

# Supplementary Papers for Planning Committee

Date: Thursday, 30 April 2020



## 5. Public Issues

3 - 94

To receive any written statements from members of the public, applicants and ward councillors on planning applications which the Planning Committee is considering at this meeting.

The deadline for the submission of written statements is 12 noon on Wednesday 29 April 2020. Written statements should be emailed to Democratic Services using the contact details on the front of this agenda.

Written statements will be collated and published as soon as possible after 12noon on Wednesday 29 April and will be available on the Council's website at the following address:

<https://democracy.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=290&MId=3813&Ver=4>

### Article 16: Covid-19 Interim Decision Making Arrangements

The arrangements for public issues to be received at this meeting have been made in accordance with Article 16 of the Council's Constitution.

The Planning Committee Protocol for Public Speaking shall not apply during the Interim Period and the provisions of this Article shall apply to statements and representations to be made at Planning Committee by members of the public, applicants and ward councillors.

It is recognised that due to its quasi-judicial role in determining planning applications the Planning Committee will need to have particular regard to representations made by members of the public, applicants and ward councillors and the Committee shall have authority to agree further specific procedures in due course to supplement those provided for in this Article. For the avoidance of doubt the deadline for submission of statements and representations in respect of matters before the Planning Committee is 12:00 noon the day before the meeting. This deadline may be changed should the Planning Committee agree further specific procedures as referenced in this paragraph.

This page is intentionally left blank

On-time representations  
received in relation to:

Cynthia House, 1 Cynthia  
Close

The proposed site at Cynthia Road has been disused for nearly a year since residents have all be re-housed as it is no longer fit for purpose and I am very pleased with the proposals to use the site to provide affordable housing.

The mix of 80% Affordable Rent and 20% Discount Sale across a mix of 22 flats and houses is a suitable proposal for the site and will help address growing housing needs both in the ward and across the wider area. The loss of sheltered housing is regrettable and we should not underestimate the need for new care facilities to accommodate our ageing population in BCP, however, the need for affordable housing continues to grow and, on balance, this is an ideal site for new long term affordable residential housing with employment opportunities locally, accessible transport links to Poole and family focused amenities nearby such as Haskells Rec and play area and Tower Park.

The design is both in keeping with the current residential feel of Cynthia Road and will actually improve the frontage, look and feel of Ringwood Road dramatically. I am pleased to see provisions for the loss of trees at the centre of the existing site, however, I agree with the officer's report to further investigate appropriate landscaping features that compliment the south side of the site so any trees will be afforded longevity and harmony with the proposed building and residential amenity. I also excited to see the use of Air Source Heat pumps incorporated into the development as a source of on-site renewable energy.

I am very much in support of this application and keen to see the site redeveloped and come back in to use as soon as possible. I thank the officers for their work on this application and hope that the committee will approve it.

Councillor Millie Earl

On-time representations  
received in relation to:

Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

27-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

We write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. We therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

A and H Patlewicz



**From:** [Brian Thomas](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Date:** 23 April 2020 13:49:23

---

I strongly object to this planning application

The application for an extension to add an additional floor to this building has no merit. Whilst the building is not part of the conservation area every indication is that it soon will be. Currently the building that shares its site with another highrise building is not too noticeable from West cliff Green but that will change. The proposal is about building very expensive flats that are not required in the area when there are currently two huge blocks of flats and an hotel being built literally across the road. The added traffic to Avon House and inconvenience does not justify what is nothing more than a money making scheme in a residential area such as ours and should be rejected for the well being of the current residents in this lovely area.

Brian Thomas  
Flat 15  
Avon House  
16 a West Cliff Road  
Bournemouth  
BH2 5EZ

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Application 7-2019-1227-G-Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth.  
**Date:** 24 April 2020 16:55:08

---

I own and reside at flat 8 Tower Court which is located on the 2nd floor at the south west corner of the building. This application refers to a three storey block of flats to the west of Tower Court.

I write to lodge objections as listed below.

### **Loss of light**

My flat has only one living room...a south facing lounge with an open balcony and a west facing window providing light for this room. Constructing another storey on Fairlea would seriously

reduce the amount of natural light entering this room. Even the internal hall relies on light from a glass door in the lounge!!!

As the sun is much lower in winter the loss of light throughout those months will be very detrimental.

The galley style kitchen has only one window at the narrow end which is also west facing and will lose some of its existing natural light should this construction be allowed to go ahead.

There is no other living space in the flat – just a bathroom and toilet with no windows, the internal hall and 2 small bedrooms.

45 degree rule – does this apply to a block of flats as well as a house? This particular application is somewhat unusual as it is an alteration to an existing building and involves a vertical

extension. If it is still subject to this rule I believe it may not conform to that particular requirement relative to the impact on my home.

### **Privacy**

We are currently about the same height as Fairlea... an additional floor would mean that our privacy would be compromised by residents having views down into our property and onto our balcony.

### **Disruption**

The proposed build is likely to take many months and considering the site is only some 20 yards away the noise from builders' machinery and equipment is likely to be unbearable. Again the close proximity will mean that we are subject to the inevitable dirt, dust and pollution which will be generated. It is highly likely that we would be prevented from using our balcony (our amenity) throughout the period of construction because of noise, dust and lack of privacy.

Yours Faithfully  
D.F.Almond.

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

J Kirby

Katy BROOKS,

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

### Conclusion



The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

K Brooks

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

We write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy. Inconsistency ??**

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, we query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

### Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. We therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

K and H Young

Dear Mrs. Holbrook,

Thankyou for informing me of the remote online meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020 to consider  
Planning Application      no.7-2019-1227-G

We write as Fairlea residents to endorse our previous three letters in which we expressed our deep concerns about the application and, as the time has gone by, we have read with some alarm the views of surrounding non-Fairlea flat owners who will be seriously affected if this application is allowed to go ahead.

1. Having owned our flat at Fairlea for nearly thirty years, it has not been difficult to put ourselves in their shoes. We imagine we would feel exactly as they do, should anyone decide to build so close to the front of our living room window so that our light would be affected, we would be staring at buildings instead of enjoying sunlight, tarmac and cars would replace all the greenery and trees, noise and traffic would destroy the peace and outlook we have become used to, and an overbearing and potentially ugly structure would dominate our living space.

2. It has been quite a shock to discover that one or two flat owners could force through the sale of our roof airspace at Fairlea for the building of three flats, **without a unanimous vote from all nine flat owners** , given the amount of chaos and concern such a development would, and in fact is, causing in this neighbourhood. Plans to further alter our Fairlea block by destroying brickwork, windows, virtually all front greenery, visual pleasantries etc. and install unnecessary parking spaces, bike stores and ugly water tanks etc. have been neither discussed nor agreed with by Fairlea flat owners. Even had we been asked, we would never have agreed to many of these changes, including the worrying plan to park cars on a bend so close to our flat as to be very noisy as well as highly dangerous. Wear and tear on the narrow access driveway from Avon House to Fairlea is unlikely to withstand seven to eight extra cars, not to mention the danger of collisions on that narrow route as well as when accessing West Cliff Road, once the Premier Inn site is completed.

3. It is also very worrying that since Fairlea and surrounding blocks of flats have underground carparks, there is no guarantee that extra weight of three new flats will not cause loss of stability to Fairlea. The idea of selling our air space to a company with no track record in this area is alarming as is the concern that it could lead to further high rise development here by any new flat owner or even a stranger.

4. Our own living space would also be compromised by any extra flats built on our roof, due to the loss of the low rise, low density, pleasant environment of Fairlea.

Removal of the four trees, equally spaced on the greenery on either side of the four existing parking spaces has already begun. For at least the last twenty-five years, the design and positioning of these four trees has been a visual asset to the front of the Fairlea building which has been enjoyed by us and other surrounding flat blocks. It is therefore quite shocking that anyone could consider destroying them, and completely replacing them with spaces for eight more cars, tarmac and bike store, especially given such current threats to the environment and nature conservation.

5. I trust that you will understand our concerns as there are also doubtless legal implications when one or two flat owners have decided to apply for planning permission which will "Damage or annoy.. occupiers of.... the...flats or adjoining neighbouring premises," clearly forbidden in our deeds. (Sixth schedule, no. 4)

Finally, as we live through these stressful and difficult Corona Virus times when we join with our neighbours, many from Avon House and Tower House windows and balconies, to clap together for our brave NHS life savers, it is tragic and heartbreaking that, led by one or two flat owners, a block such as Fairlea could even contemplate inflicting such sadness and devastation on their neighbours. I ask that you please turn down this planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Rosemary and Richard Dickson

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

We write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, we query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. We therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

D and A Widdowson



Alan HUNTER,

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

A Hunter

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

E O'Toole

Norman TODD,

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;



## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

N Todd

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

R Strutt

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area

The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

### Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

S Williams

BCP Council, Planning Services,  
Town Hall Annexe,  
St Stephen's Road,  
Bournemouth BH2 6EA

28-4-2020

Dear Chairman and Planning Committee Members,

**Re Application No. 7-2019-1227-G - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth**  
**Proposed alterations, roof extension to form 3 flats etc.**

I write to lodge objections to the Recommendation in favour of the above application as set out below :

Detrimental loss of light

There will be a loss of sunlight and diminished daylight for neighbouring flats, principally in Avon House, Bay View Gardens and the lower floors of Tower Court.

Loss of privacy. Overlooking.

The Design Guide (Sept. 2008) sets out guidelines for privacy but point 26 in the Case Officer's report rejects consideration of these guidelines, despite the fact that the separation distance is given as 18 metres only, 3 metres below the minimum. For the residents affected in Tower Court's lower floors there will be an impact in terms of overlooking and they rightly expect the Council to uphold its policies and be consistent (see Chequers Application 7-2016-1706-R refused inter alia on privacy grounds).

The building in question is going to be 41% taller according to the plans. That's a huge increase in size!

