

Planning Committee

Application Address	129-139 Princess Road & 8-14 Prince of Wales Road Bournemouth BH4 9HG
Proposal	Erection of four blocks of flats (providing 119 flats and a 20 bedroom emergency accommodation facility in buildings ranging from 6 to 9 storeys in height) with basement and surface parking, cycle stores and amenity areas - Regulation 3
Application Number	7-2020-14899-E
Applicant	BCP Council
Agent	Pentan Partnership
Date Application Valid	19 June 2020
Decision Due Date	17 September 2020
Extension of Time date (if applicable)	7 May 2021
Ward	Westbourne & West Cliff
Report Status	Public
Meeting Date	22 April 2021
Recommendation	GRANT, in accordance with the recommendation in the report
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Major category development proposal where the Council is the Applicant
Case Officer	Tom Hubbard

Description of Development

1. Planning consent is sought for the erection of four blocks of flats (providing 119 flats and a 20 bedroom emergency accommodation facility in buildings ranging from 6 to 9 storeys in height) with basement and surface parking, cycle stores and amenity areas - Regulation 3
2. The applicant has provided the following information:
 - Location Plan
 - Proposed Site Plans
 - Proposed Elevations
 - Proposed Floor Plans

- Architectural Details
- Landscaping Plans
- Street scene drawings and CGIs
- Design and Access Statement
- Contamination Ground Investigation Reports
- Air Quality Assessment
- Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy
- Heritage Statement
- Ecology Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Temporary Accommodation Management Plan
- Wind Microclimate Report
- Noise Assessment
- Landscape Design and Access Statement
- Tree Report and Method Statement

Key Issues

3. The main considerations involved with this application are:
- Impact on character and appearance of the area
 - Heritage considerations including the Westbourne Conservation Area
 - Tree issues
 - Impact on neighbouring residents
 - Living conditions for future occupants
 - Parking/traffic/highway safety considerations
4. These points will be discussed as well as other material considerations at paragraphs 26 to 146 below.

Planning Policies

5. **Core Strategy (2012)**

Policy CS1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 Policy CS2 – Sustainable Homes and Premises
 Policy CS4 – Surface Water Flooding
 Policy CS5 – Promoting a Healthy Community
 Policy CS6 – Delivering Sustainable Communities
 Policy CS14 – Transport Infrastructure
 Policy CS16 – Parking Standards
 Policy CS17 – Encouraging Greener Vehicle Technologies
 Policy CS18 – Increasing Opportunities for Cycling and Walking
 Policy CS21 – Housing Distribution Across Bournemouth
 Policy CS23 – Encouraging Lifetime Home Standards
 Policy CS33 – Dorset Heathland
 Policy CS39 – Designated Heritage Assets
 Policy CS41 – Quality Design

6. **District Wide Local Plan (2002)**

Policy 4.25 – Landscaping
 Policy 6.10 – Flats Development

Policy 6.17 – HMOs and Hostels
Policy 8.4 – A338 Wessex Way widening
Policy 8.22 – Proposals Affecting Car Parking Spaces
Policy 8.39 – Improvements to Access for Mobility Impaired Persons
Policy 8.40 – Disabled car parking

7. Supplementary Planning Documents:

Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD 2020
Residential Development: A Design Guide – PGN (2008)
Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) - PGN
BCP Parking Standards – SPD
Affordable Housing DPD and SPD

8. The National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Plans and policies should apply a 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, 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; 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.

9. In the Bournemouth area the Core Strategy is greater than five years old and the Council is also unable to demonstrate a five year housing supply, meaning that the 'tilted balance' of Paragraph 11 would apply to this proposal unless it is considered that under point i) above that the proposed development will impact upon areas or assets of particular importance (including for example conservation areas). Otherwise, development should be granted unless "any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits".

10. The following chapters of the NPPF are relevant to this proposal:

- Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Chapter 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Chapter 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals:

11. There is no relevant planning history on the site. It is currently vacant, but was previously occupied by seven detached buildings, which have now been demolished.

Representations

12. Site notices were posted in the vicinity of the site on 03/07/2020 with an expiry date for consultation of 31/07/2020. Following the receipt of amended plans a further period of publicity was undertaken with new site notices between 11/02/2021 and 05/03/2021.
13. Five representations have been received, all raising objection. The issues raised comprise the following:-

Overdevelopment

Density too high

Poor quality living conditions

Overbearing on Prince of Wales Road 2 storey properties

Not enough school places in the area to accommodate the number of families here

Insufficient parking

Impact on traffic

14. A response has been received from the Bournemouth Civic Society, making the following comments:

Reasonably satisfied with general design and scale, sufficiently detached from Westbourne core to not be harmful, but central block a little too high and density of development quite high.

Consultations

15. Urban Design Officer – Scale of development excessive in some areas, design a little disjointed, limited spacing between buildings, provision of balconies is positive, needs a lightweight material for recessed upper floors, some more detail required.
16. Heritage – Early demolition of the original building regrettable, proposed development overscale, concern at loss of trees. Objection to harm to the significance of the setting of the Westbourne Conservation Area. Benefits of the proposal do not in their view outweigh the harm.
17. Highways – No overall objection subject to conditions and obligations
18. Waste and Recycling –The application fails to meet all the requirements of the Council's guidance, however with a detailed refuse management plan identifying a private commercial collection service for the hostel element on the development along with caretaking to maintain the bin stores and to present and the return the bins from the residential block then there are no objections.
19. Trees – Objection to level of tree loss proposed, and concern at the long term retention of some of the remaining trees on the site.
20. Regulation (contaminated land) – No objection, subject to conditions
21. Regulation (noise) – No objection: If suitable ventilation strategies as detailed in the Noise Impact Assessment are implemented to reduce noise ingress from external sound, the indoor noise criteria can be met. In general, the proposed façade design appears

appropriate and reasonable to provide suitable internal amenity for future residents, based on noise from local road traffic.

