



Decision Notice and Statement of Reasons

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

Decision by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

A person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2026

Application Reference: S62A/2025/0142

Site address: 76a Savoy Road, Brislington, Bristol BS4 3SY

- The application is made under section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- The site is located within the administrative area of Bristol City Council.
- The application dated 21 November 2025 is made by Mr Daniel Brown (Habibo Homes Limited) and was validated on 5 December 2025.
- The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension, ground floor extension and internal alterations to facilitate the change of use of the property from a 5 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4) to a 8-bedroom HMO (Use Class Sui Generis).

Decision

1. Planning permission is refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The development would fail to provide a good standard of accommodation for the future occupiers, resulting in unsatisfactory living conditions. This is because three of the proposed bedrooms would have an inadequate outlook, resulting in a gloomy and oppressive space. Additionally, there would be an insufficient amount of outdoor space provided for the future occupants to enable normal daily activities. Noise and disturbance from the communal space would adversely affect the living conditions for the occupant of the adjacent bedroom. The proximity of the refuse store would also adversely affect the living conditions of the front bedroom. Consequently, the proposal would fail to provide a good standard of accommodation for the future occupiers. This would conflict with Policies BCS18 and BCS21 of the Bristol City Local Plan Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and Policies DM2, DM14, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (SADMP), and the Council's 'Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation' Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SPD).
- 2) The scale, proportions, layout and form of the extension and cycle store would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, creating incongruous, disproportionate and unsympathetic additions. The large refuse storage facilities in the frontage area would also adversely impact on the local street scene. This would conflict with Policy BCS21 of the CS and Policies DM2, DM26, DM27, DM30 and DM32 of the SADMP, and the Council's Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2005).

- 3) The lack of any off street car parking would result in an intensification of on street parking. This could lead to parking across driveways or in unsafe locations, which would have a harmful effect on all highway users and cause inconvenience to residential amenity. This would conflict with Policy BCS10 of the CS and Policies DM2 and DM32 of the SADMP.
- 4) The levels of activity, by way of the intensification of use, inadequately sized outdoor amenity space and lack of off street parking would cumulatively result in there being increased noise, disturbance and inconvenience to surrounding neighbouring residents, which would result in adverse effects on their living conditions. This would conflict with Policy BCS21 of the CS and Policies DM2, DM26, DM27, DM30 and DM33 of the SADMP.
- 5) Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would provide 20% reduction in carbon emissions, thus minimising the environmental impact of the development and positively contributing to sustainable development. The proposal would conflict with Policies BCS14 and BCS15 of the CS and the Bristol Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note (2020).

Statement of Reasons

Procedural matters

2. The application was made under Section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, which allows for applications to be made directly to the Planning Inspectorate where a Council has been designated by the Secretary of State. Bristol City Council (BCC) have been designated for major and non-major applications since 6 March 2024.
3. Consultation was undertaken on 10 December 2025 which allowed for responses by 13 January 2026. Two interested parties submitted comments. BCC also submitted a statement recommending refusal of the application. I have taken account of all written representations in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

4. Having regard to the application, comments from interested parties and BCC's statement, together with what I saw on site, the main issues for this application are:
 - The principle of the development in the area.
 - The effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers and existing nearby residents.
 - Whether the proposal would provide adequate car parking.
 - The effect on climate change.

Reasons

Principle

5. The site is a 2 storey end terraced house, located in a residential area. Planning permission was granted for a 4 bedroom dwelling in 2020 (application Ref 20/03671/F), which has been built, and based on the details before me, converted to a 5 bedroom HMO under permitted development. The proposal is to extend the property at the rear to create additional bedrooms and a communal area, that would turn the property into a larger 8 bedroom HMO.