Policy D4 : Design Quality

The siting of the proposed additional car parking 'tarmac' at the front of the development is disrespect for their neighbours' key view and represents a breach of Policy D4 – Design Quality and D3 so the extra spaces should be re-sited.

There is no indication that the existing parking spaces have been checked against the CS16 standard.

**Point 29 actually incorrectly states the additional parking spaces as 4 instead of 6 [A total of 10 proposed less 4 existing means the creation of 6 new spaces].**

**6 spaces is a breach of policy as the norm for 3 extra flats is 4 only. Two spaces should therefore be cancelled immediately to stay in line with the Parking Policy.** Inconsistency ??

The huge brick cycle storage to the left of the parking and fronting the Avon House lawn in particular adversely affects the street scene.

Under parking guidelines 2.2.2 it says separate cycle stores on the frontage of new developments are not encouraged. A cycle store in the proposed site would be a visual affront and should be re-sited.

Policy D3 likewise states any car parking or cycle storage should be well integrated into the proposed development so that it does not adversely affect the street scene and should avoid unattractive elevations.

Visual impact/Impact on the appearance of the area



The proposal to have white render and stone cladding is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings such as Avon House and the brick buildings along its western flank in West Cliff Gardens.

Not only that but the use of dark stone cladding and white render on a given elevation is highly jarring, particularly on the Northern elevation which is the one most seen by visitors and local residents, because the two colours definitely don't go together.

The planning statement says in the script that there will be new grey uPVC windows which look dreadfully drab and more suited to a prison building. They will be totally out of keeping with windows in surrounding buildings including Tower Court. In a word the visual impact of the development fails to reach an acceptable standard.

The elevation drawing attached to the application has a materials key which reads : **Aluminium framed** doors/windows/glazing which conflicts with the text (**uPVC**), leaving the reader confused. The Case Officer's report hasn't clarified this discrepancy. Grey aluminium framed windows will most definitely not be attractive.

The elevation plans filed late (27/1/20) have miniaturised the initial huge roof box without any explanation. Have all flats agreed to the underlying knock-on ramifications ?

#### Policy CS41 Quality Design

Development should be designed to respect the site and its surroundings but the proposal totally fails to do that.

If we look at the elevation diagrams we can discern, inter alia, the following design flaws :

- a) The North Elevation outer windows at fourth floor level are to have opaque glazing and are a different style to the ones below. They are also 50% taller than the windows below.
- b) I will call the brick/stonework above the windows 'cills'. The cills above the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows and the 4<sup>th</sup> floor windows are totally disproportionate in size to the cills lower down
- c) Likewise on the South elevation the cills are all different in size/'thickness' with the cill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors twice or more the 'thickness' of the ones below.
- d) If we look at the windows on the right surrounded by white render on the South Elevation those on the fourth floor are totally out of kilter with the ones below as regards design and construction.
- e) The fourth floor exterior is out of kilter with that of the existing floors/storeys so the end result is an asymmetric design.

An asymmetric design is not a quality design, breaches policy and should therefore be rejected.

#### Policy D7 (TCAAP)

This policy requires financial contributions towards the improvement of West Cliff Road and the wider public realm. So why, I query, has the applicant seemingly failed to provide any ?

#### Summary :

The design has many flaws in many areas breaching various policies.

The application breaches the privacy provisions of the Design Guide (Sept. 2008);

The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area's heritage assets.

The proposal entails a negative visual and psychological impact on neighbouring residents;

The application has not contributed towards public realm improvements;

## Conclusion

The above summary points solely in the direction of rejection. I therefore, together with some 50 households in surrounding properties, object to the application and kindly ask you to do the same and reject it.

Yours faithfully

V Barker

7-2019-1227-G

Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth, BH2 5EZ

Representation to the Planning Committee in **support** of the recommendation to **approve**

Dear members of the committee, we hope you are keeping well and safe during these uncertain times. Thank you for the opportunity to write in support of the case officer's recommendation for approval and your consideration of our final comments; we were asked to keep this brief.

The application has been considered by Mrs Holbrook, an experienced Planning Officer with the authority, who has taken into account all the objections that were raised and has concluded that in her **professional** opinion that, subject to conditions, the application should be **granted** planning permission.

The application has been called into committee at the request of Cllr Beesley for the following:

- *Detrimental to the amenities of residents in nearby properties.* However, the case officer has taken a detailed look at the relationship between the application site and the nearby buildings concluding unequivocally that there is **no material harm**.
- *Proposed development neither maintains nor enhances the visual amenities of the adjoining Conservation Area.* The current Conservation Area (CA) does not include the application site. However, the 2018 consultation draft appraisal considered the contribution that the excluded buildings, including Fair Lea and Avon House, would have to the CA. The conclusion is that the **current building is a negative contributor**. Therefore works to update the appearance of this tired building should be encouraged.
- *Inappropriate proposals and poor design of cycle storage and visually detrimental car parking arrangements.* The car parking arrangements have been **revisited** following highway comments. The cycle store is located in a discrete position and provides for on-site cycle storage where there is currently none.
- *Inappropriate and poor quality of design, including detrimental changes to fenestration and the external appearance of the building.* Whilst design is obviously a subjective matter the consideration of the application followed a design led approach undertaken by award winning architects. The proposal is for an additional floor to be added to the building, which is considered to be appropriate proportionally. The external appearance of the building, as already stated, will be **enhanced**.
- *Insufficient detail of proposals for solar panels and rainwater harvesting.* Further details have been submitted to overcome this point.

The objectors' list of concerns include the above and many non-material objections such as the location of site notices, devaluation of property and alleged covenant issues, which are not material planning considerations.

A material planning consideration that can be brought to the attention of the committee is that since the application was submitted the government released Planning for the Future (March 2020), which promises a Planning White Paper to increase the supply of housing. It states:

*"Introducing new rules to encourage building upwards, increasing density in line with local character and make the most of local infrastructure – we will **introduce new permitted development rights for***

***building upwards on existing buildings by summer 2020, including to extend residential blocks by up to two storeys and to deliver new and bigger homes. We will also consult on the detail of a new permitted development right to allow vacant commercial buildings, industrial buildings and residential blocks to be demolished and replaced with well-designed new residential units which meet natural light standards.***

Whilst the timetable for the new permitted development rights may slip slightly due to the current pandemic, it is clear that the intention of the government set out in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 118(e) will be given greater freedom as soon as practical:

*“118(e) support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In particular, they should allow upward extensions where the development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers.”*

The committee have before them a well-designed scheme that has been through the negotiations and tweaks expected of a positive planning process. The recommendation from your experienced case officer is to **approve**, the government policy and direction is to **approve**, we therefore politely ask that you take all these points into account and **approve** the application.

**From:** [Councillor John Beesley](#)  
**To:** [Mark Robinson](#)  
**Cc:** [Democratic Services](#); [Councillor Nicola Greene](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Committee meeting on 30 April 2020 - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth, BH2 5EZ  
**Date:** 25 April 2020 19:12:38  
**Attachments:** [Re Fairlea.msg](#)

---

Dear Mr Robinson,

Thank you for your email.

I have attached recent email correspondence I have had with the Company Secretary of Fairlea on behalf of their residents.

The circumstances of the objections are in some ways unusual, but are explained by there having been no consultation process put in place by the applicants.

As explained in my email attached, in order to allow both groups of local residents to take part in some meaningful consultation, it was necessary for me to make sure that they could do so at the Planning Committee in the absence of any planning consultation being offered during the planning process. The planning reasons I gave for the call in of this application to the Planning Committee were as follows:-

1. Detrimental to the amenities of residents in nearby properties.
2. Proposed development neither maintains nor enhances the visual amenities of the adjoining Conservation Area.
3. Inappropriate proposals and poor design of cycle storage and visually detrimental car parking arrangements.
4. Inappropriate and poor quality of design, including detrimental changes to fenestration and the external appearance of the building.
5. Insufficient detail of proposals for solar panels and rainwater harvesting.

To the best of my knowledge there has been no dialogue between the applicants and other residents who live nearby which is unfortunate. I think it is fair to assume therefore that there has been no public consultation, nor any attempt to discuss or explain the issues raised in the objections to the application by me on behalf of the many nearby residents who object. This should be the normal procedure and the applicants have now missed the opportunity to consult as part of their planning application process.

I therefore request that the Planning Committee defer consideration of the planning application until this has taken place in a meaningful way with all those local residents who have objected.

Regards, John Beesley



**Cllr John Beesley** FIM  
**Westbourne & West Cliff Ward**  
**Bournemouth Christchurch & Poole Council**  
[john.beesley@bcpcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:john.beesley@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Mark Robinson <mark.robinson@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 23 April 2020 13:39  
**To:** Councillor John Beesley <john.beesley@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Committee meeting on 30 April 2020 - Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth, BH2 5EZ

Dear Councillor John Beesley

<b>Application:</b>	7-2019-1227-G
<b>Proposal:</b>	Alterations, roof extension to form three additional flats and formation of additional parking spaces
<b>Location:</b>	Fairlea, 16 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth, BH2 5EZ

We are writing to inform you about the above planning application, which will be considered by the Planning Committee at its remote online meeting on 30 April 2020 commencing at 13:00.

Due to the ongoing Covid-19 national emergency, Government introduced the Coronavirus Act 2020 in March 2020 and supporting regulations in April 2020 to enable all Council meetings to be held remotely before 7 May 2021. In accordance with these new statutory provisions and Article 16 of the Council's Constitution on 'Covid-19 Interim Decision Making Arrangements', BCP Council will be holding its planning committee meetings remotely through online facilities until further notice.

The arrangements for public representations to be received at planning committee meetings during this period have been made in accordance with Article 16 of the Council's Constitution. Article 16 disapples the existing Protocol for Public Speaking during the Interim Period. It enables objectors and applicants / supporters including Parish or Town Council representatives who wish to publicly address the planning committee, to do so by providing a written statement by 12 noon on the day before the meeting.

-

If you wish to submit a written statement, please contact:

Democratic Services by email: [democratic.services@bcpcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)

Written statements will be collated and published as soon as possible after 12noon on the day before the meeting and will be available on the Council's website with the link emailed to Committee Members.

