

Response to Planning Application for conversion to HMO of 87A Redland Rd BS6 6RD

Your ref S62A/2025/0101
Application no 25/11956/PINS

Submission by a neighbour
P Max Headley [REDACTED]

I write as a near neighbour to object to the proposed conversion of 87A Redland Road to a single large HMO. Our house's curtilage is within 10 m of that of the proposed development, and our rear bedrooms are just 30 m from the intended first floor communal space. The proposed development therefore risks adversely affecting our and neighbouring family homes to a significant extent – to no communal benefit to either the local community or the city (as argued below).

The application

The cover letter that attempts to justify the reapplication demonstrates a fundamental flaw in logic: the percentage growth of need in Bristol for single person households being expected to be somewhat greater than the growth of need for families, is not a reason to *reduce* the number of households suitable for families below the already inadequate numbers. Rather, it is a reason for new build homes to address those expected needs *pro rata*. The statement "*In this context, the provision of an HMO would therefore help to meet an identified need for accommodation for single-person households*" would rightly be followed by "*at the cost of worsening the identified need for multi-person households*".

The letter's analysis of HMO density and impact is also flawed. First, the wrong house is identified. Second, ~20% of the area analysed is railway line and sports facilities, distorting the apparent density. Third, the altered submission 'reducing' the no of licenced HMOs from 2 smaller to 1 larger does in no way reduce the impact on the local environment, even if it does affect the area's ratio of HMOs to non-HMOs.

By the applicant's own admission (page 11 of the cover letter) the current maisonettes provide accommodation with a possible 4 bedrooms. That provides a family need that is not provided by any of the other houses in that run of Redland Road houses, nor any of the significant no of houses in the immediate area known to the applicant.

The applicant has no way of controlling whether the rooms will remain single occupancy as claimed. The high rent that the applicant will no doubt require will be ample incentive for individual tenants to share the expense with another, as happens frequently (certainly in student lets) irrespective of formal tenancy conditions.

Similarly, the average car use by HMO tenants is no assurance that these tenants will not own and use cars. If the proposed accommodation is to the standard claimed by the applicant the rent will be high, motivating towards more affluent tenants than many in HMOs, making car ownership more likely.

The plans indicate that much of the communal living for the proposed 10 residents (and their guests) is to be in the first floor rear extension, which is glass-roofed. That

combination motivates to more rather than less noise broadcasting into the surrounding area. With the rear of multiple family homes in Edgecumbe Road, and some in Zetland Road, being in a direct line of sight and sound from this extension, the risk of disturbance is significantly elevated over the current maisonette tenancies.

The previous Inspector's analysis of the impact of the two proposed HMOs, as quoted by the applicants, therefore still stands, albeit that the no of rooms in the application is reduced from the previous 13 to 10.

Management issues

Nowhere does the application appear to state whether the rooms will be let individually or as a group. The implication for neighbours is very different between 10 independent employed individuals vs a single group of 10 friends, particularly in terms of likely noise (parties etc). In that light it is hard to assess the likely degree of disruption to neighbours.

There is a similar failure to address upkeep issues, including the weekly bin collections that result in such untidiness with so many HMOs.

Conclusion

While this revised application addresses several of the issues that the Inspector rightly highlighted before, it fails (despite its claim) to address housing shortages and fails in several other ways either to justify the claimed benefits to the community or to allay neighbours' fears of greater future disruption.

Hearing

Should there be a hearing about this application, I would welcome the opportunity to make my points in person.