

From: John Rooney [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 May 2025 09:03
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: S62A/2025/0091 265-267 Church Road, Bristol, BS5 9HU

Morning Leanne

Further to the inspector's interim comments, please find attached revised plans to address issues raised. In summary:

- Policy-compliant bike store in rear garden for 8 bikes (to replace existing shed, so no impact on BNG) – note there remains a straight corridor through to the highway.
- Internal resi bin store relocated to the rear of the building, with room to front of 267 now proposed as a bedroom
- Storage area indicated for retail unit (for waste and recycling)
- As with other properties on the street, (and as happens currently at the application site) bins would be positioned outside the property on collection day, and brought back in afterwards. A waste management plan can be secured by condition if necessary.
- Sections provided showing changes to roof

With regards to the conditions, we have no comments to make.

With regards to the CIL payment, we note that previous applications with a similar CIL liability have been approved under the Section 62 route. Whilst it is regrettable that there is no mechanism for charging CIL via S62, the Council is in special measures because of poor performance in determining minor applications, and the applicant has chosen the S62 route made available, to ensure a speedy decision. The two issues that mean CIL would not be levied (the Council's poor performance, and the failure of government to update legislation to address this issue) are not the fault of the applicant, and to refuse permission due to their being no mechanism to provide the £1300 due (which amounts to 0.005% of the strategic CIL shortfall) would appear to render the special measures designation pointless. We would also note that the LPA regularly gives limited to moderate weight to the benefits of small housing schemes in addressing the current shortfall in the 5YHLS, yet the CIL officer would appear to want to give significant weight to the failure to provide 0.005% of the current strategic CIL shortfall. For these reasons, we do not consider that the failure to provide CIL would warrant a reason for refusal.

Kind regards

John Rooney MRTPI
Planning Associate

stokesmorgan
planning

1 The Lodge • Spillmans Court • Stroud • GL5 3RU • UK
41a High Street • Nailsea • BS48 1AS • UK

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This message (including attachments) is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. The material in it may also be subject to copyright protection. If you are not the addressee you are notified that any use, review, disclosure, or copying of the information in it is prohibited. If you have received this message in error please notify us and delete any copies of it. Whilst we take sensible precautions, we cannot guarantee that this message or attachments are virus free.