

PLANNING COMMITTEE



Application Address	29 Pine Crescent Highcliffe Christchurch BH23 4LH
Proposal	Demolish existing outbuilding and garage, sever plot and erect new detached bungalow.
Application Number	8/20/0892/FUL
Applicant	Matthews Coastal Properties Limited
Agent	Mr Matthew Witt
Date Application Valid	26 October 2020
Decision Due Date	21 December 2020
Extension of Time Date (if applicable)	22 nd February 2021
Ward	Highcliffe & Walkford
Report status	Public
Meeting date	18 February 2021
Recommendation	Grant subject to conditions and completion of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the SAMM payment.
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	<p>Cllr Brooks has called in the application for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Inappropriate in character, scale and design- Residential amenities adversely affected- Open space and trees will be lost- Lacks adequate provision of open space
Case Officer	Sophie Mawdsley

Description of Development

1. The application seeks permission to demolish the existing outbuilding and garage, sever the plot and erect a new detached bungalow.
2. The single storey bungalow would have two bedrooms and a ground floor area measuring 95.8sqm. The building would have a traditional pitched roof and elevations consisting of a natural slate roof, and a combination of red brick and rendered walls.
3. The driveway would run alongside of No 29 to the rear and provide two parking spaces. A southerly and easterly facing garden measuring approximately 160sqm would also be provided for the new dwelling.
4. The host property, a semi-detached two storey property would retain two parking spaces and a more modest garden of 97sqm at the rear.

Key Issues

5. The main considerations involved with this application are:
 - Principle of the development
 - Type and size of housing
 - Design, form, scale and layout
 - Impact on residential amenities
 - Access and highway arrangements
 - Impact on the trees and landscape
 - Biodiversity and Heathland mitigation

Planning Policies

6. Development Plan: **Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy 2014**
 - KS1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - KS2: Settlement Hierarchy
 - KS4: Housing Provision
 - KS11: Transport and Development
 - KS12: Parking Provision
 - HE2: Design of New Development
 - HE3: Landscape Quality
 - LN1: Size and type of new dwellings
 - LN2: Design, Layout and Density of New Housing Development
 - ME1: Safeguarding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- ME2: Protection of Dorset Heathlands
- H12 Residential Infill

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD 2020-2025
- BCP Parking Standards SPD 2021
- Christchurch Character Assessment

The National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

7. Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For **decision-taking** this means:

(c) Approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

(d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date ⁷, granting permission unless:

(i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed ⁶; or

(ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The relevant sections are;

Section 2 Achieving sustainable development

Section 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 12 Achieving well-designed places

Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals

8/19/0454 – 28 Pine Crescent - Construction of a detached bungalow to the rear of the existing building together with associated parking and access. Granted 10/07/19.

Representations

8. 2 Objections have been received to the proposal on the following grounds;
- Already congested with on street parking

- Cramped and plot too small
- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Set a precedent
- Covenant on the land
- No need for development

9. 2 comments received on the following grounds:

- Planting along boundaries to provide greener outlook
- Capacity of drainage system
- Screening during construction work
- Integrity of boundary between No 29 and No 28/28A.
- Boundary hedge of historic merit.

Consultations

- **Natural England** - None received
- **Wessex Water** – No objections. The planning application indicates that foul sewerage will be disposed of via the main sewer. Rainwater running off new driveways and roofs will require consideration so as not to increase the risk of flooding. The current planning submission indicates that rainwater (also referred to as “surface water”) will be disposed of via soakaway.

Highcliffe & Walkford Parish Council - We object to this planning application to create a detached bungalow on a very small plot at the rear of a semi-detached house for the following reasons; The area is an extremely busy and congested crescent with multiple on street parking. Adding this house will add to the existing heavy traffic flow; The plot is extremely small and is cramped in at the back of a semi-detached house; The house is small and is out of character with the surrounding area; Access is a single narrow carriage driveway past and shared with the semi-detached house; There is impact of privacy on the surrounding houses; Precedent will be set if such a development is approved.

- **BCP Trees & Landscaping** - There are no significant trees on the development site that are considered a material constraint on the proposal. However, there is evidence that vegetation has already been removed and the Tree and Landscape Officer would require appropriate tree and shrub planting to be included with any development of the site. This planting would replenish the vegetation lost and soften the effects of the new dwelling on the local landscape. Therefore, should you be minded to approve this application, the Tree and Landscape Officer recommends that the following conditions are imposed (Conditions #4 – 6 below).

