use

On page 1 of the CIL application form dated 20/06/24 (in the documents of application number 24/02509/PINS), it states

"Change of use from a dwellinghouse used by a single person or household (C3a) to a large dwellinghouse in multiple occupation (sui generis) for eight households/twelve people"

This completely contradicts the proposal they have made for this application ('*Change of use from a small dwellinghouse in multiple occupation for 3-6 people (C4), to a large dwellinghouse in multiple occupation (sui generis) for eight people*').

This concerns us greatly as it indicates that the applicant has every intention to increase the number of occupants way beyond the 8 people stated, should this 'suis generis' HMO be granted.

The previous application for 12 people was understandably refused by the council for multiple reasons, and we as neighbours continue to strongly object to a suis generis HMO application on the basis of:

- grossly over intensified use of the land/property
- the increase in noise transference and disturbances caused by 8, and worryingly, a potential 12 occupants
- significant increase in stress on parking and highways safety
- increased stress upon the local amenities
- A safeguarding concern for the potential occupants due to cramped living conditions
- An increase in rubbish production requiring more bins which the current proposal has not adequately accounted for.

2) Highway safety and parking:

In the cover letter dated 18/06/2024, provided under application number 24/02509/PINS, it states on page 4 that '*Neighbours stated that the use of the church opposite the site, and the proximity of the primary school, resulted in parking stress, but provided no evidence.*'

This is an incorrect statement. Please find attached photos taken by our neighbour at [REDACTED] during a school drop off period in May 2024 and were submitted to the council planning team as evidence of parking stress re application number 24/00271/F.

These photos were taken down by the council along with the other comments when the previous application was declined, but we felt it important to highlight them again given the applicant appears to be making assumptions in this new application, regarding children being walked to school/to church activities.

Given the applicant does not live in the street and therefore is not able to bear witness to the daily traffic build up/heavy use of schools and community services, the validity of her assumption therefore feels questionable to us.

The photos go some way to demonstrate the traffic stress impacting Langton Road and the surrounding areas during term time.

It has not been possible to get further photos of the cars dropping children/adults off to the sessions held in the church (Rainbows, Brownies, Kung Fu etc) or school as this would be a breach of their privacy/safeguarding issue.

We urge the council to refuse the planning application 24/02509/PINS and hope that this additional information demonstrates further reasons why granting such an application would be detrimental to the neighbourhood and those who live here.

With great thanks for your time and consideration,

Jess and Matt Porter





