

REFERENCE S62A/2025/0142

Site Address: 76A Savoy Road, Brislington, Bristol, City of Bristol, BS4 3SY

Proposal: Application for erection of a first floor extension, ground floor rear extension and internal alterations to facilitate the change of use of the property from a 5-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) to a 8- bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class Sui Generis).

Bristol City Council LPA Comments on the Proposal.

13/01/2026

#### SUMMARY

The LPA considers written representations is appropriate for determination of the application. Based on the plans and information submitted, the LPA would have recommended refusal of the application due to identified conflict with local plan policies. Further detail is provided within the Statement. The NPPF tilted balance is engaged. The LPA considers the adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so and therefore requests that the application is refused.

#### SITE DESCRIPTION

This application relates to the property known as 76A Savoy Road, which is located within the boundaries of the Brislington ward. The property is an unlisted end of terrace dwelling with single storey extension and roof dormer to the rear roof slope. The property is not in a conservation area. The property is in Flood Zone 1. There are no trees on site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.

#### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

20/03671/F Demolition of existing double storey side extension and erection of attached new build 3no. bed dwelling. GRANTED subject to conditions 06/11/20

21/01801/X Application for the variation of condition No. 6 (List of approved plans and drawings) following grant of planning application 20/03671/F for the demolition of existing double storey side extension and erection of attached new build 3no. bed dwelling. Change to approved roof design.

GRANTED subject to conditions 25/05/21

The application has been publicised by way of neighbour notifications and site notice. No representations have been received. Verbal comments from the Highway Authority are incorporated within the report. BCC Private Housing Team have confirmed that it holds no records of HMO licence for the property.

## KEY ISSUES

### (A) WOULD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE IN LAND USE TERMS?

The application property was built following consent 20/03671/F for a three bedroom attached dwelling. Plans were varied under application 21/01801/X, which included an additional bedroom within the loft. The covering letter within the submissions confirm the property is occupied as a 5 bedroom HMO, established under permitted development rights.

The application proposes extension of the property to facilitate increase in occupation of the HMO by way of provision of three additional bedrooms. The covering letter states that the additional bedrooms are proposed as single-occupancy.

Development of HMOs is covered by Bristol City Council Site Allocations and Development Management (2014) Policy DM2. The policy provides an approach to addressing the impacts and issues that may result from this form of development and aims to ensure that the residential amenity and character of an area is preserved and that harmful concentrations do not arise. This policy does not permit new HMOs or the intensification of existing HMOs where development would result in harm to residential amenity or character of the locality as a result of any of the following:

Levels of activity that cause excessive noise and disturbance to residents; or

Levels of on-street parking that cannot be reasonably accommodated or regulated through parking control measures; or

Cumulative detrimental impact of physical alterations to buildings and structures; or

Inadequate storage for recycling/refuse and cycles.

the development would create or contribute to a harmful concentration within a locality. The policy identifies a harmful concentration as a worsening of existing harmful conditions or a change to the housing mix that reduces housing choice.

The Council has adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) relevant to the determination of applications concerning houses in multiple occupation (HMOs): Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation, SPD (Adopted) November 2020 - referred to hereafter as the SPD. The SPD provides guidance in applying Policy DM2 (see above), relating specifically to houses in multiple occupation. The document states that it should be used alongside relevant Local Plan policies to determine all applications for new HMOs and for additional bed spaces within existing HMOs and constitutes an important material consideration in the decision-making process.

The document recognises that HMOs form part of the city's private rented housing stock and contribute positively to people's housing choice. This form of accommodation is generally more affordable and flexible and therefore suitable for younger people, including students, and other households that are not living as families. It is however recognised that HMOs are more intensive form of accommodation than traditional flats or dwellings. Typically this increases dependent on the level of occupancy.

The land use principle of the proposal has been considered against this context. The LPA has concerns that the proposal would result in harm to residential amenity and local character arising from the level of occupation and associated activity. The proposed rear amenity area is considered inadequate for eight persons such that harmful noise nuisance impacts would arise to the detriment of neighbouring amenity. The proposal fails to demonstrate that it would

not result in increased pressure for on-street parking in an area exhibiting parking pressures. The proposal would also result in unsightly overdevelopment from over-extension of the property and excessive refuse storage arrangements to the frontage of the property. All of these impacts are considered in greater detail further within this statement.