Written statements, the reports and recommendations that will be considered by the Committee, and a link to the live broadcast of the meeting can all be viewed by selecting the meeting date at the following link on the BCP Council's website: <https://democracy.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteeId=290>

It will not be possible to give a precise time when this application will be considered. The running order of items to be considered is expected to be in the order listed on the agenda sheet, although the Chairman retains discretion to change the order at the meeting.

Regards

**Mark Robinson**  
**Planning/Building Control Support Officer**  
**Growth & Infrastructure**  
T. 01202 451323  
[planning.bournemouth@bcpcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:planning.bournemouth@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)  
[bcpcouncil.gov.uk](http://bcpcouncil.gov.uk)

-

[Sign up](#) to BCP Council's email news service

**From:** [sue moore](#)  
**To:** [Councillor John Beesley](#)  
**Cc:** [Councillor Nicola Greene](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Fairlea  
**Date:** 01 April 2020 14:47:26

---

Dear Councillor Beesley

Thank you for your prompt reply to my e-mail. I am very grateful and will let the directors and residents know of your views. They will be appreciative of your response.

We appreciate that you are very busy and have a heavy workload and will be particularly stretched by the current pandemic.

I hope that you are keeping well and safe in the present situation.

Kind regards.

Sue Moore

> On 1 Apr 2020, at 14:14, Councillor John Beesley <[john.beesley@bcpcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:john.beesley@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)> wrote:

>

> Dear Ms Moore,

>

> Thank you for your further email.

>

> It is always difficult for a Ward Councillor when residents in a locality are divided in their opinions and it was primarily for that reason that I requested that the determination of the planning application should be made by the Planning Committee rather than by delegation to Planning Officers. To achieve that outcome it was necessary for me as a Ward Councillor to make the call-in request, supported by planning reasons, prior to the Case Officer's recommendation. That recommendation has not yet been received but interestingly, the Council's constitution is likely to be changed soon as it has subsequently been recommended for a call-in to also be permitted by 20 or more representations from local residents.

>

> Obviously it is not within my authority to do more than make representations on behalf of residents, which when an application is contentious is to be expected specifically by those who object. There is of course an expectation by the Local Planning Authority that the applicant will engage with local residents over any concerns that they may have about the application. I am not aware whether you have done this and in order to help the process towards reaching agreement, the call-in fulfils that pressing need.

>

> I am grateful for your responses to the reasons contained in my call-in, but of course I am not expected to end up in a position of negotiation with you or any other party as the applicant and indeed it would not be right were I to do so. However, I would be prepared to play a role in trying to bring you as applicants together with your neighbours who object. Perhaps that could be facilitated by me forwarding your responses to the reasons for the call-in to local residents, from a list supplied by you, unless you (or your Planning Agent) would prefer to do that yourself.

>

> To be clear, my role is not to be caught in the middle between two sets of local residents, rather that failing to achieve either an agreed compromise or a complete understanding of the proposals by those who object, that the matter is determined in public, in this case by the Planning Committee.

>

> I hope this helps.

>

> I am copying my Ward Councillor colleague, Nicola Greene, for her information.

>

> Regards, John Beesley

>

>  
> Cllr John Beesley FIH  
> Westbourne & West Cliff Ward  
> Bournemouth Christchurch & Poole Council  
> john.beesley@bpcouncil.gov.uk  
>  
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: sue moore [REDACTED]  
> Sent: 31 March 2020 14:07  
> To: Councillor John Beesley <john.beesley@bpcouncil.gov.uk>  
> Subject: Fairlea  
>

> Dear Cllr Beesley  
>

> Further to my letter regarding the development of the roof at Fairlea, I have not received a response from you by e-mail. It may be of course that you have responded and sent a letter to my home address and if that is the case, could you please send me a copy via e-mail so that I can share it with the directors and residents of Fairlea. Currently we are in France, in lockdown because of the coronavirus and so not able to return home at the moment.  
>

> If you have not yet responded, we would very much welcome a response to our letter and the points that we raise. The residents of Fairlea would wish you to fully understand our position and would wish you to respond to us.  
>

> We understand that the planning committee meeting has now been postponed until 30 April.  
>

> I look forward to hearing from you.  
>

> Kind regards  
>

> Sue Moore  
> Company Secretary  
> Fairlea Management Company (Bournemouth) Ltd  
>  
>

> DISCLAIMER: This email and any files transmitted with it may be confidential, legally privileged and protected in law and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. The copyright in all documentation is the property of BCP Council (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council) and this email and any documentation must not be copied or used other than as strictly necessary for the purpose of this email, without prior written consent which may be subject to conditions. Any view or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of BCP Council. BCP Council reserves the right to inspect incoming and outgoing emails. If you have received this email in error please contact the sender by return and confirm that its contents have been destroyed.

\*\*\*\*\* This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This footnote also confirms that this email message has been checked for the presence of computer viruses.



On-time representations  
received in relation to:

Bourne Valley Community  
Centre, 56 Herbert Avenue

## Statement of Andrew Hill, local resident objecting

I want it known that in accordance with my previous correspondence to the council about this application I object to it for reasons as follows:-

- 1} I appreciate that there is a need for this kind of Special Housing scheme but do not think this site is suitable as the proposed density of 80 dwellings per hectare is very high compared to the surrounding area which is a low density area.
- 2) The proposed site is not well provided by bus services which the residents will need for travelling to work or other facilities that they may need.
- 3) The site is adjacent to school playing fields which I do not consider to be a good situation.
- 4) It seems to me that this kind of development needs to be in a more town centre locations so that the facilities etc that these people need are near by and not miles away as with the proposed development.
- 5) It seems to me that the council are taking the easy way out, they own this land and decided to use it for this type of development regardless to local opinion.

**From:** [Jenny Brandon](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Reference APP/19/01444/F  
**Date:** 23 April 2020 21:18:33

---

Dear Mr Gilfillan, with regards to the following planning application

## **Application Summary**

**Address:** Bourne Valley Community Centre, [56 Herbert Avenue, Poole, BH12 4EE](#)

**Proposal:** Erect 2 x 2 storey blocks of flats (24 in total) accessed from Herbert Avenue. To be used as temporary accommodation.

I would like to object to the building of this two storey apartment block at 56 Herbert Avenue, Poole. I live at [REDACTED], which is within a very short walking distance to this address. I have read on Bournemouth echo that this is to be used for temporary housing for homeless people. My 14-year old daughter walks to her school bus stop on Herbert Avenue every morning on her own, so do many other kids in this area. In the afternoon when school finishes, they then take the bus home and walk home on their own. There are also two local schools and Branksome recreation ground where lots of kids do sports and / or meet up. It will be a big concern of safety for the children if a large number of homeless people stay here so close to the school bus stop, Branksome recreation ground and two local schools. In addition, the building of a two storey apartment block is not in line with the large number of detached homes in this area and it will also cause parking issues on the busy road of Herbert Avenue, as there are only 11 parking spaces for 24 residents and their visitors in this apartment block. I sincerely hope that the council will be able to find a more suitable place for housing for the homeless people. Thank you for your consideration on this matter. Kind regards.  
Chaoqun Tang

**From:** [frankie newman](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** Planning for 56 Herbert Avenue/APP/19/01444/F  
**Date:** 29 April 2020 11:55:56

---

Hi

I still have concerns over the size of the development on a small parcel of land. 24 flats of numerous sizes does seem to give an overpopulation. In theory if there was just one person in each bedroom that would give 53 people but in reality there will probably be more than one person in each bedroom. Allowing for a couple in each flat plus a child in each other bedroom increase the number to 97 in reality it will probably be higher.

We are also concerned about parking at the facility as there is not one space per flat. Also access for large vehicles looks limited. Herbert Avenue is already very busy and does not need more congestion.

The other aspect is the wildlife what assurances will we get that this will be protected.

Lastly what assurances will we get regarding dealing with any anti social behaviour that arises.

In our opinion a smaller development would be more beneficial.

Thanks

Frankie

Sent from my iPhone

**Herbert Avenue - APP/19/01444/F**

**Written Statement of Jo Keating**

**27<sup>th</sup> April 2020**

I had hoped that in the normal and well-practiced way I would be able to address you in person, to highlight a range of concerns I, and many in my local community have on this planning proposal. Over 100 objections were lodged in response to the proposed development on Herbert Avenue. Whilst I totally understand the need to socially distance at this unprecedented time, the new planning determination process of a virtual meeting will undoubtedly result in under-representation of community views. As a result it is felt your important and long-reaching decisions will be made without normal or full public input, against which balanced judgments can be made with full appreciation of community opinion. Many of the respondents who objected are elderly or vulnerable and are currently having to shield against Covid19. The virtual meeting format asks for written statements by email only, which discounts anyone who does not have access to / or the technical know-how to send an email. Due to lockdown they are not going to be able to get outside help to have their objections submitted or heard by way of a written statement. The new process offers no provision to cover this so I question the legitimacy in terms of public interest. Put simply, in normal circumstances this meeting in public would indeed be well attended by a concerned community. I do hope this is not lost on you as a determining Councillor as part of this remote and detached process.

Overall, I recognise the acute need for a 'Specialist Housing Scheme' to protect and best serve vulnerable members of our society. I totally sympathise with anyone in the awful position of being homeless. A high percentage of people who find themselves in this position have complex needs, and therefore need a high level of support to get back on their feet. Indeed, para 6.17 of the Planning Statement refers to the 'specialist use' of this development site. It is clearly very important that residents are able to gain access to additional support needed to enable them to make positive longer term changes to their lives. Not to afford these residents with access to these opportunities, purely on the basis of an easy to implement location would be remiss and poor planning in my view. This landuse does need to be situated on suitable land and not just a site that is convenient because it is already empty and an easy option.

With regards my specific concerns on the proposal, these are principally about Accessibility (and the more specialist services and support needed by vulnerable people), Building Density and Safeguarding.

