



Committee Report

Application Address	Wessex Fields, Castle Lane East, Bournemouth, BH7 7DT
Proposal	Erection of a four/ five storey business and household storage building, together with associated access, car parking and landscaping
Application Number	7-2019-9177-DP
Applicant	Lok'n'Store Limited
Agent	Bell Cornwell LLP
Date Application Valid	31 July 2019
Decision Due Date	29 October 2019
Extension of Time date (if applicable)	TBA
Ward	Littledown and Iford
Report Status	Public
Meeting Date	Thursday 17 December 2020
Recommendation	GRANT
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Cllr Lawrence Williams: Planning application fails to address refusal reasons associated with previous planning application.
Case Officer	Peter Burridge

Description of Development

- 1 Planning permission is sought for the 'Erection of a four/ five storey business and household storage building, together with associated access, car parking and landscaping'.
- 2 The applicant has provided the following information:

	Existing	Proposed
Site Area	0.69ha	0.69ha
Use	Vacant	B8 storage
Height (approx.)	n/a	16.95m
Depth (approx.)	n/a	54m
Width (approx.)	n/a	48m

Key Issues

- 3 The main considerations involved with this application are:
 - Principle of development;
 - Impact on character and appearance of the area;
 - Residential amenity;
 - Highway safety;
 - Ecology;
 - Waste and recycling;
 - Drainage;
 - Contamination.
- 4 These points will be discussed as well as other material considerations in the report below.

Planning Policies

5 Core Strategy (2012)

CS1: NPPF- Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CS2: Sustainable Homes and Premises
CS4: Surface Water Flooding
CS6: Delivering Sustainable Communities
CS15: Green Travel Plan and Transport Assessments
CS16: Parking Standards
CS18: Increasing Opportunities for Cycling and Walking
CS26: Protecting Allocated Employment Sites
CS30: Promoting Green Infrastructure
CS35: Nature and Geological Conservation Interests
CS38: Minimising Pollution
CS41: Quality Design

6 District Wide Local Plan (2002)

3.20 Contaminated land
4.25: Landscaping
5.1: Jobs creation

7 Supplementary Planning Documents:

Public Realm Strategy: Guiding Principles - SPD

8 **The National Planning Policy Framework (2019)**

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development plan proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF.

Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals:

- 9 7-2018-9177-DK: Erection of a business and household, storage building, together with associated access, car parking and landscaping. Refused: 9 August 2018

Refusal reason:

It is considered that by reason of its excessive scale, bulk, mass, footprint and height, but also inappropriate layout and poor design, the scheme as proposed would result in a form of overdevelopment, which would appear unduly prominent within the street scene. The proposal would not appear in keeping with the established pattern of development in the business park, and therefore adversely affect the character and appearance of this area. It would fail to provide for a well-connected network of streets and roads, as required by Policy CS6 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy. Furthermore, the development as proposed would result in a loss of biodiversity, which the applicant has failed to mitigate for, by providing biodiversity enhancements. It is therefore considered that the development as proposed would fail to meet the aims of Policies CS6 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, the Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy SPD, and the revised NPPF.

Representations

- 10 4 site notices were displayed on 15 August 2019 with a consultation expiry date of 13 September 2019. The notices were displayed in front of the site on Castle Lane East, at the entrance to the Tesco store on Riverside Avenue, alongside Tringham House on Deansleigh Road and in front of the Village Hotel to the rear of the application site.
- 11 4 further notices were erected on 27 February 2020 advertising amended plans. These site notices had a consultation expiry date of 8 March 2020.
- 12 4 further notices were posted on 28 August 2020 advertising additional amended plans. The notices were in the same positions with a consultation expiry date of 7 September 2020.
- 13 6 letters of objection (3 from one objector) in response to the original plans (summary):

Access Issues:

- Repeat of first application and fails to address objections;
- Application invalid because site access some 20m short of highway thus no access;
- Decision liable to judicial review if approved;
- No right of access from adjoining landowner and permission unimplementable;
- No right of access to connect to footpaths/ cycle paths associated with the public highway;
- Proposal can not demonstrate a well-connected network of roads and streets;
- Unsafe access to Deansleigh Road - LPA's requests need land outside applicant's control;
- No certainty that connection with Tesco will come forward.

