

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Please find below my altered objection, as per your request.

I strongly object to yet another planning application for 59 Langton Road, Bristol.

[24/02509/PINS](#) on the following grounds:

1. **Garden Room** – This application has been re-submitted with no changes, so all the reasons for the original rejection still stand, (e.g no cooking facilities for the garden room and inadequate light and this over looks No 57). In addition, the back access lane that gives access to the proposed garden room, is a **private** lane, whereby garages are situated.
2. **Noise** - I am aware that both adjoining neighbours to the property, have experienced significant noise from Number 59, which has included parties. This can also be heard by other residents of the street and in the back access lane.
3. **Parking** – Due to the lack of alternative travel provision in this area. The bus service is almost non-existent, no e-bikes or scooters. There has been an increase of cars in the street, it is quite easy to see the new tenants at the property, get in an out of their cars. In the original application for a 12 person HMO, it apparently was a 'car free development.' No evidence to suggest that this has been adhered too. It has been noted that on the property listing on sparerooms that there was on street parking with '*no restrictions or permits needed*'.
Furthermore, the church and church hall opposite the property is used extensively, over 7 days a week, every week. Parents drop their children off at the church and church hall in cars and quite often park in the middle of the road. Not only is this visible from my window, but my children attend these groups and many children and dropped off and picked up by car "...*Would most likely be attended by local children, and as such parents would generally walk rather than drive their children there.*"
4. The increase of a further two residents would be **harmful to residential amenity**, purely based on the unacceptable noise levels from the property. Especially, for No 57 and No 61, but also keeping us awake at night at [REDACTED]
5. **Discrepancy in plans:** The [Proposed Plan for the application 24/00349/CP](#) (certified 30th January 2024) shows the 2nd floor as having 1 bathroom and 2 single occupancy bedrooms. The [Existing Floor Plan for this application](#) shows the 2nd floor as having 1 bedroom, 1 "office" and 2 off-suite bathrooms. In other words, the current plan doesn't match what was permitted originally.

Yours sincerely,

Jo Partridge