**Accessibility:**

Applying blanket Accessibility parameters, paragraph 6.21 of the Planning Statement states 'the site location is in a relatively sustainable location with fairly regular bus services'. No reference is made to *very* or *highly accessible*, which would perhaps be befitting of a site within an "accessible corridor". Clearly this site is not afforded extensive sustainable travel

opportunities, particularly compared to a town centre locations, or indeed to specific facilities needed.

Whilst the 2 bus services close to the site may provide access to town centre facilities (subject to cost / affordability) the limited routes are very unlikely to provide direct and convenient access to employment opportunities across the conurbation. Having worked in Recruitment for the last 18 years I can categorically say it is not realistic for anyone to have to take 4 buses each day to commute to work and back. This would be better achieved from a Town Centre location. As an example, Poole Bus Station has 23 different bus routes from there, which cover all of the conurbation.

It is also important to note that, rightly, significant weight is applied to the principle of Accessibility in the material submitted by the applicant and much is drawn upon it as part of the Recommendation Report. I agree Accessibility is fundamental to the suitability and success of any landuse. However, it is important to recognise Accessibility is not a blanket parameter which applies equally the same way for every individual. Fundamentally it is about the ease of journey and modal propensity to travel between two locations. Those locations are not just the local shops or leisure facilities (for example) but should include all facilities fundamental to the well-being of an individual. Despite identifying that individuals of this site will need to gain access to additional support facilities, no assessment is made by the applicant in this regard about how accessible this additional support is from this proposed site. Are the determining Committee completely satisfied that the additional support needs of individuals of this specialist use site have been fully considered? Will they be best served from this location, or will location be an additional burden and barrier placed upon them by poor Planning decisions?

**Density:**

The proposed site density calculates at 80 dwellings per hectare (para 6.14). As acknowledged in the Planning Statement, this is a 'relatively high density scheme', particularly as the site is located in a predominately low density area (para 2.3), which is consistent with my own view of this predominantly residential area. This development will clearly not be in keeping with the surrounding area, and whilst this should not preclude increased density being introduced, the foundation on which that judgement is made again falls to "Accessibility".

Paragraph 5.10 of the Planning Statement identifies that The Poole Local Plan (2018) Policy PP2(d) recommends that the housing density should optimise the potential of sites that sit within the accessible corridor with a minimum of 50 dph, Notwithstanding my comments above on the application of a blanket Accessibility parameter, I note that this proposed site is located on the very periphery of the accessible corridor yet the proposals is for well above 50 dph. Should it have been located the other side of the accessible corridor "cliff-edge" threshold, against which it is immediately abutting, the recommended densities would be far lower than that proposed. They would indeed be more akin to the existing residential setting; a density level long established.

I would also note that the proposed density of 80 dph is closer to the density level recommended for town centre locations (The Poole Local Plan (2018) Policy PP2(d)), indicating this type of specialist landuse may indeed be better suited to a town centre location.

**Summary:**

The Committee will clearly note that there are numerous areas of concern, particularly across density and accessibility which do not appear to reconcile with local or national policy.

We know it very important that residents of this proposed site are able to gain access to additional support needed to enable them to make positive longer term changes to their lives. Not to afford these residents with access to these opportunities, purely on the basis of an easy to implement location would be remiss and poor planning. Herbert Avenue is not the right location in this regard, a town centre location would be fair better suited. It would be more in-keeping with the proposed density of 80ph, the accessibility gained from a town centre location will be fair superior to that of Herbert Avenue and the relevant services needed by those with complex needs would be far more accessible.

In summary, whilst it is important that provision for specialist housing is made, it does need to be in a suitable location, just because the land in Herbert Avenue is available, this does not make it the right site. I would urge the Committee to seek greater confidence in the evidence base presented to them and ensure the basis of their decisioning judgement is robust.

**From:** [Kate Trott](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** APP/19/01444/F  
**Date:** 28 April 2020 20:59:55

---

I am writing in reference to the proposed plans for what was previously Bourne Valley Community Centre on Herbert Avenue. I do understand that in the current times of social distancing that holding a virtual meeting is the safest way to proceed, however it does lead to concerns about under representation of any objections to the wish to be voiced. The limited nature in which those objections can be expressed and the constraints that this imposes on many, means that anyone unable to email in loses their right to have their say. It means that due to the decision to hold this meeting in this way, it gives rise to concern about due process being followed and how uninformed the local community are feeling despite over 100 objections being lodged.

A concern raised by BCP's Highway Authority is around Highway Safety, to the extent that Steve Stace has recommended on 2 separate occasions that this proposal is declined. I acknowledge that the parking provision has increased to 15 spaces, however this is still under the required level of provision for 24 residential units which is similar to this social accommodation therefore this proposal doesn't provide sufficient levels of parking provision to meet requirements of highway safety. The impact for the lack of parking provision of the current proposal means the roads surrounding the proposed development would be negatively affected. It is acknowledged that there is no parking provision along Herbert Avenue, and any parking upon this road would have negative consequences for the flow of traffic and the general safety of both road users and pedestrians along a busy main road. Assuming the proposal is geared towards families who are in an accommodation crisis or homeless, then it is highly likely that each of these families would have one, or more, vehicle. This means the provision of parking doesn't meet the basic requirements of parking provision needed and that overflow car parking would be sought by the flats residents in the surrounding area. BCP Highway Authority acknowledged the high likelihood of residents therefore taking short term parking risks, parking in inconsiderate locations, which in an area already suffering from tensions due to parking constraints will add to those issues and exacerbating an already escalating issue, potentially making the development's residents feel at odds with local community from the outset. Equally those trawling parking for spaces will hamper the flow of traffic, increasing congestion and pollution. Therefore the culmination of all this would surely result in failing to deliver a safe and sustainable development.

The plans for the development to provide temporary accommodation are short term with the aim that in 3-5 years this accommodation becomes part of the normal council letting stock with secure tenancy offered to those families with either primary or secondary school aged children. That means in matter of 10 years the number of those who will be of age to own a car residing in the accommodation will increase dramatically. With a flat of 3 bedrooms equalling homes with 2 adults and just 2 children will become potentially as car owning/driving age is reached means 4 cars for each flat, 3 for each 2 bedroom and so on. The impact of all these additional cars needing parking hasn't been factored into the proposal at all nor based on the concerns already being expressed by BCP Highway Authority for the lack of car parking proposed, is there any scope to absorb this additional need in the locality around the site.

I also feel that there are safeguarding concerns for the location next to a school field. Based upon conversations with Su Spence, Poole Housing Partnership, who by her own admission is unable to provide any guarantee that the flats won't turn into HMO's if the housing needs evolve. Whilst it was made clear that this goes against the policy that



everyone has their own front door, she herself said that she was unable to say that multiple occupancy would not happen and there was a general acknowledgement that this would potentially result in behaviour that would present concerns with a primary school field located next door. As a school governor, I find this very concerning and have concerns for the impact upon the children and their ability to use the field which is their only access to green space at school. These concerns are compounded by the fact that passing by the access point to the development is the route taken by the children to the school field due to the location of the pedestrian crossing next to it.

To summarise, I hope that the Committee clearly understand the levels of concern there are around this development's location. It is absolutely correct that accommodation such as this is found or built but it needs to be located in the right place, and whilst this land is available it doesn't automatically make it the right place. Herbert Avenue is not the right location. I urge the Committee to review the proposal and fully take into account the objections of the local community and BCP Highway Authority when making their decision.

Application:- APP/1901444/F

Dear Mr Gilfillan,

Regarding the proposed development of 24 flats over 2x2 storey blocks to be used as temporary accommodation for the homeless.

My objections to this development are:-

1. Adequacy of parking, loading and turning.

Looking at the plans there are only 11 parking bays for 24 flats. This does not seem adequate.

2. Location of flats to the nearby schools.

It is not appropriate to have up to 24? vulnerable adults within close proximity of nearby schools due to the fact that the residents may have drug and alcohol issues and as a result could be a risk to children in the area. Central Avenue, on a school day between 8am and 9am and then 2.30pm to 4.00pm, is the crossover route between Heatherlands Primary School and St. Joseph's Catholic School. There is a procession of mums, dads, babies in buggies, toddlers, school children and older siblings walking, scooting and cycling as they walk up to the steps and across the crossing lights on Herbert Avenue. It is a delight to watch it each school day.

In addition there are two schools on Herbert Avenue namely the Quay School and St. Aldhelms. Surely the priority of the council should be to safeguard our children rather than flood the area with convicted criminals and people with drug and alcohol abuse issues. There is a playing field right next to the proposed development used by local schools and clubs. This is not an ideal location for the flats.

3. Location of flats close to a public house

The New Star public house is next to the proposed development. Alcohol abuse is a common addiction in the homeless. A pub next to the accommodation cannot fail to be an irresistible temptation.

4. Fear of Crime

We all know that many of the homeless have issues in terms of crime, addiction and mental health. This development has a footfall of at least 100 children a day passing the flats. This is a risk for the safety of these children. We have all seen the discarded drug paraphernalia on the paths, this is a danger to everyone near these flats.

5. Noise and Disturbance resulting from use

There cannot fail to be noise and disturbance from the flats both day and night, due to mental problems and drug abuse from the residents.

These five points are my representation about the proposed development.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs L Elliott

**From:** [Michelle Bowe](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** Herbert Avenue APP/19/01444/F  
**Date:** 27 April 2020 19:46:23

---

Dear Sir's

If I can start by expressing how disappointed and concerned I have felt on how this planning application has been handled.

You started the processes when the school's and family's next to the proposed site were on their Christmas holidays with many residences being away, not giving them time to find out more information or able to contact you in time to express their concerns.

The community had expressed their desire to attend the open meeting to advise why they do not believe this is the right site for the proposed housing development. To be told that you have decided to have this behind closed doors and not be able to join the meeting via the internet or by waiting till lock down to finish has left us feeling abandoned and you will not understand or listen to our concerns and the views of the community.