Design Issues:

- Over development – excessive in scale, mass, height and bulk;
- Height exceeds neighbouring Tringham House;
- Footprint 15% larger than shown previously;
- Building covers far larger percentage of site than neighbouring land uses;
- Design and appearance out of character with Wessex Fields Estate (brick hotel/ offices);
- Unduly prominent (not a corner plot);
- Sits forward of building line;
- Limited number of jobs created outweighed by adverse impact on wider area;
- Has no regard to its context and seeks to impose company corporate brand;
- Storage building better located on industrial park.

Biodiversity:

- Does not comply with updated NPPF;
- Net biodiversity gain.

Other:

- Application contains inaccuracies;
- Parking provision below standard;
- Inappropriate site use.

14 4 letters of objection (3 writers) to amended plans advising that objections remain and raising the following additional concerns (summary):

- Council has accepted status of land at site access as disputed;
- Council has failed to provide evidence regarding disputed land and process for determining status of this land by neighbouring landowner is being advanced;
- If approved, Council should impose Grampian condition that no development is carried out until necessary access rights have been granted;
- Inappropriate for footpaths/ cycle paths to join private land as pedestrians/ cyclists would be discharged onto a private operational roadway;
- Would not promote permeability but would cause confusion and public safety issues;
- Extended pedestrian/ cycle route to Tesco beyond application site so not part of proposal;
- Current access between Tesco and application site has been gated for many years;
- Revised footprint 7% larger than refused scheme;
- Quality of route proposed to Tesco poor;
- Objection letters not uploaded to public website.

15 1 further letter in response to the second amendment raising the same issues which it is not felt have been addressed. It is highlighted that the land to be dedicated does not fall within the red edge site boundary and does not form part of the proposals. It is also highlighted that there is no evidence that Tesco support the link questioning whether it can be implemented.

16 1 further letter relating to the plan showing land to be dedicated as public highway. The applicant is not able to dedicate land for vehicular access to their site. For land to be capable of being dedicated, it must connect to another public highway and this connects the private service yard with a private road. This dedication offer should be disregarded.

17 Dorset Wildlife Trust:

- Site part of identified potential ecological network;
- NPPF states policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance natural environment;
- No further comments once submitted BMEP is agreed by Natural Environment team and DC.

18 Natural England:

Natural England have not advised an objection to this application although they have advised that the application fails to include an acceptable Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) and that the proposal would result in substantial and permanent loss of biodiversity. The proposal is not policy compliant until mitigation and compensation has been identified and secured. Subsequently with the working agreement between Natural England and BCP Council no longer in place, Natural England advise that internal advice is sought from the Council's Ecologist as to whether they consider no harm/ degradation will occur as a result of the development (mitigation considered and management secured) to ensure policy compliance.

19 The above issues are addressed in the main report with the exception of the following, which are dealt with as preliminary issues:

Impact of the disputed status of land. Representations have been received regarding the applicant's alleged lack of lawful access from the site to the public highway. This relates to an ongoing dispute regarding the status of a strip of land ("Disputed Land") connecting the undisputed highway at Deansleigh Road to the private road/ accessway leading to the site. The dispute is currently the subject of County Court proceedings. The Council's position is that the Disputed Land is highway land. On this basis the application is not invalid and the red line on the location plan properly includes all necessary land to carry out the proposed development.

However, even if the Council is wrong as to the highway status of the Disputed Land, that does not mean that access cannot be achieved by the applicant. It is often the case that private law arrangements are concluded between parties to overcome such issues of access. Indeed, the applicant does in fact have a private right of way over the private road/ accessway pursuant to a deed of easement. There is therefore no reason to suggest that similar private rights could not be secured over the Disputed Land.

It is not therefore considered appropriate or necessary to deal with the ongoing legal dispute for the purposes of this application. Ultimately, it is the role of the Council as local planning authority to assess if the proposal is acceptable in planning terms – which is what this Report focuses on in the following sections.

Pre-commencement condition. A Grampian condition would be inappropriate in these circumstances. It is not, in the Council's view, relevant to planning or to the Development nor is it reasonable in the circumstances. It is also not necessary; if the Council is wrong as to the Disputed Land and the applicant is unable to secure private rights of access, the Development will in any event be unable to proceed in accordance with the grant of permission.