6. Policy DM2 of the SADMP (supported by the HMO Supplementary Planning Document, adopted 3 November 2020) aims to ensure that the intensification of use of existing HMOs preserves the residential amenity and character of an area and that harmful concentrations of HMOs do not arise. Part 1 of DM2 is dealt with below, however, part 2 refers to whether the development would create or contribute to a harmful concentration of HMOs; of which there are two parts, firstly a worsening effect on existing conditions; and/or, a reduction in the choice of homes in the area by changing the housing mix.
7. The property would be adjacent to an existing HMO, but there are no HMOs opposite or to the rear, and therefore, the proposal would not sandwich an existing residential property or properties. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in 10% or more of the total dwelling stock being occupied as HMOs in a 100m radius. Therefore, the proposal would not result in a harmful concentration of HMOs in the locality.
8. However, whilst the proposal may comply with the part 2 assessment of Policy DM2 of the SADMP, there are additional assessments necessary, which I consider below.

Character and Appearance

9. The site is set within a row of terraces, that contain 2 storey dwellings, with dual pitched roofs. Some contain dormer extensions to the rear. The adjacent property has a 2 storey rear extension with a shallow hipped roof, but 2 storey rear extensions are infrequent in the main. The area has a pleasant, suburban character, containing high quality dwellings that are generally well maintained.
10. The extension would extend to the rear at first floor and ground floor. The ground floor would project further than the first floor, both would have a flat roof. The form and detail of the roof would be incongruous and poorly relate to both the host property and the street scene, particularly at first floor. Furthermore, the overall scale of the extensions would be out of keeping with the surrounding pattern, being of a substantial and excessive scale. The proposed extension would not respect the local pattern and character, and would certainly not create a coherent rear building line and a visually balanced pair with No 76, despite the building line aligning at first floor.
11. Additionally, the cycle store would be of a substantial size, taking up a sizeable amount of the plot. Coupled with the footprint of the extension, the proposals would disproportionately develop the plot, and fail to leave sufficient usable external private space for occupiers of the building.
12. The refuse arrangements at the front of the dwelling would also be substantially large and conspicuous. It would detract from the existing character of the street, which, in the main contains pleasant and attractive front garden spaces that are not overwhelmed with refuse storage.
13. Therefore, the proposed design would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with Policies BCS21 and BCS15 of the CS and Policies DM26, DM27, DM30 and DM32 of the SADMP. These seek to ensure high quality standards of design that makes a positive contribution to an area's character and identity, creating and reinforcing local distinctiveness, respecting existing development.

Living conditions

14. The proposed alterations would change the ground floor and first floor layout, resulting in there being 3 bedroom windows on the side elevation. Currently, all bedroom windows are located on the front or rear elevation, providing adequate outlook. The proposed windows to the 3 bedrooms would face the side elevation of No 74a. The distance between the bedroom windows and the wall would be wholly insufficient to provide an adequate outlook for the future occupants. It would result in gloomy, oppressive and extremely poor living conditions. This would be amplified by the intense use of these bedrooms as the only private space occupants would be provided with.
15. Additionally, the location of the ground floor rear bedroom would be adjacent to the communal area, and the living conditions for this bedroom could be negatively affected by the proximity to this space through increased noise and disturbance. The front bedroom at ground level would also overlook the large refuse store, which would provide a poor outlook, along with impacting the overall enjoyment of the space. Therefore, the proposal would fail to provide suitable living conditions for the future occupiers and a high standard of amenity.
16. Given the location of the outbuilding between Nos 76a and 74a, and the existing rear extension, the proposal would not result in any adverse impact towards the living conditions of the occupiers of No 74a. The first floor extension would be unlikely to harm the living conditions of No 76, due to the existing first floor extension. However, the single storey rear extension would project a considerable distance, at around 4.36m. Coupled with the land levels dropping away by around 0.4m, the extension would end up being rather tall at its end. However, the roof design would result in the bulk of the structure being contained, and the vertical 45° rule would not be broken. Therefore, the effect of the proposals on the neighbouring living conditions for the occupiers of No 76 would be satisfactory.
17. In terms of the effect of the intensification of the use, from a 5 bed HMO to 8 bedrooms, coupled with the adjoining HMO, there would be increased movements and disturbance through daily comings and goings. Furthermore, it did not appear that No 76a was currently occupied on my visit, and therefore the change would be even more perceptible for existing residents.
18. The amount of external amenity space would be small, insufficient for a HMO of this scale. This is compounded by the large bike store and the extensions, which have removed the existing plentiful rear garden. Coupled with the inadequate amount of space, it is likely that residents would congregate in a small space, and this could result in increased noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.
19. Consequently, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of future occupiers and existing occupiers of surrounding dwellings, conflicting with BCS21 of the CS and Policies DM2, DM29 and DM30 of the SADMP, which seek to ensure HMOs provide a good standard of accommodation by safeguarding the amenity of existing development and creating a high-quality environment for future occupiers, achieving appropriate levels of outlook.