The SPD expands on DM2 to provide a definition of what represents a 'harmful concentration' in the wording of the policy. This relates to two principles; local level and area level. At local level, a harmful concentration is found to exist where 'sandwiching' occurs. This is where a single family dwelling (use class C3) becomes sandwiched with HMOs at both adjacent sites. With regards to the wider area, a harmful concentration is found to exist where a threshold proportion of 10% HMOs within a 100m radius of the site occurs. This is generally identified as a tipping point, beyond which negative impacts to residential amenity and character are likely to be experienced and housing choice and community cohesion start to weaken.

The Council's HMO calculator and additional data confirms that (as of January 2025) within 100m of the application site there are a total of 103 residential properties, 6 of which are HMOs. This means that the percentage of HMOs within 100 metres of the site is 5.83%. The property is adjacent to another 6 person HMO at 76 Savoy Rd, however there are no other HMOs adjacent or opposite the site. At ward level the percentage of HMOs within Brislington West stands at 2.77%.

Taking this data into account the LPA does not consider there is a harmful concentration of HMO accommodation in the vicinity or that intensification of the HMO as proposed would result in harmful concentration of HMOs at either local or ward level. The accommodation would contribute to the overall housing mix of the area, in accordance with the expectation outlined by Policy BCS18.

Notwithstanding, as outlined above, the LPA considers that the proposal fails to represent policy compliance with policy DM2 read as a whole. This is due to the highlighted concerns in respect of the adverse impact of the development on residential amenity and the character of the locality as a result of inadequate amenity space, levels of noise and disturbance, cumulative detrimental impact of the proposed extensions and refuse arrangements and living environment for future residents. There are also concerns raised in respect of the impact of the proposal on local parking demand and insufficient information such as a parking survey to demonstrate that the increase in residents and removal of the previously approved car-parking space would not harm local amenity due to increased demand for on-street parking. These issues are reviewed further within the report, however given the concerns and identified conflict with Policy DM2 in respect of adverse residential amenity and character impacts, the proposal overall fails to demonstrate that the principle of development is acceptable in land use terms.

#### (B) WOULD THE PROPOSAL BE ACCEPTABLE IN RESPECT OF DESIGN AND LOCAL CHARACTER?

Section 12 of the NPPF states that; 'Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes'. Paragraph 41 of the National Design Guide states that well-designed new development responds positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary. It enhances positive qualities and improves negative ones. Paragraphs 52 and 53 outline that local identity is made up of typical characteristics such as the pattern of housing, and special features that are distinct from their surroundings. Well-designed new development is influenced by an understanding of local

character including built form and includes the composition of street scenes, individual buildings and their elements; the height, scale, massing and relationship between buildings; roofscapes; and façade design, such as the degree of symmetry, variety, the pattern and proportions of windows and doors and their details.

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) seeks to achieve well-designed places. Paragraph 130 states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 134 states that development which is not well designed should be refused.

Bristol Core Strategy Policy BCS21 (2011) advocates that new development should deliver high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character and identity, whilst safeguarding the amenity of existing development.

Policy DM26 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) expands upon BCS21 by outlining the criteria against which a development's response to local character and distinctiveness will be assessed. This policy states that the design of development proposals will be expected to contribute towards local character and distinctiveness by responding appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings, building lines and setbacks from the street, skylines and roofscapes. Development should also reflect locally characteristic architectural styles, rhythms, patterns, features and themes taking account of their scale and proportion. Development will not be permitted where it would be harmful to local character and distinctiveness or where it would fail to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions.

Policy DM27 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies expresses that the layout, form, pattern and arrangement of streets, buildings and landscapes should contribute towards the creation of quality urban space and that the height, scale and massing of development should be appropriate to the immediate context, site constraints, character of adjoining streets and spaces and setting. DM27 further states that the layout and form of development, including the size, shape, form and configuration of blocks and plots, will be expected to establish a coherent and consistent building line and setback that relate to the street alignment.

Proposals should not prejudice the existing and future development potential of adjoining sites or the potential for the area to achieve a coherent, interconnected and integrated built form. Policy DM30 relates to extensions and alterations to existing buildings. Extensions should be physically and visually subservient and leave sufficient usable external private space for occupiers of the building, whilst respecting the siting, scale, form, proportions and overall design of the host building, its curtilage and broader street scene.