- **BCP Highways** – Both dwellings would share the existing access, which although single width, would be unlikely to result in significant vehicle conflicts for two dwellings particularly where waiting opportunities exist for vehicles on the road. A new access would be provided to the frontage of the existing house to provide a new parking area. This would require formation of a new kerb crossing at the applicant's expense. Sufficient parking would be provided for both dwellings and onsite turning would be possible to the rear. No Highway Objections subject to a condition.
- **BCP Waste & Recycling** - The application fails to meet the requirements of the WCA, however if a suitable presentation point is created with presentation and return to store conditioned in a grant of planning permission: No objection.

Constraints

- Planning Team Areas - 0.00m
- Agricultural Land Classification - 0.00m
- SSSI Impact Risk Zone - 0.00m
- CBC and EDDC Areas - 0.00m
- Highways Inspected Network - 4.58m
- Heathland 5km Consultation Area - 0.00m
- Airport Safeguarding - 0.00m
- Airport Safeguarding - 0.00m
- Wessex Water Sewer Flooding - 0.00m

Planning Assessment

Site and Surroundings

10. The site is currently occupied by a semi-detached two storey dwelling benefiting from a larger garden on a corner plot. The immediate locality is characterised by a uniform settlement pattern within an established residential area. The street scene consists of single storey bungalows and two storey semi-detached properties.

Principle of development

11. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that where policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, planning permission must be granted unless policies in the Framework provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposals. Following the publication of the Housing Delivery Test in February 2019, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year land supply with a 20% buffer applied. In high level terms, the Housing Delivery Test

compares the net homes delivered over three years to the homes that should have been built over the same period (the housing requirement).

12. The '5 Year Housing Land Supply' document has been updated in 2020 and now only considers the housing supply in the former Christchurch Borough Council area of the adopted Core Strategy (2014). The document confirms that in the next five years of the plan period, the housing supply is 1,668 set against a target of 2,094. This results in a shortfall of 426 dwellings over the Core Strategy target which includes a 20% buffer and the previous shortfall of the Core Strategy target. This equates to a 5 year supply of **3.98 years**.
13. It is recognised that as the site is not designated or relates to any of the policies as set out in footnote 6 of paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019) the 'tilted balance' needs to be applied.

Type and size of property

14. Policy LN1 refers to the type and size of units. The Strategic Housing Assessment (SHMA 2015) states that 2 and 3 bedroom houses are what is mostly required in the Christchurch area. The proposal would provide a 2 bed bungalow in a sustainable location and is in line with the requirements as set out in the SHMA.
15. The policy also refers to the Housing Quality Indicators. Whilst these have been overtaken by the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), they are still referred to in the adopted Local Plan and therefore are a material consideration. The proposed property would have an internal area of 95.8sqm. The HQI for unit size suggests that for a 4 bedspace (2 double bedrooms), the internal space should be between 67 and 75sqm. Therefore, this proposal is considered to meet the HQI for unit size and complies with this aspect of policy LN1. The NDSS set out that 70sqm is the minimum for a 2 bedroom (4 persons) property and therefore the proposal also complies with the NDSS.

Design, form and layout

16. The proposed bungalow is sited to the rear of No 29 but the proposed plot is considered to be large enough to accommodate the new dwelling without it appearing cramped. There will be glimpses of the property from Pine Crescent through the gap between No 29 and No 28 and over the boundary fence of No 30 from the public footpath to the south of the site. However, this is not considered to harm the visual amenities of the locality. The proposed plot and resultant plot for No 29 are smaller than those seen within the immediate locality; however given they are not overly visible in the public realm it is not considered it harms the character or visual amenities of this residential locality.
17. A material consideration is the recent approval of a similar application adjacent to this site at No 28 for a single storey dwelling to rear which has been constructed. Therefore, whilst this application has to be considered on its own merits, the

adjacent development shows how a property can be built on a similar plot in an acceptable manner and does not harm the visual amenities of the area.