Consultations

20 Policy Officer: no objection

'...A previous application for the same use - ref 7-2018-9177-DK - was refused on 9.8.2018. However, the refusal reasons do not refer to a conflict with Policy CS26, and the Delegated Report concludes that the erection of storage building is considered appropriate in principle...'

21 Urban Design Officer: no objections subject to conditions

'...The proposal by its nature would make a noticeable change to the area, the designs have been carefully revised by the applicant and on balance this would be acceptable in urban design terms, in my opinion.'

22 Tree Officer: no objections subject to conditions

'I have assessed the soft landscaping scheme submitted for this site and it forms a high quality scheme and I recommend its approval...'

23 Highway Officer: no objection subject to S106 and conditions

'...The proposals represent excellent improvements to the local walking and cycling infrastructure...'

24 Ecology Officer: no objection subject to condition

'The biodiversity work as described in paragraph 4.9 of 'Ecological Assessment Planning Application 7-2019-9177-DP', June 2020 by Richard Tofts Ecology and shown in 'Landscape Strategy Plan – Ecological Areas' (Drawing No. 694-LA-P-01, rev H) by Bradford-Smith will provide suitable biodiversity compensation and enhancement for this site...'

25 Waste and Recycling Officer: no objections subject to condition

'...The application fails to meet the requirements of the WCA, however with a complaint bin store or a WMP detailing private collection conditioned in a grant of planning permission: No objection....' The subsequently submitted Waste Management Plan is acceptable.

26 Environmental Health Officer (land contamination): no condition required

'...The full contaminated land condition is therefore not necessary however I would recommend that an informative note be attached...'

27 Drainage Officer: no objection

'There is no objection to the principle, it is the technical detail that is the (minor) issue and that can be subject to a condition.'

28 Wessex Water: no objections

Constraints

29 Safeguarded employment area as identified by the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy.

Planning Assessment

Site and Surroundings

30 The application site is located within the Wessex Fields business park. The area comprises the Tringham and Everdene office buildings to the west and it is understood that this vacant site was also originally intended for similar office buildings. There are other uses including the large Tesco supermarket to the east and Royal Bournemouth Hospital. Bournemouth

Crown and County Courts and the Village Hotel stand to the rear. The character of the area is dominated by the busy Castle Lane East which runs to the front of the application site.

- 31 The application is for a 4/5-storey storage building, with associated car parking. Vehicular access would be via Deansleigh Road. The application has been submitted further to refusal of an earlier planning application.

Key Issues

Principle of Development

- 32 The application site is allocated by the Bournemouth Local Plan for employment purposes. Policy CS26 states that *'New development on the allocated employment sites should provide a use within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8'*. The proposal forms a B8 use thus there can be no in principle objection with the proposal policy compliant in this respect. This reflects the conclusions at the time of the last application. It is noted that the proposal would create 5 full time equivalent jobs as per the last application. The Planning Policy Officer has raised no objection to the proposal on this basis.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

- 33 Notwithstanding that a storage building is acceptable in principle, storage buildings are often characterised by their large box-like design; their design is also invariably heavily influenced by the company brand; e.g. yellow is the predominant colour for 'Big Yellow Self Storage' and orange for Lok n' Store as is the applicant in this case.
- 34 Objections to the previous application focused primarily on the design of the building having regard to its excessive scale, bulk, mass, footprint and height, its inappropriate layout and overall poor design. As such, it was considered that it would appear unduly prominent within the street scene and in this regard, the officer report highlighted that this is not a corner site and therefore, in design terms, the building would be expected to be less dominant within the street scene than the corner plots, with particular regard to Tringham House. The planning officer also commented that *'Although Castle Lane East is a very wide and busy route, it has retained a spacious feel, which gives the area a sense of openness and relatively undeveloped character, particularly as Wessex Fields lies on the outskirts of the conurbation and is within close proximity of the Green Belt'*.
- 35 It was further observed that other buildings had been designed in a sensitive manner set back from the Castle Lane frontage and with Everdene and Tringham Houses' characterised by their architectural articulation and detailing and with pitched roofs helping to break up their overall scale and mass. It was noted that these buildings have a smaller footprint compared with the proposal despite being on plots of comparable size. The retained area of spacing around these buildings was considered to contribute to the spacious feel of the area.
- 36 Overall, the following were highlighted as being of concern previously:
- It was to project significantly forward of the building line set by Tringham House;
 - The building was bulky and over scale for the character of the area;
 - Its boxy and utilitarian appearance;
 - Vast expanses of cladding in corporate colours with cladding not characteristic of the area;
 - Limited glazing;
 - A perceived industrial appearance that would be out of keeping with the business park;
 - The south-east elevation was considered to have the appearance of a rear elevation;
 - No account for pedestrian desire lines across the site from Deansleigh Road to Tesco;
 - A lack of landscaping with the building surrounded by hardstanding;
 - Excessive use of boundary fencing enclosing the site;

