

From: Colin Pemble [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 November 2025 17:40
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: S62A/2025/0126 2--5 Highland, Clifton, Bristol , BS8 2YB

Dear Leanne,

Thank you for your email and offer to us to review the LPAs report and suggested conditions.

We note the content of the report and that it is supportive of the development being granted planning permission. One point that is disconcerting is reference made on the status of the existing HMO within the property. As per the LPA's Planning Register and for the avoidance of doubt, in January 2023, a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use and Development (CLEUD) was issued by the LPA establishing as a matter of fact the existing HMO at no.2 was lawful. The property has also been licenced with the Council's Housing Dept for many years. This is referred to in the application covering letter and for information, a copy of the decision letter is attached.

Regarding the LPA's fourteen suggested conditions, while we fully support measures that ensure appropriate design quality, amenity protection, and environmental safeguards, we consider that a number of the conditions as drafted are disproportionate to the scale of development, duplicate existing statutory controls, or do not satisfy the tests of necessity and reasonableness set out in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance.

We have the following comments on the particular conditions:

1. Samples of external materials - Given the conservation are setting, the condition is fine so long as it is clear that it not a 'pre-commencement' condition (it is under the heading) as it will make the demolition process difficult.
2. Large Scale details - We are unclear on what the reference to 'Recessed platform to front elevation' actually relates to. The other listed details are accepted.

3. Construction & Demolition Management Plan - Most matters included within this condition, such as asbestos removal, dust suppression and noise mitigation, are regulated comprehensively under separate statutory regimes (HSE, Control of Asbestos Regulations, EPA). Requiring the Plan duplicates these controls and is disproportionate for a modest development.

Aspects of the condition (and information from advice note 1) could be incorporated into an appropriately worded revised version of Condition 6 (see below).

4. Noise from air source heat pumps - The condition can be simplified with another that the LPA has introduced as it lessens the burden of having to submit further information for approval. The alternative condition reads as follows:

Any air source heat pumps provided at the property shall be in compliance with noise levels specified in the Microgeneration Certification Scheme planning standards (MCS 020) (Details of the Microgeneration Certification Scheme (MCS 020) calculation can be found at <https://mcscertified.com/mcs-has-published-an-updated-version-of-mcs-020/>).

5. Structure Adjacent To/Within 6m of the Highway - The requirement for such a site is wholly unnecessary as the construction does not involve basement excavation, retaining walls, or deep foundations that could impact highway stability. The nature and scale of the development is such standard strip foundations or raft foundations will pose no highway risk. The issue will be addressed through the Building Control process, which already requires structural calculations.

6. Construction Management Plan - The alternative wording under the Construction Method Statement condition suggested by the Inspector

would be more than adequate to address the key issues and ensure the development is carried out in an appropriate manner.

7. Site Characterisation and Risk Assessment /8. Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan / 9. Remediation and Verification - The alternative wording under the Land Contamination condition suggested by the Inspector is more than adequate to address the issues and ensure any contamination is addressed appropriately.

10. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination - This condition duplicates the "unexpected contamination" clauses already within Conditions 7-9.

11. Reinstatement of Redundant Accessways - This should not be tied to occupation as S278 agreements often delay the reinstatement timescale.

12. Completion and Maintenance of Cycle Provision - This is noted and accepted.

13. Implementation/Installation of Refuse Storage and Recycling Facilities - This is noted and accepted.

14. Sustainability Compliance - This is noted and accepted.

I trust the Inspector will consider the above as our suggested revisions, which we believe adequately ensure the development is undertaken appropriately while minimising administrative burden and avoiding unnecessary delay to this modest scheme.

Regards,

Colin

aspect360

planning ■ design ■ development

Aspect360 Ltd - Planning and Development Consultants

[Redacted signature block]

This email and any attachments are intended solely for the use of the named recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately, delete this email from your system, and do not copy, distribute, or disclose its contents to anyone. Aspect360 Ltd accepts no liability for any damage caused by viruses transmitted via email and cannot guarantee that this message or any attachments are virus-free.

On Wed, 12 Nov 2025 at 15:04, Section 62A Applications Non Major
<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Patrick

Thank you for your message.

It is unfortunate that the report has come in after the deadline, however the Inspector is willing to view the contents.

[@Colin Pemble](#) – should the applicant wish to provide any comments on the report or suggested conditions, it would be helpful to receive any response no later than Monday 17 November 2025.

Kind regards

Leanne

Section 62A Applications Team