There has been over 100 objections lodged with a large proportion of that by letter, by only accepting written statements via email there will be a large members of those 100 who do not have access to the internet and had planed to attend in person. They also did not have ample time to send this in via the post.

We have a large number of retired residence who are elderly or need asstanace and would not be aware that the meeting has been cancelled these vounrable residence who cant use the internet will not be heard.

I recognise that specialist housing is needed and we need to look after all vounrable people however just because you have some council land and the build is by the council it does not make this a suitable location.

First it is right next to the school playing field and some homeless people have a problem with drugs and alcohol and I feel it is to close to the children.

We are also trying to build a close community, to have a constant stream of temperry Tennent's who can not build close ties with the neighbourhood will damage this.

In Parkstone we have a major problem with parking with many residence unable to park and also there is many parts of Parkstone that people double park making traffic at peak times dangerous by building over 24 flats in a small plot of land with only a very small number of parking spaces will mean this will make it worse.

It is also not in keeping the area. My house and the neighbouring houses are pre second world war with my own property being built in the 1930. I do not believe that a block of new flats is in keeping with the area.

I also feel that public transport is not sufficient as we have very limited bus routs and would be

better placed in a town centre.

We know that it is very important that the residents at the proposed site are able to gain access to additional support, by not providing them with this in the proposed area and would suite a town centre not a back bit of land on Herbert Avenue.

Please do listen to mine and the other 100 residence concerns who have not been able to take part in the committee meeting.

Kind Regards

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** [Rachael Gentle](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Cc:** [Chris Harrod](#)  
**Subject:** 56 Herbert Avenue, proposed development.  
**Date:** 28 April 2020 11:55:00

---

Written Statement of Mr and Mrs Baker. [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern

I would like to bring to Committee's attention that BCP Highways Authority have advised on 2 occasions that they recommend refusal of this development. On 2<sup>nd</sup> March BCP Highways were still raising concerns regarding safety despite the Applicant increasing the number of spaces, I quote from the email 2<sup>nd</sup> March from Steve Stace of the Highways Authority "The parking provision has increased to 15 spaces, although given the number of proposed units has not been reduced, this still represents a parking shortfall of six spaces" and "There are still concerns on the lack of parking and the impact this would have on highway safety, therefore, Transport Policy would still be recommending refusal for the reason previously noted".

BCP Highways still have objections and the Applicant has said he is unable to do what Transport want, plus the fact that one of the major plays made by the Applicant is that this site is in an 'accessible corridor' and parking spaces would not be needed as residents of specialist housing are unlikely to own a car so replacing the bike parking with car spaces undermines their own policy and assertion in relation to this development.

Please see the excerpt below from the Applicant in response to Steve Stace's recommendations, where he confirms he is unable to make the changes required in relation to the parking spaces, and there is no data available in regards to car ownership.

"I note that transportation are still recommending refusal although Steve has made suggestions which we have been able to accommodate. Were you, however, still minded to refuse the application on the grounds of the level of parking provision, we would have no alternative but to reduce the footprint of the buildings. Thus reducing the desired number of temporary units approved by the council or alternatively by increasing the height of the buildings. Stay duration I have been in touch with BCP council's homeless team and unfortunately there is no statistical data collected in relation to the number of homeless people that have a car".

As stated by the Applicant one of the major plays is the location being in an accessible corridor, which is isn't as Herbert Avenue is only serviced by 2 bus routes – there seems to be contradictions by the Applicant in terms of the need for the development to be in an Accessible Corridor and whether or not the parking criteria set out by the council needs to be met or not – there is no data statistical to back this up in terms of car ownership, and it could in-fact turn out that each household owns a vehicle or possibly even 2 vehicles, which would create issues in terms of safety and parking in the locality.

It would be a poor planning decision to approve a development that your own highways authority has recommended on 2 occasions be declined on grounds of safety.

Please can you confirm receipt if this email by return.  
Many thanks  
Mrs and Mrs Baker

**From:** [tonya clarke](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** proposed housing development 56 HERBERT AVENUE  
**Date:** 28 April 2020 13:48:29

---

We had hoped to discuss this in person at the meeting this week but under current circumstances we realise this not possible.

I am also disappointed that the meeting is going ahead behind closed doors as it were as the local residents cannot have their say. As we know many are extremely unhappy as we are.

We feel this is definitely NOT the right location for this sort of build, not in keeping with this area, definitely not enough parking spaces for the amount of flats. So much extra traffic directly opposite our property, which is already congested with school drop off from St Josephs primary school directly behind us.

Accessibility this site we feel is definitely not good in accessing Poole & Bournemouth with regular buses. A more town centre location would be much more suitable, there is enough trouble with the homeless in Parkstone already as you are I am sure aware of. Ashley Road area.

My husband and his mother have already suffered trouble Ashley Road area, and are very concerned that is coming closer to us!!!

we know this type of property is going to cause many issues with many local residents. from elderly to the children.

Which is a safeguarding issue for the 4 schools in such a close proximity and St Josephs primary schools playing field next to the proposed site.

We know the local schools are very concerned,

At this meeting this week we know there was going to be attendance from St Josephs to put across their side.

More annoying than anything is that us as residents no one seems to care about how this will affect us and our properties. How they may go up or DOWN..

No residents are going to be happy with this build which is NOT suitable at all for this busy area and heavy traffic at peak times.

I do hope consideration from the local residents will be taken as we cannot be there in person at the meeting this thursday.

Mr Darren Clarke  
Mrs Tonya Clarke  
69 Herbert Avenue

**From:** [e-mail coolfords](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** Planning reference APP/19/01444/F  
**Date:** 29 April 2020 10:29:12

---

APP/19/01444/F|Erect 2 x 2 storey blocks of flats (24 in total) accessed from Herbert Avenue.

To be used as temporary accommodation.|Bourne Valley Community Centre, 56 Herbert Avenue, Poole, BH12 4EE

Please find below my statement in regard to the above planning application.

I am very concerned with the proposed buildings being in such close proximity to St. Joseph's playing fields and school, which raises serious safeguarding issues. There are also two

other schools, The Quay School and St. Aldhelm's Academy on Herbert Avenue. The lane from

Connaught Crescent is used regularly to access these schools.

I'm not saying that all homeless people have alcohol problems, but to some , living next to a public

house could add to their problems.

We live next to Branksome Recreation Ground and already have to deal with disruptive behaviour

on a regular basis and feel that this will be added to if these plans are passed.

The roads around this area are already very busy and this building work will only cause more

problems.

I feel there are enough problems in the area without adding more to them.

JEAN AND MICHAEL FORD

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Your reference: APP/19/01444/F

I object to the proposed planning at Bourne Valley Community Centre, 56 Herbert Avenue, Poole, BH1224EE.

For the following reasons.

Temporary housing for a minimum of possibly 53 homeless residents who may be vulnerable, have drug, alcohol and mental health issues is not appropriate when situated next to a school playing field which it will overlook.

There are also 3 schools in close proximity to the proposed development, surely the council should be safeguarding these children and not putting this type of development anywhere near schools.

The proximity to Branksome Recreation ground which is an alcohol-free zone (not normally policed) could result in it becoming a meeting point for the residents of the housing which could result in an increase of anti-social behaviour and crime, also drug and substance abuse resulting in drug equipment being left lying around for example used needles etc.

Intimidation of local families using the area could also occur making them feel unsafe, and it could become a no-go area for most.

There is also a children's playground on the recreation ground as well as another in Rossmore Road which is very close to the proposed development.

2 storey blocks of flats are not in keeping with the local area which consists of mainly detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows with gardens and would result in more overdevelopment of the area.

Access from Herbert Avenue which is a very busy main road with no parking will result in more traffic congestion and parking problems as there are only 15 allocated parking spaces for the flats which could potentially have 53 residents, if most have vehicles they would be parking dangerously on bends and junctions in the already heavily congested surrounding roads.

Signed

P Light.



Your reference: APP/19/01444/F

I strongly object to the planned 53 bed blocks of flats as temporary accommodation for the homeless for the reasons given below.

15 parking bays for potentially 53 people will cause problems for the surrounding area. There is no parking in Herbert Avenue, residents would have to park in the already congested surrounding area where vehicles are already parking on dangerous bends etc.

These flats would be adjacent to and overlook St Joseph's school sports field, can we be sure if residents have a drug habit any used needles etc would not find their way through/over the fence and it is not appropriate for the children to be overlooked so closely in their sports wear?

Building over such a large plot of land increases the risk of flooding to surrounding area.

Central Avenue is a widely used shortcut from the proposed development/ Herbert Avenue and surrounding areas to access Branksome Recreation ground and onward to Ashley Road past Heatherlands school in Library road. Central Avenue has already had problems with cars being vandalised and noise from drunken people late at night returning home from a night out and we fear this will become worse.

Many of the homeless residents will potentially have drink/drug/mental health problems and being so close to the recreation ground it would be very likely become a meeting place for drug use etc. Turning it from lovely family play park into a no-go area with discarded needles etc as has happened to other locations. Although the recreation ground has a "no alcohol" policy this is rarely enforced. Many homeless people congregate on nearby Ashley Road high on drugs or drink. I personally have been approached aggressively by some of these people and they can be very intimidating. Many lone women and elderly people use this park for exercise/dog walking etc and it would be a great loss to them if they became afraid to go there alone.

Many children walking to schools in the area i.e. – St Aldhelms Academy, St Josephs and Heatherlands. These young impressionable children walk from all areas past the proposed development to get to and from their schools and it would not be good if their parents felt it necessary to take them by car.

This proposed development would be an eyesore and out of keeping for the surrounding area that consists mainly of detached houses and bungalows with neatly kept gardens.

While I have every sympathy with the homeless families in the area, I do not believe this development to be the right thing to do. This site would be far better developed with affordable permanent homes for families, more in keeping with this area. This plan is over development at its worse.