The LPA considers that the proposal is contrary to policies BCS21, DM26, DM27, DM30 as well as SPD 2, Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions. Overall, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and quality of the area. The extended property would be significantly larger than other similar properties on this part of Savoy Road. The extensions would fail to reflect the local pattern and grain of development to the rear of local properties nearby and the ground floor extension would extend significantly beyond the established rear building line of the property and those adjacent. Full width two storey extensions are not typical to the location or type of property. The scale and massing of the extensions would be incongruous and excessive for the host property and location such

that is considered harmful to local character and distinctiveness. The extensions and large cycle store would result in excessive plot coverage with inadequate amenity space provided in relation to the intended level of occupancy of the HMO. There is insufficient detail provided in respect of material and appearance of the cycle store to demonstrate policy compliance. The scale and appearance of the increased refuse storage proposed for the frontage is considered incongruous to the streetscene and harmful to local character.

**C)DOES THE PROPOSAL PROVIDE A SATISFACTORY LEVEL OF RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION?**

Policy DM2 expects that HMO accommodation should provide a good standard of accommodation. Policy BCS21 expects that development provide a good standard of amenity for future occupiers. The Council considers that the proposal is contrary to policies BCS18 and BCS21 of the Core Strategy (2011), policies DM2, DM14, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014), and the NPPF (2024) and the Council's 'Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation' Supplementary Planning Document (2020). This is because the proposal would not provide a high-quality living environment in the following respects:

The outlook from the two rear ground floor bedrooms and light levels therein would be compromised and unsatisfactory due to the proximity to 74a Savoy Road. The rear ground floor bedroom would also likely be adversely impacted by noise and disturbance due to its proximity to the only communal room within the property which would function as kitchen dining and communal area/ access to garden. The garden area is considered small and insufficient for the level of occupancy proposed by the application, taking account of day to day activity including laundry and relaxation. The front ground floor bedroom would be directly impacted by proximity to the frontage refuse storage. The impacts would be experienced individually and cumulatively. Overall, taking into account the intensity of occupation, the LPA considers that the proposal would fail to provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers.

**D) WOULD THE PROPOSAL UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE RESIDENTIAL AMENITY OF NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES?**

Policy BCS21 in the Bristol Core Strategy (Adopted 2011) advocates that new development should deliver high quality urban design and safeguard the amenity of existing development.

Policy BCS23 in the Bristol Core Strategy and Policy DM35 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policy also state that new development should also not lead to any detrimental increase in noise levels.

The LPA considers that the proposal is contrary to policies BCS21, BCS23, DM2, and DM30 for the following reasons -

The LPA is concerned that increase in residential occupation of the HMO as proposed would result in increased noise levels in the garden during the summer months, given the diminished size of the garden/amenity area and its proximity to adjacent properties.

There is also concern that the single storey extension would result in harmful overbearing and enclosing impacts on the garden amenity of residents of 76 Savoy Road, due to its height, depth and direct proximity to the garden area. Similar concerns exist as to the impact of the extension on the garden amenity of 74a Savoy Road, for the same reasons. The visual impact of the excessive refuse stores in the front garden would also diminish the residential amenity of the local area, contrary to the above policies.

## E) HIGHWAY SAFETY, TRANSPORT AND MOVEMENT ISSUES

Section 9 of the NPPF (2023) states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals so that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued and the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects. This policy further states that development proposals should ensure that net environmental gains, and patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places. The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health.

Policy BCS10 in the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) states that developments should be designed and located to ensure the provision of safe streets and reduce as far as possible the negative impacts of vehicles such as excessive volumes, fumes and noise. Proposals should create places and streets where traffic and other activities are integrated and where buildings, spaces and the needs of people shape the area. Policy DM23 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) in addition states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions. Examples of unacceptable traffic conditions referred to in the policy include the introduction of traffic of excessive volume, size or weight on to unsuitable highways/or in to residential or other environmentally sensitive areas. This could result in high levels of transport noise and disturbance, a decrease in air quality and unsafe conditions both on the highway and for pedestrians. This policy further states that development proposals will be expected to provide an appropriate level of safe, secure, accessible and usable parking provision (including cycle parking) and that proposals for parking should make effective and efficient use of land and be integral to the design of the development. The approach to the provision of parking aims to promote sustainable transport methods, such as walking, cycling and public transport, as encouraged by Core Strategy Policy BCS10.

