

Objection to Planning Application 25/13176/PINS

Site: Chasefield House, 888 Fishponds Road, Bristol BS16 3XB

I write to formally object to the above planning application, which seeks to convert the former care home at 888 Fishponds Road into two large Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), one of 9 bedrooms and one of 10 bedrooms.

Preliminary Comment on the Process

I note from the Planning Portal that applications submitted under Section 62A (ending “/PINS”) must be submitted directly to the Planning Inspectorate and not all such applications invite comments.

However, I strongly urge the Inspectorate to take this objection into consideration. The proposed development will have a direct and significant impact on neighbouring properties, including my own, which adjoins the site boundary. It would be wholly unjust for such a far-reaching scheme to proceed without local voices being heard.

I also note that the applicant has failed to properly address the reasons for refusal in the previous planning application (ref. 22/02990/F), which Bristol City Council rejected on grounds of parking, highway safety, and harm to residential amenity.

Grounds for Objection

1. Overconcentration of HMOs and Harm to Families

The site is immediately next to another HMO (886 Fishponds Road). Approving a further 19-bedroom HMO creates a harmful cluster. Many surrounding properties are long-standing, family-owned homes. This development would “sandwich” family households between transient occupancies, undermining community cohesion. This runs contrary to Policy DM2 and the HMO SPD, which explicitly seek to avoid such harmful concentrations.

2. Impact on Residential Amenity and Character

Families nearby will face increased noise, antisocial behaviour, and parking disputes. The transient nature of HMO tenants erodes stability and character in the neighbourhood.

3. Parking and Highway Safety

The scheme offers only two off-street spaces for 19 potential residents. The surrounding area already suffers from high parking stress, and the adjacent junction has been described as unsafe by the Council’s own transport officers. The previous refusal (22/02990/F) was partly based on parking/highway impacts, yet the applicant has not resolved these issues.

4. Loss of Community Facility

The building was formerly a care home (C2 use). Policies DM5 and BCS12 protect such community facilities unless there is clear evidence of no ongoing need. Given the shortage of care and supported housing places in Bristol, the justification for permanent loss is unconvincing.

5. Conservation Area Impact

The site is in the Stapleton & Frome Valley Conservation Area. Subdivision of gardens and additional hard boundaries erode historic character, contrary to local guidance.

6. Crime and Safety Concerns

The Police Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO) concluded the scheme is “not acceptable in its current format”. Within 400m, 886 crimes were reported in one year, including high levels of antisocial behaviour, theft, and violence. The design fails to address key safety requirements: no access control system (entry fobs, CCTV, secure mail); poor cycle store location with little natural surveillance; and no management plan to address antisocial behaviour, visitor access, or parking. The local area already experiences significant problems with homelessness, drug misuse, and disorder, and another large HMO cluster will worsen conditions for neighbours and future residents.

7. Lack of Clarity on Intended Occupants

Unlike the previous application, which specified “supported living,” this submission is silent on who the tenants will be. As worded, the HMOs could be occupied by students, transient renters, or vulnerable groups, each with very different impacts. This absence of detail prevents proper assessment and increases risks for both the community and residents.

Conclusion

This proposal is inappropriate for the site and contrary to multiple planning policies:

- DM2 & HMO SPD – harmful concentration and loss of community balance
- DM23 & BCS10 – unacceptable parking and highway impacts
- DM5 & BCS12 – unjustified loss of community facility
- Conservation Area policies – erosion of historic character
- NPPF and crime prevention policies – failure to address security, crime, and antisocial behaviour

As a [REDACTED], I must express my strong disappointment that this process may limit my ability to be heard. It is essential that these legitimate concerns are fully considered before any decision is made.

For the reasons above, I respectfully urge the Planning Inspectorate to refuse this application.