18. The proposed scale and appearance of the bungalow is considered to be appropriate for the site and given the character of the street scene. The height of the bungalow measures 4.4metres so it is not considered to appear visually intrusive within this rear plot. The proposed materials of slate, brick and render are considered to be appropriate for this locality.
19. The scheme is considered to comply with the test in Policy HE2 to be compatible with or improve its surroundings in its layout; site coverage; architectural style; scale; bulk; height; materials and visual impact.

Residential Amenity

20. Given the single storey nature of the proposed bungalow, it is not considered it would result in any harmful overlooking into the neighbouring plots. There would be views from the first floor windows on the rear elevations of No 29 and No 30 towards the new dwelling. With regards to No 29, there may be oblique views of the rear garden of the new property; however given the position of the building and the window positions it is not considered harmful level of overlooking would occur into the new plot.
21. There is approximately 15 metres from the rear of No 30 (excluding ground floor extension) to the rear corner of the new bungalow. There are likely to be some views of the rear garden of the bungalow; however there is 20 metres from the rear of No 30 to the proposed patio outside the living room. These distances are considered to be sufficient to provide acceptable privacy for occupiers of the proposed dwelling. The proposed access would run alongside No 29 and there are side openings on this elevation. However, given the proposed parking area for No 29 to the side and as the access only serves one property it is considered the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance for the occupiers of No 29. On the adjacent site, the access to No 28a runs along this boundary too.
22. The outlook from No 29 and No 30 will change with the provision of a new dwelling in the proposed position. However, given the single storey nature of the proposal it is not considered the building would appear visually intrusive. It would not cause an overbearing impact or result in an unacceptable loss of outlook. The new dwelling No 28a to the north is set away from the boundary with No 29 with the driveway and garage in between. Therefore, as the proposed property is sited 3.6 metres south of this boundary and it is single storey, it is not considered the scheme would have an adverse impact on the occupiers of this adjacent dwelling.
23. To the north east of the application site, Silverways Nursing Home is located. This two storey building in the shape of a cross has one wing extending towards the application site. Given the substantial hedge along this boundary and the

presence of some mature trees it is not considered the proposed bungalow would impinge on the amenities of the occupiers of the nursing home.

24. Overall, the scheme is considered to comply with the test in Policy HE2 to be compatible in its relationship to nearby properties including minimising general disturbance to amenity.

Parking and Access arrangements

25. The BCP Parking SPD has been adopted; however this application was submitted prior to this adoption. Notwithstanding this, the proposal provides two parking spaces which meets the old Dorset standards and exceeds the current BCP standards in terms of parking provision which shows the site in zone D and this equates to 1 parking space for a two bed house. The site is within a sustainable location within walking distance to public transport and the centre of Highcliffe with the services and facilities it provides.
26. The Highway comments received were based on the Dorset standards; however it is considered the layout of the access and parking is suitable for the new dwelling and host property. The traffic generated by a single modest dwelling would not result in severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network, which is the test in the NPPF (para.109). Given the use of the driveway by only 3 vehicles it is not considered its single use width is an issue. The proposal is not considered to result in any highway safety issues and as such is in line with policies KS11 and KS12 of the Local Plan.

Trees and Landscape

27. There is no Tree Preservation Order on the site; however there are two mature trees located on the boundary in the north east corner of the site and two other large trees in the adjacent site but which place some constraint on the site. T1 is an English Oak and has been identified in the Arboricultural Assessment as having poor form and categorised as a C. The adjacent Holly also has a C categorisation. Close to the south eastern boundary is a Norway maple, measuring 9 metres in height.
28. The Arboricultural Assessment concludes that there is no development within the root protection zones or crown spreads of the trees and potential impacts are limited to soil compaction and from construction activities. These can be mitigated by protective fencing and temporary ground protection. The BCP Tree and Landscape Officer considers the scheme to be acceptable; however recommends additional soft landscaping and planting to compensate for the removal of some smaller fruit trees within the site. The plot is large enough to ensure some replacement planting is put in place and this can be secured by a landscaping condition. This can include additional planting on the southern boundary with No 30 and the south west boundary with No 29.