- The proposed position of the front boundary fence immediately adjacent to the pavement.
- 37 This application has been submitted further to pre-application discussions that were primarily focused on the design, massing and scale of the building and the site layout. In respect of these amended plans, the Urban Design Officer has commented that in comparison to the refused scheme, the footprint has been brought back from Castle Lane albeit it still steps forward of Tringham House whilst the revised footprint also allows extra landscaping; the amount of space given over to vehicle access and hardstanding has been reduced. Further, this revised scheme includes a path from the Castle Lane frontage to the rear of the site and linking to Tesco; this responds to previous objections regarding a lack of connectivity. This path is addressed further in the highway comments below.
- 38 The height of the proposal has been reduced from up to 6-storeys as previously proposed to a 4/ 5-storey building whilst the irregular shaped footprint and under-croft help to move the building away from a standard box-type appearance which was readily apparent looking at the initial plans. The introduction of brick improves the appearance of the building and helps it better relate to Tringham House; this is in addition to the additional glazing provided. In this regard, the use of different materials and windows helps add articulation.
- 39 Notwithstanding the above, the proposal has been subject to various amendments as a part of this application to improve its design and detailing and notably, the south east elevation that would be readily visible from the Tesco carpark. Overall, these revised proposals, as amended, are considered to comprise a significant improvement on the previously refused plans and the revised proposal is now acceptable in design terms. As such, it would now be compliant with the NPPF paragraphs 127 and 128 which requires high quality design and early discussions between the applicant and planning authority and further, local plan policy in respect of which policy CS41 seeks to ensure that developments and spaces are well designed and of a high quality; the revised proposals achieve this.
- 40 It is noted that this site (where a B8 use is acceptable in principle) has long been vacant with no 'traditional' office building forthcoming. Further, the neighbouring Tesco store on the adjoining site is a typical modular supermarket that presents a large expanse of parking to the street scene. It is also noted that there are pending developments at Bournemouth Hospital where BCP Planning Committee have resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to completion of a S106 Agreement for a building that is likely to be taller and more prominent.
- 41 Concerning landscaping and boundary treatments, there have been various officer concerns and associated improvements have been introduced as a part of the amended details. In response to the most recently amended plans, the Council's Tree Officer advises that the soft landscaping scheme is of high-quality and its approval is recommended. A detailed soft landscaping maintenance specification is also required but this can form the basis of an appropriately worded condition. In this way the proposal complies with policy 4.25 which requires proposals to provide sufficient space for planting and landscaping and CS41 that requires proposals to contribute positively to the appearance and safety of the public realm.

Trees

- 42 The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objections subject to a planning condition requiring compliance with the submitted arboricultural method statement. In so doing, the proposal would be compliant with policy 4.25 in so far as that the arboricultural information submitted is acceptable and provision would be made for future planting.

Ecology

- 43 The first application attracted an associated refusal reason due to a loss of biodiversity and associated lack of mitigation. Since this time, the Council's working agreement with Dorset Council has ceased and a BMEP is not specifically required. This does not negate the need to fully address this issue, however.
- 44 This application includes an Ecological Appraisal which has been assessed by the Council's Ecology Officer. In this regard the biodiversity work described within the report, in summary comprising planting along the southern boundary bank and the western boundary; new sown grassland; new hedgerow; three house sparrow terraces; two bird boxes for hole-nesting birds on trees along the southern bank; hedgehog houses and gaps to allow hedgehog movement, and stag beetle loggerie (log equivalent of a rockery) are acceptable. If these works are implemented in full, it is considered that the application would be compliant with the provisions of the NPPF at paragraph 174 and CS30. In so doing, the proposal would address that part of the previous refusal reason relating to the loss of biodiversity, lack of mitigation and associated enhancement. It would be necessary to attach an appropriately worded condition if permission is granted.