Policy BCS15 in the Bristol Core Strategy states that all new development will be required to provide satisfactory arrangements for the storage of refuse and recyclable materials as an integral part of its design. Policy DM32 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies states all new developments will be expected to provide recycling facilities and refuse bins of sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development. This policy further states that the location and design of recycling and refuse provision should be integral to the design of the proposed development. In assessing recycling and refuse provision, regard will be had to the level and type of provision, having regard to the above requirements and relevant space standards; and the location of the provision, having regard to the need to provide and maintain safe and convenient access for occupants, while also providing satisfactory access for collection vehicles and operatives.

Policy DM23 also states that the provision in new development of safe, secure, well-located cycle parking can be very important in encouraging people to cycle regularly. It is important that development proposals incorporate these facilities and parking at the outset of the design process. Policy DM2 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies states that the sub-division of dwellings into houses in multiple occupation will not be permitted where the development would harm the residential amenity or character of the locality as a result of levels of on-street parking that cannot be reasonably accommodated or regulated through parking control measures; as well as inadequate storage for recycling/refuse and cycles.

Policy DM32 states that the location and design of recycling and refuse provision should be integral to the design of the proposed development. It should have regard to the need to provide and maintain safe and convenient access for occupants, while also providing satisfactory access for collection vehicles and operatives.

The site is within walking distance to a local supermarket and has reasonable access to Bristol City Centre. There is no adopted parking standard for a large HMO (*Sui Generis*) under the provisions of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP).

The application dwelling was erected under consent 20/03671/F. The approved block plan showed a single parking space to the rear, accessed via the rear access lane, as well as two parking spaces adjacent at 76 Savoy Rd. The proposed scheme replaces the parking space with a large cycle shed to accommodate eight cycles. Transport Development Management have expressed concern about the loss of off street carparking given the increased occupation of the HMO in a location that suffers from parking stress and in the absence of a parking survey to demonstrate that increased parking demand arising from the development can be reasonably and safely accommodated in the local area.

The property is located in an area where there is high stress/demand for on street parking and existing residents evidently already struggle to find somewhere to park in the street and local area. A high proportion of properties in the local area including Savoy Road have dropped kerbs and off street parking within their immediate frontage, which constrains opportunities for on-street parking.

The LPA considers the proposed intensification of the HMO use would conflict with policies BCS10 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM23 and DM32 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Local Plan (2014) for the following reasons;

The area is not covered by any parking controls. The development would increase occupation of the HMO by three residents and include the removal of the single car-parking space. This will likely exacerbate parking demand in the area that already demonstrates parking stress, and no parking survey has been submitted to demonstrate that this would not be the case. The proposal has not demonstrated that the level of on-street parking in the local area would not be adversely impacted to the detriment of local residential amenity and character and highway safety.

#### Cycle Parking

A large covered cycle store is proposed in the curtilage of the site, however the scale of this limits garden size. The need to accommodate so many cycles is as a result of overall intensification of the HMO and removal of the car-parking space from the site. The spatial constraints of the site and highlighted cumulative difficulties in accommodating sufficient cycle storage alongside extension of the property and provision of a proportionate usable and practical garden area are considered indicative of harmful over-development of the site.

#### Refuse Store

Two large refuse stores are proposed located within the frontage area on Savoy Road. Whilst this would adequately serve residents of the HMO and is conveniently located, the scale and level of the waste storage would be conspicuous given the narrow width of the property when compared with adjoining dwellings and standard level of refuse provision. As outlined above, the excessive amount of refuse storage would detract from the local streetscene and adversely impact local character, contrary to policy DM2.

### (G) SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Current planning policy within the adopted Bristol Development Framework, Core Strategy (2011) requires new development to be designed to mitigate and adapt to climate change and meet targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. This should be achieved, amongst other measures, through efficient building design, the provision of on-site renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20% based on the projected residual energy demand of new buildings.

The approach proposed should also be supported by the provision of a sustainability statement and an energy strategy.

Policy BCS14 states that new development will be expected to demonstrate that the heating and cooling systems have been selected according to the following heat hierarchy:

1. Connection to existing CHP/CCHP distribution networks
2. Site-wide renewable CHP/CCHP
3. Site-wide gas-fired CHP/CCHP
4. Site-wide renewable community heating/cooling
5. Site-wide gas-fired community heating/cooling
6. Individual building renewable heating

The submissions include a Sustainability Statement and Energy strategy that commits to an upgraded solar pv array, however insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that the measures would reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20%. In addition, the PV array is not indicated on any of the plans. In the absence of these details that should include comparative details evidencing current energy demand and generation and accurate projections taking account of increased occupation, the LPA considers the proposal fails to demonstrate policy compliance with policies BCS13 and BCS14.