Car parking, cycling and refuse storage

20. No car parking is proposed with the proposal. Indeed, the parking space to the rear is proposed to be removed and replaced with a bike store. Whilst there are no minimum car parking standards and parking is uncontrolled on street, the lack of any off street

car parking to serve the proposal could lead to adverse impacts related to on street parking. This is particularly the case given the existence of the adjacent HMO.

21. Moreover, the Council advise that this is an area that suffers from high parking stress, and many properties have dropped kerbs and off street parking within their immediate frontage, which constrains opportunities for on-street parking even further.
22. The area is well located to services and amenities, and 8 cycle storage spaces would be provided. However, an 8 bed HMO is likely to result in an intensification of on street parking, and given the existing conditions, this could lead to parking across driveways or in unsafe locations. Therefore, in the absence of a parking survey to demonstrate otherwise, the proposal would have a harmful effect on all highway users and cause inconvenience to residential amenity.
23. This would conflict with Policy BCS10 of the CS and Policies DM2 and DM23 of the SADMP, which seek to ensure that appropriate levels of safe, secure, accessible and usable parking provision are provided, ensuring the provision of safe streets.

Sustainability and Climate Change

24. The Sustainability Statement and Energy strategy 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%. Additionally, the PV array is not indicated on any of the plans. The proposal should include comparative details evidencing current energy demand and generation and accurate projections taking account of increased occupation. Consequently, it would fail to comply with Policy BCS13 and BCS14 of the CS, which requires new development to be designed to mitigate and adapt to climate change and meet targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

Conclusion

25. The proposal would fail to comply with the development plan as a whole. It would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would also not meet the needs of the future occupiers because it would fail to provide acceptable living conditions or a high standard of amenity. There would be harm to existing living conditions of nearby residents. There would also be a failure to ensure that appropriate levels of safe, secure, accessible and usable parking provision are provided and the proposal does not demonstrate that it have been designed to mitigate and adapt to climate change and meet targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The effects could harm both health and well-being, and my overall conclusions on future living conditions is such that the benefits of increased residential accommodation become much reduced. It also indicates that the proposal is not sustainable development.
26. Therefore, the benefits of the proposal, being the increased provision of residential accommodation, would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse effects.
27. For these reasons, planning permission is refused.

Katie McDonald

Inspector and Appointed Person

Informatics:

- i. In determining this application the Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the Secretary of State, has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. In doing so the Planning Inspectorate gave clear advice of the expectation and requirements for the submission of documents and information, ensured consultation responses were published in good time and gave clear deadlines for submissions and responses.
- ii. The decision of the appointed person (acting on behalf of the Secretary of State) on an application under section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the Act") is final, which means there is no right to appeal. An application to the High Court under s288(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is the only way in which the decision made on an application under Section 62A can be challenged. An application must be made within 6 weeks of the date of the decision.
- iii. These notes are provided for guidance only. A person who thinks they may have grounds for challenging this decision is advised to seek legal advice before taking any action. If you require advice on the process for making any challenge you should contact the Administrative Court Office at the Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, WC2A 2LL (0207 947 6655) or follow this link: <https://www.gov.uk/courts-tribunals/planning-court>