Highway Safety

- 45 The proposed access is from a private road that leads to the Deansleigh Road southern roundabout. At the site entrance, it is proposed to add an additional arm to an existing three arm private road junction, as a four-way crossroads, with the north-south route taking priority. Given that the junction is on a private road, with low flows as described in the transport assessment, the proposed junction layout is acceptable.
- 46 The Transport Assessment contains an assessment of proposed trip generation based on the Aldershot Lok'nStore facility. However, no account is made of the fact that the proposed facility is 40.6% larger than the Aldershot site (effective storage area of 5,203m²), which generates up to 103 vehicle trips per day. Applying the uplift in scale, the development is likely to generate up to 145 vehicle trips per day. The Local Highway Authority conclude that this level of trip generation is not a cause for concern.
- 47 The Parking Supplementary Planning Document estimates that the B8 use would generate a demand for 37 parking spaces. The Transport Assessment proposes a lower allocation, in view of the use and with limited employees. Data is provided from an existing Lok'nStore site in Aldershot which indicates a maximum accumulation of 13 vehicles on a Friday. Applying the 40.6% uplift to account for the larger facility, this site is predicted to generate a pro-rata demand for 18 car parking spaces. 17 parking spaces are proposed; a shortfall of 1 space. The applicant has provided data from other Lok'nStore sites to support the proposed level of parking, which the Local Highway Authority advise is acceptable in this instance.
- 48 The proposed car park layout is acceptable.
- 49 12 staff and 4 visitor cycle parking spaces are proposed. The parking provision and layout is acceptable.
- 50 The application includes a new 4m wide pedestrian/ cycle route through the site to provide a link from Castle Lane East to Tesco. Behind the new building, this route would run alongside the Tesco boundary on land outside the application site but within the applicant's ownership (identified in blue on the plans). This route would include a crossing at the access road for cyclists and pedestrians and with the land for this route to be dedicated as public highway as part of a S106 agreement (the extent of land for adoption has been reduced so that it relates only to this new pedestrian/ cyclist route).

- 51 It would be important to ensure the new 4m wide path felt safe (particularly having regard to that part to the rear of the proposal and alongside the Tesco boundary) to aid attractiveness of use. This would be achieved, in part, by retaining a relatively open boundary with planting that would include frequent low-level sections between trees and with no wall or fence within 4m of the red line (except for a simple post and double rail fence, if required) within the vacant plot abutting the shared use path and this should be included within a S106 agreement. It would also be necessary to include adequate street lighting and direction signage at appropriate intervals.
- 52 Overall, the Local Highway Authority conclude that the development would provide excellent pedestrian and cycle facilities that would be secured in perpetuity. In so doing, the revised proposal would accord with the provisions of the NPPF paragraph 102 that looks for opportunities to promote walking and cycling to be promoted and pursued and CS6 that seeks to improve accessibility and permeability on foot and by cycle by providing well connected, safe and attractive routes.

Residential Amenity

- 53 The application site is remote from neighbouring properties the closest of which are on the opposite side of Castle Lane East. Residential amenity issues did not form part of the refusal reason attached to the last application and there is no associated objection to this scheme.
- 54 In the absences of neighbouring residential properties, the site is flanked by the Tesco store to the east and Tringham House to the west. Having regard to the commercial nature of the adjoining uses, and with a good level of separation to Tringham House, the relationship that is proposed is acceptable. Overall, the proposal would be compliant with CS38 and CS41 in this regard.

Waste and Recycling

- 55 The applicant has submitted a Waste Management Plan that has been reviewed by the Council's Waste and Recycling Officer. He is happy with these details and implementation of the submitted details would need to form the basis of a suitably worded condition if approved. To this extent, the proposal would be compliant with CS38.

