

From: David Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 June 2025 16:38
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
Subject: 87A Redland Road - S62A/2025/0102

Dear Sirs,

Application Ref S6@A/2025/0102 -87A Redland Road

I write to oppose in the strongest terms the application for planning permission to convert 87A Redland Road into a single dwelling that would become a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

My objection is premised upon the following arguments:

1. GHL properties submits that there is demand (indeed need) in Bristol for more social accommodation and that the creation of a HMO with 10 bedrooms (sui generis) addresses this need. I concede that there is a housing shortage but argue strongly that to address such social need (as we must), we must act responsibly, in accordance with a strategic plan where sites are selected with due regard to the social character of the surrounding area. What we do not want, is an argument that pretends to address an important social need while in reality, it seeks an opportunity to 'cash in' by filling what would be a veritable slum dwelling, with 10 or more occupants jostling for bathroom space and other amenities. Redland Road has for decades offered good comfortable family accommodation close to good schools, parks, a small railway station and other facilities that combine to sustain (only just) this little neighbourhood where families meet at the occasional street party, and who look out for each other as other areas decline and become steadily more alienating. Yes, we must address the housing shortage, but not by the destruction of the social fabric of established communities. We would welcome an application from GHL properties to convert 87A Redland Road into good affordable family units – these too are in short supply; and if we are to believe that there is a genuine social reason for an application that seeks to redress the shortage of social housing, such an application might find more favour.
2. The Secretary of State has set out good reasons why the earlier application was rejected. There is very little in this revised application to convince me that the proposed HMO is suitable; and this is an argument beyond the proposed address to one that argues that we should not be encouraging accommodation so cramped and confining that it encourages transience. Very few communities want short term 'hostels' where people come and go and remain strangers. There are a number of HMO's in the immediate area that provide ample evidence of this. Transience and a sense of 'unbelonging' destroys the character of our streets in Bristol. No care is taken to rid the pavements of recycling bins making passage for parents with pushchairs, or those who rely on mobility scooters. and other aids such as those for the visually impaired, difficult. Proposing bike and bin stores is not a guarantee that these are used. Again, there is ample evidence to underscore the point.
3. The final argument is the question of density. The proposed HMO will sandwich a family home between another (the dentist surgery next to the family home in question is in this argument discounted).

I trust that the Secretary of State will find these objections reasonable and fair. We must all share the responsibility to make Britain work for all of us, and do so in a principled manner. There can be no argument to suggest that the social housing crisis is best addressed through the creation of unsuitable urban slums that destroy the already fragile social character of our communities. Redland

Road welcomes a mix of occupants; and the creation of dwellings that are suitable for different constituencies must (as this consultations allows) offer residents an opportunity to engage actively in a balanced discussion of how to best address the need.

Yours faithfully,

David Johnson and Rosemary Johnson

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]