

From: Helen Attree [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 6:39 PM
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: 24/03623/PINS

Reference	24/03623/PINS
Address	59 Langton Road Bristol BS4 4ER
Proposal	Application for Planning Permission for 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 seven people, including erection of refuse and recycling stores.

I am writing to object to the Section 62A application for a change of use from a small dwelling house in multiple occupation for 3-6 people (C4) to a large dwellinghouse in multiple occupation (sui generis) for 7 people.

I was made aware of this most recent application in a letter from Bristol City Council dated 30th September 2024 which appears to have been sent only to a very small selection of direct neighbours, therefore this would reduce the potential for other objections in the wider area.

The numerous planning applications for this property, 7 in total since April 2023, have caused confusion and lack transparency. With the conflicting information, it is often difficult to understand the intent of the planning applications for this former 2 bedroom terraced family home.

Since being aggressively redeveloped with the addition of rooms in the attic and removing existing internal wall insulation, an unacceptable level of noise travels from the property into directly neighbouring properties and beyond. As mentioned in the Bristol City Council Pollution Control statement, they have suggested that testing is undertaken to understand the lack of sound insulation, and I feel it is important that this is implemented prior to increasing occupancy further. Whilst 3-6 people are currently permitted to live at the property, which appeared to be via an automatic approval rather than site inspection, the current occupancy appears to exceed this with guests and visitors to the property, therefore an additional permanent resident (and their visitors) would have a further negative impact on adjoining neighbours.

It was noted in the recent declined decision for 8 people, there was an inconsistency between the permission granted for the current 3-6 people based on the plans submitted at that time, and the current property layout based on the documents submitted which indicate that development has already taken place outside what was previously agreed. Perhaps the local planning authority should have the opportunity to investigate the inconsistency between what was agreed and what has actually been implemented in the property, and perhaps check on the number of actual residents at this time, before considering further approvals.

I would again like to voice my objection to the impact of parking on the already crowded road. The parking survey was not carried out at the times confirmed in the survey, with evidence of this previously offered when the objection was noted by TDM. In addition, it is noted most of the current residents use cars, and use local lampposts for bikes, which can obstruct the pavements.

The area is primarily occupied by family homes and the introduction of an HMO is out of character with the area.

I am concerned about the existing lack of waste management at the property, with the high number of residents including their guests and visitors, and the fact there should be 2 sets of bins and recycling boxes for the number of existing rooms, but with them only having one bin, this is often overflowing, especially when this is not correctly left out for the fortnightly collections, and then left to block the pavement to pedestrians.

If this application were to be considered for approval, I strongly urge the inspector to enforce the recommended assessment with recommendation for mitigation measures for the transmission of noise to neighbouring properties.

Yours faithfully

Helen Attree