#### **(H) ECOLOGY**

The LPA accepts the proposal would impact less than 25 sq.m of onsite habitat and does not impact a priority habitat. As such, the Council considers the proposal would be exempt from mandatory BNG in event of an approval.

#### **CIL**

The proposal would not be CIL liable as the development would provide less than 100 square metres of new build that does not result in the creation of a new dwelling.

#### **(L) PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION**

##### **Planning Balance**

Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged for decision making purposes because the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply. There are no protected areas or assets as referenced in paragraph 11(d) (i) and footnote 7 of the NPPF present on the site. Therefore, the test set out in paragraph 11(d)(ii) applies, which states that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

The proposal would result in harm to the residential amenity and character and appearance of the area, would harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would provide a poor-quality living environment for future residents. In addition, the proposal fails to demonstrate that

additional parking demand as a consequence of additional residents in the HMO can be safely accommodated on local streets and would not adversely impact on local parking pressure. Further detail is also required to demonstrate compliance with local plan sustainability policies.

It is acknowledged that there is significant housing demand in Bristol and the scheme would make a small positive contribution to local housing supply. However, the most important policies within the Local Plan for determining the application, with which the development conflicts, are consistent with those of the NPPF. Whilst the benefits attract moderate but limited positive weight in the planning balance, there would be permanent harm caused to the residential amenity, character and appearance of the area, to the amenity of adjacent residents, and poor living conditions for future occupiers. The highway safety implications, parking demand impacts and sustainability credentials have not been clearly demonstrated as policy compliant. Individually and cumulatively, these matters should attract full weight in the planning balance. Overall, the proposal fails to amount to sustainable development given the negative amenity, design, environmental and social implications of the scheme. The Council considers that the adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the LPA concludes that the proposals would be contrary to the development plan, read as a whole, and that there are no material considerations, including policies in the NPPF, that would justify determining other than in accordance with it.

The Council therefore respectfully requests that the application is refused due to the following reasons:

1.

The development would fail to provide a high-quality and adequate living environment for future occupiers of the proposed HMO by virtue of poor outlook and limited light affecting residents of the two rear ground floor bedrooms. Noise and disturbance from the communal kitchen/living area would likely disturb the resident of the adjacent bedroom. Further, the extended HMO would provide inadequate external amenity space, failing to allocate sufficient space for daily activities commensurate with the level of occupation. Further, the location of the refuse storage would impair the amenity of resident of the adjacent bedroom, given the level of occupation of the HMO.

As such, the proposal is considered contrary to policies BCS18 and BCS21 of the Core Strategy (2011), policies DM2, DM14, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014), and the NPPF (2024) and the Council's 'Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation' Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

2.

The proposed extensions, by virtue of their scale, proportions, layout, form and relationship with adjoining properties, will have an adverse impact on the quality and design of the host building and character and appearance of the area. The extensions would diminish the character of the host building and be out of keeping with the form of development and urban grain of the locality and would fail to contribute positively to the area's character and identity. The large refuse storage facilities in the frontage area would adversely impact on the local streetscene. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM2, DM26, DM27, DM30 and DM32 of the Site Allocations and

Development Management Policies (2014), and the NPPF(2024) and the Council's Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2005).

3.

The proposed ground floor extension would result in overbearing and enclosing impacts on the garden amenity of adjacent properties due to its scale and proximity to adjacent garden areas. The increased occupation of the HMO and limited external amenity space would result in noise and disturbance to the detriment of local residential amenity. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM2, DM26, DM27, DM30 and DM33 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014), and the NPPF(2024)

4.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in increased levels of on-street parking demand in the local area, to the detriment of residential amenity and/or highway safety. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy BCS10 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM23 and DM32 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Local Plan (2014).

5.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would provide the requisite 20% reduction in carbon emissions by solar PV array, thus minimising the environmental impact of the development and positively contributing to sustainable development. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policies BCS14 and BCS15 of the Core Strategy (2011) as well as guidance found within the Bristol Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note (2020).