Signed

P Sealey

### Written Statement - Stuart King

I have a number of concerns regarding the proposed plans to build 24 Units of Housing for the Homeless on Herbert Avenue. Reading through the Planning Statement and the subsequent communication emails and amended plans it does confirm my concerns that the proposed site is unsuitable for the size of development.

Whilst I fully appreciate the need for this specialist social housing to be provided it does feel like a square peg is being forced into a round hole to satisfy the required provision for this type of housing.

Just because the site on Herbert Avenue is vacant council land and doesn't make it the right location.

I have listed my main concerns below:

#### Density:

- The density of the proposed development isn't in keeping with the local area. This is a low density residential area, and the proposed development is high density.

#### Highway Safety

BCP Highways authority have on 2 occasions, and this is despite changes to the plans, still recommending refusal. Steve Stace the Transportation Officer stated in his emails of 2<sup>nd</sup> March and 14<sup>th</sup> Jan

**"from a highway perspective the proposal is for 24 residential units, similar to that of social housing accommodation and therefore the standard parking provision is required"**

**"Transport Policy recommend refusal of the proposal for the following reason:- The proposal fails to provide sufficient onsite parking and could result in drivers taking short term parking risks, parking in inconsiderate locations and trawling the streets looking for parking spaces, increasing vehicle movements on the highways adjacent to the site, impacting on the flow of traffic and increasing congestion. As a result the proposal will increase highway safety dangers, impact on the flow of traffic, increasing congestion and pollution in the area and does not meet the aims of delivering safe and sustainable development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policies PP34 & PP35"**

- The site is not big enough to accommodate the criteria set out by the council in terms of parking provision. The Applicant has acknowledged the site cannot accommodate the required level of parking – please see email below:

From: David Hood Sent: Thu, 5 Mar 2020 14:31:12 +0000 To: James Gilfillan – Planning Officer

*I note that transportation are still recommending refusal although Steve has made suggestions which we have been able to accommodate. **Were you, however, still minded to refuse the application on the grounds of the level of parking provision, we would have no alternative but to reduce the footprint of the buildings. Thus reducing the desired number of temporary units approved by the council or alternatively by increasing the height of the buildings.***

- I'm sure the council is under pressure to deliver this housing project, reading the email from the Applicant, where he states if the plans were refused on the grounds of parking the Applicant would have no alternative but to reduce the footprint of the building, see highlighted email above. This certainly comes across as applying pressure to pass the plans and reinforces the notion of the 'square peg, round hole' analogy I referred to earlier.

The site simply isn't big enough to accommodate 24 residential units and the required parking spaces, rendering it an unsuitable location.

**Summary:**

It would be remiss to ignore recommendations of safety from Transport & Highways experts, and to go against the Council's own Parking Provision for this type of social housing, it's just bending the rules to suit which isn't acceptable.

I implore you to seriously consider the potential ramifications of ignoring the advice of your Highways Authority. Particularly as the location of the site is so close to a Primary School Playing Field, safety needs to be a paramount concern, and not something that is put aside because it is a convenient location and empty land. Whilst there is a need to provide this type of housing I don't believe that should be delivered at the potentially very high cost of compromising Highway Safety, particularly when the advice of experts is so clear. Approving council plans on council land where clearly it is an unsuitable site is not the right decision and I hope your planning decision reflects this.

Thank you for taking the time to take on-board my concerns.

Kind regards

Stuart King

## **Representation from W Batten**

With regards to the proposed housing development at 56 Herbert Avenue which due to the current situation I will not be allowed to attend due to social distancing.

I would however like to make a few points which I believe need addressing before any decisions are made.

Drainage issues from the site would directly cause problems down Central ave and flood at the junction with Playfields Drive

This already happens on various occasions so to put this housing on the site would make things much worse

Parking spaces I believe for 24 flats should be more than the revised plans of 15 including 3 for the disabled and are they the required width because on the original plans the reports say they are not and also building regulations say more spaces are needed to comply

I would like to mention that the site is between two schools St Joseph's and Heatherlands which to my way of thinking is certainly not acceptable

Other problems with the site is antisocial behaviour which we have in the area already and this site being situated next to a through cut from Herbert Ave to the Branksome recreation ground will be make things worse not only for the local residents but for the vulnerable people you are intending to be housed in the development

I am really pleased to support this application and will comment on the scheme as a whole as many residents in Newtown & Heatherlands raised their concerns during the planning consultation based on misleading press coverage.

The application is for two two-storey blocks containing 24 one, two, and three-bedroom flats under a PHP scheme to provide temporary accommodation to families facing homelessness until permanent accommodation can be found. As you will all be aware, the council has a statutory duty to house people from certain groups such as those with disabilities, those with dependent children or expectant mothers. Housing stock is very low at the moment across the area and with more and more people unable to make payments in private rented accommodation and a shortage of council and affordable housing more families are becoming homeless.

These families are currently housed in B&Bs which comes at a huge cost to our tax payers and raises some safeguarding issues around safety and security. Rooms in B&Bs are also not always appropriate because they may not include access for people who use wheelchairs and have mobility problems.

Unfortunately, the local newspaper, when reporting on the scheme, equated families in need of temporary accommodation, that the council have a statutory duty to house, with rough sleeping in the town centres. This, understandably, caused confusion for the residents and parents and even the Head of St Joseph's school who then promptly submitted a number of objections during the consultation period raising concerns such as rises in anti-social behaviour, drug related crime, prostitution and even paedophilia as the new blocks will overlook the school field.

I was personally upset by the comments considering that there are more than likely families at the school at risk of or facing homelessness and in desperate need of suitable, temporary accommodation, however, I take the comments in the context of the misleading report from the newspaper.

We do have some ongoing anti-social behaviour in the area but that is very much a separate issue and it is simply not fair to deny families in crisis suitable temporary housing because of its unrelated existence.

This application will improve the general feel of the area, bringing an abandoned site up to date and providing a meaningful scheme that accommodates families across BCP in need of temporary accommodation, which is safe and secure, and reduces the cost to the tax payer. I thank PHP and BCP Officers for their work on the application and hope that my statement has clarified the situation in light of objections the committee may have received.

Councillor Millie Earl

On-time representations  
received in relation to:

Land North of A35 and  
South of Milhams Common

WRITTEN SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 8/19/1376/FUL  
TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE BCP PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 30TH APRIL 2020.  
(P .J. Fenning)

My name is Peter Fenning, I am a retired chartered geologist and secretary of the Christchurch Conservation Trust and we wish to object to this application to build a new stepped access way from the A35 onto the water meadow known as Millhams Common. Our objections are

1 At item 30 of the Case officer's report to you it states that this proposed access path is unsuitable for people with reduced mobility but considered to be reasonable given the reasons for providing this new access which is to reduce pressure on protected Heathlands. At 32 the officer states that this stepped path will put disabled people at a disadvantage from accessing the site

2 At item 33 the officer points out that questions have been raised as to why the existing gated access further along the A35 could not be enhanced as a new pedestrian access. The officer states that this area is the first to get flooded and would minimise access.

3 The officer is not taking into account your 20th February committee meeting which granted planning permission for 8/18/3263/FUL. It included a planning condition which stated that a condition ,No 19, required adherence to the summary of Biodiversity Mitigation Proposals received on 03/02/2020.

4 Reference to this mitigation document at page 2 ,(2.1.1) states that besides the proposed new stepped pathway a second access will be provided via enhancement of the existing gateway **which comprises a gentle sloping gradient more suited to those of reduced mobility**

5 The above is confirmed in Ecosupport Ltd report with the heading of Heathland Infrastructure Project Scheme dated 22/7/2018 . Within this report is an Appendix with an annotated airphoto clearly showing the proposed new path route inside the common and closely following the southern site boundary and detailing the existing trackway as an entrance point from the bypass. This contradicts the officer statement given in item 33.

6 At item 35 the officer states that the construction of the new steps will impact on some of the vegetation and biodiversity. However this is balanced against the need for access to facilitate access to the common. We disagree.

.Nowhere in the documentation is it noted that when the A35 bypass was built it was on an elevated base and left a 10-15 metre wide strip, either side, as a natural barrier between the road and the water meadows. This was planted with vegetation and is a natural habitat for birds , insects etc. Given the pressures on wildlife sites it is unacceptable to deliberately cause damage on the excuse of requiring access when a perfectly acceptable and more appropriate existing access is a few metres away.

7 The comments in section 30 and 32 on putting disabled persons at a disadvantage cannot go unchallenged as Christchurch Town Council has stated in its objection . Wildlife Trusts are finding ways to encourage the disabled into nature areas and open spaces.

**From:** [Geoffrey Furnell](#)  
**To:** [Chris Harrod](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Application 8/19/1376/FUL  
**Date:** 23 April 2020 09:10:57

---

Dear Mr Harrod

Re - Planning Application 8/19/1376/ FUL Milliams Mead North.

Could I please ask you to forward the attached images of the recent flooding to the land, to all members of the Planning Committee of BCP.

I write to you in my capacity as a Trustee of Christchurch Commoners who since time immemorial have had grazing rights on this land, which is a registered Common.

I would also bring to your attention that no consultation was offered to the Trustees or Stewards of Christchurch Commoners within the process of this application.

Yours sincerely

Geoff Furnell

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Geoffrey Furnell [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 23 April 2020 at 08:41:51 BST  
**To:** [REDACTED]

















Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Geoffrey Furnell](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Application 8/19/1376/FUL  
**Date:** 28 April 2020 15:13:14

---

Representation ( Objection ) against Application 8/ 19 / 1376 / FUL - Land North of A35 and South of Milliams Common - From Mr Geoff Furnell Trustee of Christchurch Commoners Association.

Milliams Mead North has been used as pasture by Christchurch Commoners as mentioned in Town Documents as far back as 1649 , and is a registered Common.

Commoners allow free access, but caution is needed when walking on The Mead when stock are grazing.

Bounded as it is by both the Millstream and the Avon , it can become treacherously flooded, to such a severe extent that the animals grazing are removed during the winter months and the meadow remains waterlogged for some considerable time.