Flooding

- 56 The Drainage Officer advises there is no known surface water flood risk and whilst it looks as if there may be an old ditch line crossing the site this would be filled. The application form states that the applicant proposes to dispose of surface water to a 'Sustainable drainage system' and or "a soakaway" and the Drainage strategy drawing shows a large soakaway in the west corner which appears to have all the onsite surface water drainage leading to it; this would comply with the principles of the Bournemouth SuDs policy.
- 57 Additional information has been received responding to specific queries that were raised by the Drainage Officer whilst it is noted that drainage concerns did not provide a reason refusal in respect of the last application. A such, there is no associated objection to this scheme which is considered compliant with policy 3.20 subject to an appropriately worded planning condition and the proposals would be compliant with policy CS4.

Contamination

- 58 The Council's external consultants have assessed the Ground Investigation Report submitted which details that no evidence of contamination was found on site. The consultants advise that assessment represents a robust investigation, that no further work is necessary and a

remedial strategy in unnecessary. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be compliant with policy 3.20. Nevertheless, if unexpected contamination is found, the Council should be informed, and the Environmental Health Officer recommends and associated informative.

Summary

- 59 The scheme which forms the subject of this amended planning application is acceptable and as such, addresses the previous objections raised. This is subject to a S106 agreement and planning conditions.

Planning Balance

- 60 The application seeks full planning permission for a B8 storage use which is acceptable in principle on a site that has long been vacant. Objections have been raised to the design and appearance of the proposal and how it relates to the character of the area. The proposals in their revised form are acceptable and policy compliant. These revised proposals would also facilitate a step change in site connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists whilst the scheme would secure ecological mitigation and enhancements. The proposal would also provide a new employment generating use. The merits of the scheme weigh in favour of the proposal and are considered to outweigh any associated harm.

- 61 Therefore, having considered the appropriate development plan policies and other material considerations, including the NPPF, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the development would be in accordance with the Development Plan, would not materially harm the character or appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring and proposed occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The Development Plan Policies considered in reaching this decision are set out above.

Recommendation

- 62 **GRANT** permission with the following conditions, which are subject to alteration/ addition by the Head of Planning Services provided any alteration/ addition does not go to the core of the decision and the completion of a Section 106 agreement with the following terms:

Section 106 terms:

- The construction of new shared use cycle/ footways, as shown on plan P103 P10, including a raised parallel crossing at the site access, street lighting to a standard to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and direction signage at regular intervals;
- The dedication of the land shown on plan P106 P3 by the Owner as public highway including:
 - land required for the new sections of shared use paths;
 - land adjacent to Castle Lane East (up to 2m in width) to enable the council to widen of the existing segregated cycleway to 4m, subject to an agreement that no structure over 0.6m shall be built on that land and the land shall only be used as a pedestrian footpath or cycle path.
- No wall or fence to be constructed above 1.2m within 4m of the shared use path on the land within the blue line of the application, except for a simple post and double rail fence (if required) without the written permission of the Local Planning Authority;

- Tree planting between the shared use path and the vacant land should retain gaps at ground level of at least 2m in width at regular intervals and at all times. Hedge planting shall be maintained below 1.2m at all times;
- A post and double rail fence not more than 1.2 high by 3m in length is installed at the location shown on plan CLE-FORUM-00-XX-DR-A-XX-P105 rev. P2 and planting adjacent to the fence maintained below 0.6m, in order to provide natural surveillance of the shared use path from the Tesco car park;
- Not to object to the adoption of land between the site access and Deansleigh Road, should the Local Highway Authority proceed to adopt this land.

Conditions:

1. Development to be carried out in accordance with plans as listed

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location Plan; drg no. P100 P1
 Site Location Plan; drg no. P101 P2
 Proposed Site Plan - Hard Landscaping & Boundary Treatments; drg no. P103 P10
 Extent of Works for Footpath/Cycleway in S106; drg no. P105 P2
 Land for Dedication in S106; drg no. P106 P3
 Land Uses in Adjacent Sites; drg no. P110 P3
 Comparison Site Plans; drg no. P111 P4
 Topographic Site Plan; drg no. P160 P2
 Proposed Ground, First & Second Floors; drg no. P200 P3
 Proposed Third, Fourth & Roof Plans; drg no. P201 P3
 Proposed Elevations & Section Sheet 1 of 2; drg no. P302 P4
 Proposed Elevations & Section Sheet 2 of 2; drg no. P303 P4
 Reveal Details and Material Interfaces; drg no. P304 P1
 Street Elevation & Location Plan; drg no. P310 P2
 Landscape Strategy Plan; drg no. 694-LA-P-01 I
 Detailed Planting Plan & Schedule; drg no. 694-LA-P-02 D
 Drainage Strategy; drg no. 17-110D 300 P4

