



Decision Notice and Statement of Reasons

Site visit made on 4 February 2026

By Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

A person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2026

Application Reference: S62A/2025/0145

Site address: 33 Brockworth Crescent, Stapleton, Bristol BS16 1HQ

- 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 20 November 2025 is made by Mr David Holliday of Lodgeway Properties Ltd and was validated on 5 January 2026.
 - The development proposed is change of use of existing small house in multiple occupation (use class C4) to a large house in multiple occupation for up to 8no occupants (sui generis) with associated cycle storage.
-

Decision

1. Planning permission is granted for change of use of existing small house in multiple occupation (use class C4) to a large house in multiple occupation for up to 8no occupants (sui generis) with associated cycle storage, at 33 Brockworth Crescent, Stapleton, Bristol BS16 1HQ in accordance with the terms of the application dated 20 November 2025, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: As required by section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 4455.PL.02 Rev.B.

Reason: To provide certainty.
 - 3) The additional accommodation hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the bike store for 2 bicycles shown on the approved plan has been provided and made available for the storage of 2 bicycles. The bike store shall thereafter be retained and kept available for the storage of 2 bicycles at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate cycle parking, supporting use of sustainable modes of travel.

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 was designated for non-major applications between 6 March 2024 and 27 January 2026. The application was made to the Planning Inspectorate during this period.
3. Consultation was undertaken on 9 January 2026 which allowed for responses by 6 February 2026. The Council submitted a statement and a number of interested parties submitted responses. I have taken account of all these representations in reaching my decision.
4. I carried out an unaccompanied site visit on 4 February 2026. This enabled me to view the site and the surrounding area.

Main Issues

5. Having regard to the above representations, together with what I observed during my visit, the main issues for this application are:
 - whether the location of the development accords with the strategy set out in the development plan;
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring dwellings; and
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Location and Principle of Development

6. Policy BCS18 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 (the Core Strategy) states that new residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. As the application property is already a house in multiple occupation (HMO) the existing housing mix would essentially remain unaltered, despite the use changing from Class C3 to sui generis.
7. Policy DM2 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 (the SADMP) sets out restrictive criteria specifically covering the intensification of existing HMOs. Within this context, no alterations to the existing buildings are proposed; proposed additional cycle storage can be secured by condition; adequate storage for recycling/refuse is available; and no concerns have been raised by the Council's specialist officers in relation to noise and the local availability of parking.

8. Policy DM2 additionally restricts development where this would create or contribute to a harmful concentration of HMOs. Having regard to the policy criteria, none of the above matters have been currently identified as generating harm which might be exacerbated, and as the development would again not affect the housing mix, it would not reduce choice.
9. The Managing the Development of Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (the SPD) additionally indicates that a harmful concentration of HMOs can arise where more than 10% of the total dwelling stock is thus occupied within a 100-metre radius. The current percentage stands at 6.17%, and would again not be changed as a result of the development.
10. The SPD further explains that a harmful concentration of HMOs can arise where an existing dwelling is sandwiched between two HMOs. Three dwellings stand between No 33 and an HMO at 25 Brockworth Crescent, albeit 2 of those dwellings are semi-detached. To the extent that sandwiching nonetheless occurs, the situation again already exists.
11. Policy DM2 more generally requires the provision of a good standard of accommodation. This reflects Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy which states that development will be expected to create a high-quality environment for future occupiers. Insofar as the Council has regard to licensing standards when assessing performance against this requirement, the accommodation provided would be compliant.
12. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the location of the development accords with the strategy set out in the development plan by Policy DM2 of the SADMP, and Policies BCS18 and BCS21 of the Core Strategy.

Living conditions

13. Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy also sets out the expectation that development will safeguard the amenity of existing development. As established above, the Council's specialist officers raise no concerns regarding noise or increased competition for parking space. This is partly based on an absence of past complaints. Notably the only dwelling which directly adjoins No 33 is also in use as an HMO, and so occupied in a similar way.
14. Interested parties have raised additional concerns including loss of privacy, loss of light, and potential waste management issues. But whilst a small bike store would be added to the rear of the property, the development would not involve any alterations to existing buildings. As such there would be no harmful effect on the level of light reaching neighbouring dwellings. Nor would there be any increased potential for overlooking given that no additional windows would be added. As noted above, adequate storage for recycling/refuse is available.
15. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring dwellings, in accordance with Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy.

Character and appearance

16. Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy raises a further expectation for development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness. The property in question is located within a C20th residential area and currently appears much the same as any other dwelling within the street. Again, as there would be no change to the existing dwelling or the outbuilding to the rear their visual presence, and the contribution they make to the character and appearance of the area, would remain unaltered. The new bike store would have no noticeable effect.
17. Insofar as interested parties have nonetheless raised concerns over height, scale, density and overdevelopment, these are not relevant in relation to the dwelling or outbuilding to the rear, and nor would the bike store give rise to any of these effects.
18. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, again in accordance with Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy.

Conditions

19. A condition setting the time limit for commencement of the development is required by statute. As the development is for change of use with the only works being the addition of a bike store, a condition requiring compliance with the plan which shows the store is required for sake of certainty. It is unnecessary to reference any other plans. A further condition requiring the provision of the proposed bike store is necessary in order to ensure that this takes place in a timely manner, that adequate cycle storage therefore exists for use by occupants of the property, and to support sustainable travel. Though the Council suggested a condition requiring provision of a store for 3 cycles, this is not what is shown on the plans or necessary to serve the needs of 2 additional occupants.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

20. For the above reasons the proposed development would comply with the development plan. I therefore conclude that planning permission should be granted.

Benjamin Webb

Inspector and Appointed Person

Informatives:

- i. In determining this application no substantial problems arose which required the Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the Secretary of State, to work with the applicant to seek any solutions.
- ii. The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:
 - (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
 - (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Bristol City Council.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements is considered to apply – in this case that listed below:

Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

- (a) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
 - (b) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).
- iii. 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
 - iv. 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>
 - v. Responsibility for ensuring compliance with this Decision Notice rests with Bristol City Council.