A stock entry gate already exists off the A35 , together with a registered foot path at the bottom of Beaconsfield Road , which leads directly to Milliams via a recently replaced foot bridge. Adding a further entrance compromises the security of the grazing animals .

I would also bring to the Committees attention that during the application process as legal occupiers of the land at no time consultation of the proposal was given or offered.

Signed

Geoff Furnell - Trustee of Christchurch Commoners Association.

My name is Stephanie King and I was born and lived with my parents at No 45 Beaconsfield Road which directly overlooks the Millstream and the Millhams common. Since moving away I have visited the common many times. I know it well My grandson has grazed horses on the common over the last years.

Much of what has been written in the BCP paperwork lacks a true understanding of the facts. and it is a muddle. These facts are

When the Christchurch Bypass was built the level of the road surface was raised and so there were downward sloping banks either side. Trees and bushes were planted along both banks and formed a screen between the bypass and the adjoining water meadows This screen became a habitat for birds, mammals and butterflies and still is.

At the same time a sloping access track was constructed on both banks to allow vehicles to deliver grazing animals onto Millhams common on the North Side and on the South Side to South Millhams water meadow

These tracks are shown on the maps then and now are on the Ordnance Survey maps. Pedestrians also used these ramps . The Northern track onto Millhams common is still used by walkers and by the graziers' vehicles. I see at page 77 paragraph 33 that someone thinks that this existing trackway onto Millhams Common could not be enhanced as a new pedestrian access because this area is the first part to get flooded. Whoever says that should visit the site more often, it is not.

You do not need a new access it is there it just needs a new surface and a new access gate/style plus a gate for the vehicles. The author of this report should ask himself how will the council access the site to mow the new long grass paths without vehicle access to deliver a large mower. You will not do it with a new narrow stepped path down a steep bank as the application appears to forget

Also if this report author states that this existing access is unsuitable because it is the first to flood why is the new path access route inside the common shown as passing through it and why is this entrance shown as an access point. You can see this as Appendix 1 in a document named Land Off Bargates . Heathland Infrastructure Project Scheme.( 22nd July 2019) Reference Planning Document 8/18/3263/FUL

I see that the new stepped pathway (cost £25,000) will be unsuitable for disabled access as said on page 78 paragraph 38. I see that that the planning benefits of providing this stepped access outweigh the concerns of a lack of disabled access. I have a severely disabled son and I cannot believe that this statement is in a Council document.

Does this Council not recognise that disabled people need every bit of a help to get out into the countryside, apparently not.

I object to this application

**From:** [Sue Newman](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** North Milham common land  
**Date:** 23 April 2020 11:46:10

---

Dear Committee

This is still a registered common and has rights of pasture only for horses.

No dogs. No fisherman. These activities require a licence; they are not as of right.

It is vital that the commoning rights are capable of being implemented, and the fish-hooks left by fisherman has discouraged horse-owners from grazing their animals on the common. Occasionally they are still commoned but we don't want any more discouragement to this than already exists.

Dogs, for instance, are a grave danger to horses, which are spooked by them, and get chased by them. Furthermore, this land, which was granted to the townspeople nearly 1,000 years ago for commoners' use, has never been cultivated and supports a wide variety of wild flora and fauna. Only last week I noticed a water vole's tunnel across the meadow and its exist on the riverbank. These are endangered animals. This is their refuge. Dogs will dig out and kill water voles.

The swans are particularly noticeable. They nest on the river bank and would be adversely disturbed by free-roaming dogs, as would any ground-nesting birds. Dogs' excrement, furthermore, alters the characteristics of the soil, which are home to invertebrates.

Please run this common as a wildlife haven, not a park, and respect its common rights and its ancient history. I attach pictures, including the water-vole tunnel, identified by a zoologist belonging to The Bournemouth Natural Science Society (along with lynx footprints).



Yours faithfully,

Mrs S L Newman-Crane  
18 Riverdale lane  
Christchurch  
BH23 1RL

Author of The Christchurch Commons

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

## **BCP Council Planning Committee Agenda Item 6D**

### **Land North of A35 and South of Millhams Common**

**Formation of pedestrian access from classified public highway; installation of surfaced pathway, gate and handrails.**

#### **Statement on behalf of the applicant**

Good afternoon Chair and Members

This statement is submitted on behalf of the applicant in support of the Planning Officer's recommendation that planning permission should be granted.

#### **The Proposal**

The planning permission that has been sought is specifically for the formation of a pedestrian access (crossover) from the footway of the Christchurch bypass (A35 – a classified road) into the adjacent land which is highway verge maintained by the Council.

In turn, the purpose is to provide an additional pedestrian access route into Millhams Common which is a designated Open Access Area and Common Land located close to Christchurch Town Centre but currently little used by the resident population. The proposed access follows the route of a desire line visible on site created by people informally accessing the common from this location which indicates that people want to access the Open Access Land in this way. The proposal will enable them to do so more safely. No part of the proposed development falls within the common land; it is simply to provide a more direct means of access.

The proposal was devised in consultation with the Council's Countryside Team and Natural England, and is part of a Council strategy to increase public use of open spaces to reduce pressure on nearby Heathlands. Funding for this work was negotiated and secured by your officers as part of the resolution of the Council to grant planning permission for the redevelopment of the Police Station/Magistrates Court site.

As such, the proposed access is something that the Council has proactively sought to secure, and which the Council considers to represent a material benefit arising from the Magistrates Court site development.

#### **Response to Concerns**

We are therefore disappointed that this approach to enhancing public access, requested by Natural England and your Countryside Team, has generated some objections.

Christchurch Town Council has raised the following objection:

- The kissing gate design and stepped access does not allow access for wheelchair users; and,
- The site is not suitable in principle for Heathland Infrastructure Provision given that the site floods frequently and is rendered unusable for a proportion of the year which has not been accounted for.

As is set out in the committee report, Cllr Hall also referred the application to Committee because of concerns about the Open Access Land being liable to flooding, and the proposed means of access not being suitable for disabled persons.

These objections are reflected in representations from other stakeholders, which also raise concerns about public access to Millhams Common causing including litter and potential conflict between dog walkers, grazing livestock and nesting birds.

#### **Principle**

In response to concerns about public use of the land:



- 1) Millhams Common is already designated as Open Access Land and Common Land; public access is both permitted and encouraged;
- 2) The proposal is simply the creation of an additional means of access to the land. It does not seek to establish the principle of public access; and,
- 3) The facilitation of enhanced public use of Millhams Common was a requirement of BCP Council when it resolved to grant planning permission for the Police Station.

#### Land liable to flooding

The proposal has been devised in consultation with the Council's Countryside Team and Natural England. In supporting enhanced public access, the Council and Natural England are fully aware that the land is liable to flooding at certain times of year. This does not preclude beneficial use for much of the year.

#### Access for All

The design of the proposed stepped and ramped access takes account of the steep slope between the public footway alongside the A35 and the common land. Whilst clearly and by definition providing significantly improved access to the land, the proposal will not and can not deliver a means of access that would be readily suitable for wheelchair users. As stated by your planning officers in the committee report:

*"31. Careful consideration has been given to the Equalities Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty at s149 of the Act. Section 20 of the Act refers to the requirement, where a physical feature puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, to take such steps as it is reasonable to have to take to avoid the disadvantage. Saved policy T16 of the Christchurch Local Plan refers to improvement for access and other facilities for mobility impaired people will be included within highway improvement and traffic management schemes and in any new development proposals.*

*32. This path and the proposed kissing gate will put disabled people at a disadvantage from accessing the site. However, the HIP itself will not be laid out to provide adequate surfaces for wheelchairs to use. Given the sensitivity of this land with the adjacent designations, it is not appropriate to create a more formal layout with hard surfaced paths. Notwithstanding the fact that planning permission is not considered to be required for the ramp, steps and gate, it is considered the new access provides an improved access for as many people as possible and is reasonable in the context of Section 20 as referred to above. Furthermore, any proposed improvements to Milhams North would be contrary to its use as Common and would require SoS approval for works on the Common to 'improve it'."*

#### **Summary**

The formation and future maintenance of the access will be funded from contributions being secured from the Planning Obligation (S106) in conjunction with the development of the Police Station site.

Paragraphs 91 and 98 of the NPPF highlights the importance of public rights of way and access. Natural England support this application as it will provide improved access to the common land at Milhams North. The proposed access would enable more residents of the Town Centre to enjoy access to this Open Access Area and the land and allow a greater number of people to use this land as an alternative to protected heathland elsewhere in the vicinity.

I commend your Planning Officer's recommendation that planning permission can and should be approved.

Thank you.

On-time representations  
received in relation to:

137 Rosemary Road

Dear Council Members

I am saddened and disappointed that this further addition to an approved application has come before you again. I am not being cynical but I was there when the previous planning application was passed and an objector who was objecting to another application stated, "This is how it is done; a contentious application is passed and a few months later more amendments are proposed." It appears that this citizen knows what he is talking about.

I would like to remind the esteemed councillors that the previous application was only passed by one vote despite serious objections. The same arguments still apply but the consequences will be only amplified to an unacceptable level.

The main objection was that it was a grotesque building out of character with the single storey properties adjacent and surrounding the site. There are severe privacy and loss of light issues. The building will be unacceptable close to 135 Rosemary Road and will block out the light to the lounge and bedroom. This also has privacy implications. The newly suggested two bedroom properties will be able to see directly into my lounge as there is a large window in the side of my property which they can look through. There is also a gross invasion of privacy issue here. The councillors stated that traffic was not an issue but the councillor who said this drove by in the middle of the morning when traffic is light. If she comes back at rush hour, she can watch how many cars come down our road traveling at speed. There will be more visitors' cars parked around the proposed building and increased traffic in and out of the property just as school children from two nearby schools are passing by. It is an accident waiting to happen.

My Councillor, Millie Earl has also told me that she has severe doubts whether the two new proposed rooms will be ideal for human habitation and no doubt she will be able to expand on this.