Biodiversity

29. The application site lies within 5km but beyond 400m of Dorset Heathland which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and as a European wildlife site. The proposal for net increase in residential units is, in combination with other plans and projects and in the absence of avoidance and mitigation measures, likely to have a significant effect on the site. It has therefore been necessary for the Council, as the appropriate authority, to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications for the protected site, in view of the site's conservation objectives.
30. Natural England has advised that on a site that lies between 400m and 5km from the SSSIs, an appropriate assessment may reasonably conclude that there would not be an adverse cumulative impact on the integrity of the SSSIs. This is on the basis of the adopted Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020 -2025 which will provide mitigation against the impacts of new dwellings on the heathland. The Framework requires a financial contribution from the applicant to go towards funding the mitigation measures which are provision of a financial contribution to go towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) of the SSSIs.
31. The applicant has submitted a signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking to secure the SAMM contribution and therefore the proposal will be acceptable in terms of its impact on protected heathlands and it would accord with Policy ME2 of the Core Strategy.
32. An ecological appraisal has been undertaken on the site and no signs of protected species or their habitats were found during the survey. The following enhancement measures are proposed in order to provide net gain on the site in line with the NPPF and policy ME1;
- Bat box/tube incorporated into the new house
 - External lights kept to a minimum
 - House martin terrace installed
 - Two bee bricks
 - Native or wildlife friendly trees and plants planted around the site.
33. These enhancement measures can be secured by condition.

Summary

34. The proposal is considered to be a sustainable form of development in that it would make a modest contribution to the housing supply and provide a two bedroom bungalow in a sustainable location. The development does not result in any harm to the larger trees within and adjacent to the site and there remains opportunities to secure new planting on the site. The built relationships created are acceptable and the impact on neighbouring properties has been minimised by the scale, siting and position of openings. The access and parking arrangements

are considered to be acceptable and the biodiversity of the site will be protected and enhanced through the proposal and Heathland Mitigation will be secured through a legal agreement and CIL.

Planning Balance

35. In the absence of relevant up to date development plan policies, given the lack of a five year housing land supply, the balance is tilted in favour of granting planning permission except where the benefits are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse impacts or where specific policies in the NPPF provide a clear reason for refusal.
36. The council encourages sustainable development. This seeks to strike a balance between the economic and social benefits of new housing with any potential environmental impacts that result from the loss of a larger garden and potential impact on residential amenities, and the social benefits derived by the creation of much needed housing.
37. The proposal is considered to be a sustainable form of development in that it would make a modest contribution to the housing supply and provide a two bedroom bungalow in a sustainable location. The proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION

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 Section 106 agreement dated 8th January 2021.

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Location, Block Plan and Site Plan 002C
Topographical Plan
Proposed Plans and Elevations 003B

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

3. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials details of which are shown on plan No. 003 Rev.B unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: This is required to ensure the satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

4. Other than for the erection of tree protection, before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site, a pre-commencement site meeting between the Tree and Landscape Case Officer and Site Manager shall take place to confirm the methods of protecting trees on and adjacent to the site during development in accordance with the submitted Tree Report ref: DS/45520/SC and Tree Protection Plan ref: DS/45520/SC, both dated 29/09/20 submitted with this Report. The confirmed tree protection shall be retained until the development is completed and nothing shall be placed within the fencing, nor shall any ground levels be altered or excavations made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: This meeting is required prior to commencement of development in the interests of tree protection.

5. No development above DCP (damp proof course) shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include hard surfacing materials; means of enclosure on all boundaries; details of boundary planting, schedules of plants (noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate). The tree species within the landscaping scheme should include the following species; 'Betula Pendula', Alnus glutinosa 'Lacinata' or Crataegus x prunifolia.

Reason: This information is required prior to above ground work commencing as the long term establishment, maintenance and landscaping of the site is necessary to preserve the amenity of the locality.

6. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development and the planting carried out in the first planting season following completion of the development or its first occupation, whichever is the sooner. Any planting found damaged, dead or dying in the first five years following their planting are to be duly replaced with appropriate species.

Reason: This information is required prior to occupation of development in order to ensure the implementation of the scheme is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

7. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or utilised until the access, parking, and turning areas shown on the approved plans have been

constructed. Thereafter, these areas shall be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for those purposes specified.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

8. Prior to occupation of the development details of a presentation point for waste and recycling collection shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure adequate recycling and waste collection facilities.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any subsequent re-enactment thereof, no extensions or outbuildings permitted by Classes A, B, or E of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the above Order shall be constructed or erected without express planning permission having first being obtained.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and protecting the trees around the site.

Background Papers