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. Prior Approval of Other Materials

Details and/or samples of all external facing materials to be used on the external surfaces of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any superstructure works on site. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship between the existing and the new development in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

3. No external pipework on elevations

Unless shown on the approved elevational drawings any pipework (with the exception of rainwater down pipes) shall be internal to the building.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

4. Storage Use Only

The premises shall only be used for storage within the meaning of class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and for no other purpose whatsoever (including any other purpose in Class B8 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: To retain proper control over the development and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

5. Surface Water Drainage (SUDS Implementation)

Prior to the commencement of any substructure works on site (or such other timeline as may otherwise have been agreed in writing by the local planning authority in advance of such substructure works commencing), a scheme for the whole site providing for the disposal of surface water run-off and incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development or in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following:

- a) A scaled plan indicating the extent, position and type of all proposed hard surfacing (e.g. drives, parking areas, paths, patios) and roofed areas.
- b) Details of the method of disposal for all areas including means of treatment or interception for potentially polluted run off.
- c) Scaled drawings including cross section, to illustrate the construction method and materials to be used for the hard surfacing (sample materials and literature demonstrating permeability may be required).

Reason: To provide satisfactory drainage for the development in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012) and in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Local Planning Authority's Planning Guidance Note on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

6. Implementation of the approved Arboricultural Method Statement

The tree protection measures as detailed in the arboricultural method statement dated 20 November 2019 and prepared by eco urban Limited shall be implemented in full and in accordance with the approved timetable and maintained and supervised until completion of the development.

Reason: To ensure that trees and other vegetation to be retained are not damaged during construction works and to accord with Policy 4.25 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (February 2002).

7. Landscape Maintenance

Within 3 months of the date of commencement of the development, full details of a landscape maintenance plan for a minimum period of 5 years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development includes a long-term management plan for the landscaped areas in the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policy 4.25 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (February 2002) and Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

8. Ecology

The compensation and enhancement as given in 'Ecological Assessment: Planning Application 7-2019-9177-DP', June 2020 by Richard Tofts Ecology and shown in 'Landscape Strategy Plan – Ecological Areas' (Drawing No. 694-LA-P-01, rev I) by Bradford-Smith, should be implemented in full and subsequently maintained.

Reason: To be compliant with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 8, 170 and 175 "Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity" and Bournemouth Borough Council Core Strategy Policy CS30 Promoting Green Infrastructure.

9. Boundary Treatment (Location shown on plan & type on forms)

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved fence(s)/wall(s) shall be erected in the position(s) shown on the approved plans of the type and dimensions specified. The fence(s)/wall(s) shall be thereafter retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and privacy and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

10. Turning & parking

Before the commencement of development, details of the specification (a typical cross section of the surfacing is required) of the areas for turning and parking, including the marking out of spaces shown on the approved plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These areas shall be constructed and surfaced in accordance with the approved details prior to the first opening of the facility and permanently retained and kept available for the users of the development hereby permitted at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policies CS14 and CS16 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

11. Cycle Store

Before the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, the visitor cycle parking for 4no. cycles and cycle store for 12 cycles, which must include a 1100mm wide access door, shall be provided as shown on the approved plans and thereafter be retained, maintained adequately for public use and kept available for the employees and visitors to the development at all times.

Reason: To promote the cycling mode of transport and in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

12. Provision of a Refuse Management Plan

The Refuse Management Plan submitted and received on 27 March 2020 shall be permanently implemented in full upon the first opening of the facility.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development includes a long-term management plan for the collection of refuse in the interests of visual and residential amenities, and to accord with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

13. Statement required by National Planning Policy Framework (APPROVALS)

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the revised NPPF the Council, as Local Planning Authority, takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The Council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this instance the agent was updated of all the issues raised, provided with an opportunity to respond and planning permission was granted.

14. Informative Note: Potential contamination

INFORMATIVE NOTE: If during site works unforeseen contamination is found to be present then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has consulted the Local Planning Authority. The contamination will need to be assessed and if necessary an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the Local Planning Authority.