It is obvious that if this is passed, the decision will be all about extra money for the developer and the Council achieving its own agenda rather than listening to the valid concerns if the CITIZENS it is supposed to serve!

Ronald Ames

Dear sir  
re application 137 rosemary road.

we oppose this application for Large occupancy on this small site. this will cause hardship for tenants  
And more traffic on this road, being on the a junction it will cause a lot of Congestion during building  
and problem parking outside other peoples homes .we are on a 20mph road but lots of cars exceed  
that. we would like to see a bungalow on site not multi storey

Thankyou

mr and mrs Anthony miles

**From:** [Harry Durdle](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Application concerning 137 Rosemary Road (APP/20/00066/F)  
**Date:** 28 April 2020 21:46:51

---

I would like to register my objection to the above application.

I live in Good Road near the junction with Rosemary road and the above indicated property.

I am particularly concerned around a number of points relating to the proposed development.

The existing application is already out of keeping with its surroundings. Had I known about it prior to the original application I would have raised objections at that time.

I realise that that opportunity has passed. However, I feel the following points are relevant to the new application.

Although the building size is not changing the style with 'roof windows' will be even less in keep with the surrounding area.

The changes will further exacerbate the following highway safety issues. Such issues have already been evidenced with the conversion of two properties in my part of Good Road, one bungalow and one house, to HMOs where planning permission was not required.

- Significant extra use of on-road parking causing
  - Obscured vision for all road users, e.g. Vehicles, cycles and pedestrians
  - Traffic flow issues which would be significant given the use of Rosemary Road as a 'rat run'.
- Vehicular access to the property adjacent to the roundabout junction with Good Road.

Regards

Mr H. Durdle

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**E-MAIL CONFIDENTIALITY**

This e-mail may contain confidential and proprietary material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact Harry Durdle and delete all copies. Harry Durdle does not accept legal responsibility for the contents of this message, as the Internet is not secure and this message is subject to possible data corruption either accidentally or on purpose. Efforts have been made to ensure this e-mail is free of any virus. Recipients are recommended to apply their own virus checks to this message on delivery, as Harry Durdle will not accept responsibility for loss or damage arising from the use of this email or its attachments. Harry Durdle may be contacted at [harry.durdle@btinternet.com](mailto:harry.durdle@btinternet.com).

**From:** [Donna Russell](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** APP/20/00066/F Proposed development 137 Rosemary Road Poole BH12 3HE Claire Moir  
**Date:** 28 April 2020 19:56:42

---

For the Attention Of:

The Planning Committee (Remote Meeting) 30th April 2020 commencing at 13:00

Ref: APP/20/00066/F

Firstly, thank you for your recent notification of this Planning Committee meeting.

I am surprised to find that we are, once again, considering something that was **initially refused**; a development for 4 x 2 bed and 2 x 1 bed flats (6 flats in total), with potential for 18 residents. The initial refusal of plans led to a proposal for a reduced number of flats with a potential residence of 14 and these were approved; at the council meeting October 2019, in Christchurch, as a result of the proposal having a 'call in' placed on it. Also, I would like to bring your attention to the vote result at this meeting; 6 against and 7 for, a slim majority of just 1!

It appears that the difference for this most recent proposal is for the additional 2 x 1 bed units to be in the roof space; I voiced my concern that this would happen in my previous representations letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2019. These living spaces, in the converted roof space, are likely to be quite compact and with the use of velux windows in a living unit that does not benefit from any other view of the outside world, one might question the 'well being' of those who would live here.

Also, I do still have a concern that this could impact on the privacy of my conservatory (positioned at the rear of my property) and back garden. This area of my home is in constant daily use.

## Traffic generation and road safety

The increased potential residence will add to the traffic generation, movement and noise levels. The indicated 7 parking spaces is highly unlikely to prove sufficient for 18 residents, without making any allowances for visitors. Road safety is another issue since the overspill of parked vehicles will create a highway nuisance and impair visibility at a crossroad junction.

I know that the council is under pressure to increase the number of available residences but feel that the proposed development is a clear case of intense saturation without due regard for the health, well being and safety of current neighbours and the proposed considerably increased number of residents.

Yours sincerely

Mr Peter Phillips

(Sent from the email of my daughter, since I do not have an email facility)





**From:** [jackie ann Mclachlan](#)  
**To:** [Democratic Services](#)  
**Subject:** App/20/00066/f  
**Date:** 29 April 2020 06:06:30

---

I would like to object to the new application which is applying to get six flats at 137 Rosemary Rd Parkstone instead of the 4 flats which has been obtained.

I am aware the building will be the same size as the original application which was passed, but the roof will be different with windows which is out of keeping with the area, over looking properties near by, it also will be multiple occupancy again out of character with properties in the immediate area which are mainly bungalows. I also feel there is safety problems with the entrance to the property being close to roundabout. Our bungalows will have reduced light due to the size of the large building, plus the loss of privacy.

I therefore would like to strongly object to the new planning application.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs J A McMachlan



Sent from my iPad

29<sup>th</sup> April 2020

RE: 137 ROSEMARY ROAD, POOLE, BH12 3HE (APP/20/00066/F)

Dear Chairman, members of the committee and officers,

Thank you for taking the time to read this prepared statement in support of the planning application currently under consideration at 137 Rosemary Road, Poole.

In October 2019, this committee granted the outline application “to demolish existing dwelling and erect a block of four 2-bed flats with parking, bins and cycle storage.” (APP/19/00759/P0).

A reserved matters application (APP/19/01460/R) was submitted following the outline approval, which was granted in December 2019.

This application (APP/20/00066/F) has been called in by Councillor Earl and Councillor Le Poidevin on the following grounds; a) parking shortfall, b) traffic pressures and c) overdevelopment.

I would like to address these points one by one.

a) Parking Shortfall

This application conforms to the council’s required parking standards.

b) Traffic Pressures

Your professional officers have not objected to this application and the subject site is in the sustainable transport corridor as set out in the local plan, which was only ratified by Poole Council on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2018.

c) Overdevelopment

This application is supported by the planning officer and surely this is the type of development that will secure much needed low cost housing for the conurbation.

I would like to remind members that externally the bulk and mass visual impact is not in any way distinguishable from the previously approved application.

In addition to these points there will be many benefits of this scheme. The development will make good use of a sizeable corner plot and create 6 new homes which will most likely be purchased by those taking their first step on the property ladder, making a contribution to private home ownership in the borough. The apartments will also comply with current building regulations, meaning that they will be more energy efficient and have less of an impact on the environment than the existing dwelling.

In summary, I would like to ask committee members to consider these points and support this application in line with the case officer's recommendations.

Yours Sincerely,  
Richard Carr  
Chief Executive Officer

When the applicant's previous application for this site came before planning committee in October last year it was for four, two-bedroom flats across two storeys. Now the applicant has returned with an application for four two-bedroom flats with another two one-bedroom flats in the roof across three storeys. The height and footprint remain the same, but the mass will increase.

It is clear that the new application with additional flats will not only exacerbate some of the issues I brought before the committee last year but it also raises new concerns around the amenity of future occupiers and current pattern of development.

Starting with the former, I raised on the previous application that the proposed block of flats' car park would impose noise and vibration on neighbouring residents, particularly those at 67 Good Road and 139 Rosemary Road. With potentially another two to four cars in need of spaces, more cars will be using the car park, which means more noise and vibrations in what is currently a back garden. We can accept that some noise and vibration is permissible based on the approval of the previous application, however, the addition of two flats requiring parking in seven unallocated spaces means vehicles will enter the car park, realise there are no spaces, and then have to reverse onto the road next to the roundabout junction and find a parking space.

Policies PP34 1(d) and (e) state: 'The council will manage growth and improve accessibility for all by improving safety and managing road space.' The ward has ongoing issues with limited on-street parking and an undesirable culture of on-kerb parking and access to the site is close to a mini roundabout which is known for being a particularly dangerous junction. Even more concerning is the fact we have three schools in the area which children walk to and from. The increased number of vehicles entering the site, then reversing back out onto the road, raises the risk of adversely affecting highway safety and the convenience of pedestrians. As future residents will have no choice but to park on the road this will only create another hazard for pedestrians to navigate and consider when crossing the junction.

At the committee meeting last year, the committee focused on the size and scale of the building in their deliberation. The new application brings that issue back into question with the proposed increase in volume and mass which will make the proposed building more dominant and more imposing than the original application. Policy PP27 1(a) (iii) states: 'Development will be permitted provided that it reflects or enhances local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings in terms of height and scale [and] bulk and massing, including that of the roof.' Height, scale, bulk and mass were the most contentious issues with the previous application – the current application pushes these boundaries further.

The most concerning issue relevant to the current application only is amenity afforded to the potential new occupants of those one-bedroom second floor flats. Policy PP27 1(c) of the local plan states: 'Development will be permitted provided that it would not result in a harmful impact upon amenity for local residents and future occupiers.' The windows on the top floor are proposed to sit on either a pitched roof or flat roof at 1.6m to avoid any overlooking issues, however, in the process, the applicant is depriving future occupants of amenity.

I feel very strongly that we should not be allowing homes to be built without windows and only roof lights. Paragraph 127(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework says: 'Planning decisions should ensure that developments ... promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.' Creating homes without windows does not sit well with this statement.

The applicant kindly affords each flat a larger roof light, however, the size and scale of the proposed building, that would sit atop one of the highest points, if not the highest point, in Poole, amongst

bungalows, with two large roof lights facing the street, is simply not in keeping with any buildings in the area.

This application is a tragic attempt to satisfy planning stipulations around the needs of future occupants to have access to a window and be compatible with the surrounding area – neither of which it does well because it is impossible to marry these requirements at the chosen site.

I hope the committee will take this opportunity to halt any more attempts to increase the size of the proposed building in this application. And take into consideration the danger that unallocated spaces will have on highway safety, the amenity afforded to future occupants of those top floor flats and the incompatibility of large roof lights on a three-storey building that could occupy the site.

Councillor Millie Earl

This page is intentionally left blank