22. Natural England – No objection, subject to securing appropriate mitigation against heathland impact
23. Police Architectural Design Officer – Lack of natural surveillance to informal play area. Layout in general looks secure, subject to some additional detail, lighting and cctv provision.

Constraints

24. The site is subject to the following constraints:
 - Tree Preservation Order (1040/2015)
 - Wessex Way widening Development Control Line (BDWLP Policy 8.4 refers)
 - Adjacent to Westbourne Conservation Area

Planning Assessment

Site and Surroundings

25. The large site is made up from seven former detached villas, which have now been demolished. It lies to the northern edge of the Westbourne area, just to the south of the A338 'Wessex Way'. This main road is raised in comparison to the application site the eastern end, with a tall retaining wall, gently sloping down to the west where the site and road become level. The site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order and there are many mature trees on the site, mainly to the front and rear boundaries. Princess Road is severed by the western end of the Wessex Way as it approaches the County Gates roundabout. The western boundary of the site is located on the boundary between the towns of Bournemouth and Poole. There is a large 6 to 10 storey tall block of flats opposite the site known as Westbourne Heights. The main core of Westbourne to the south is designated as a Conservation Area and contains a mix of commercial and residential development, generally 2-3 storeys in scale.

Key Issues

Principle of the development

26. This proposal is for a scheme that primarily comprises 119 residential flats, of which about 70% would be affordable rented units (82), with an additional block of 37 private rented units. The development also includes a 20 bed emergency family hostel accommodation unit, managed within the Strategic Housing Options team, for families, where the Council had a statutory homeless duty. This replaces a previous similar use on the site and provides much needed accommodation in this sector and help alleviate a significant demand in the area.
27. The site is located in the Westbourne area of Bournemouth, which is an identified District Centre area in the adopted Core Strategy. Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy has a hierarchy of areas suitable for residential intensification. In this case the site is within 400m of a district centre so is considered a suitable and sustainable location for residential intensification.

28. The site is considered previously developed brownfield land. It does not have any site-specific policy designations either in terms of site allocations, or restrictive policies. The main constraints are the existence of a Tree Preservation Order across the site, and the need to retain a portion of the northern area of the site for potential future Wessex Way widening. Overall however, the site is suitable for residential development in principle, subject to assessment of the relevant issues and material considerations.
29. The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, so the ‘tilted balance’ of paragraph 11 of the NPPF applies, meaning that the development should be approved unless the adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The development would make a significant contribution towards local housing supply, including a significant affordable housing provision, in a sustainable location on an under-used site. The other merits or issues of the proposals are explored in the following paragraphs.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

30. The proposal is for a major development that will potentially change the appearance of the area and the wider skyline in the area. The development comprises of four main blocks across the site. The main issues relate to:
- the height, scale and mass of the development and the visual impact of the proposals,
 - the overall density, and spacing of the buildings,
 - The site layout and its functionality,
 - the impact on the Westbourne Conservation Area and any other heritage assets,
 - detailed design considerations.

Height scale mass

31. The original buildings on the site have already been demolished. Existing trees and vegetation have been retained. The proposal is for a development of four residential blocks, ranging in height from 6 to 9 storeys.
32. The site is bound by the A338 Wessex Way to the north and Princess Road to the south. To the southern side of Princess Road are two existing large blocks: one residential and one office building, which are significantly taller than surrounding development at 10 storeys each. Beyond to the south and east is the Westbourne Conservation Area. Existing development in and around the Westbourne shopping area generally ranges from 2-4 storeys, with late Victorian/early 20th century terraces with ornate detailing. Development to the west across the boundary into Poole tends to be for blocks of flats around 4-5 storeys in height. The proposed development would therefore be in the height range of the two existing taller blocks in the area, but less in keeping with the general scale of development in the Westbourne area overall. However, it is considered that the site is sufficiently detached from the main Westbourne Core in an area of more varied townscape, with taller buildings and other developments of varying scale and character, including empty car park sites.
33. The heights of the proposed buildings are as follows:

Block A	6 storeys
Block B	8 storeys (including one recessed top floor)
Block C	9 storeys (including one recessed top floor)
Block D	6 storeys (including one to two recessed top floors)

34. The site levels drop a little from west to east meaning that what is the basement level in Block A is effectively the ground floor to Block D. The Wessex Way is also raised above the site at the eastern end.
35. In a wider context, locating taller development adjacent to the Wessex Way would reinforce more of a corridor adjacent to this busy road, leading from the County Gates roundabout to the west, through Bournemouth town centre and Lansdowne areas, where there are other tall buildings adjacent to this road.
36. The scale of development was considered by the Council's Design Review Panel at the pre-application stage. The report states "*The Panel members were comfortable with the building heights and felt that the articulation of the blocks was good*". The principle of taller development adjacent to the Wessex Way was accepted by the panel, and no concern was raised about the impact on the conservation area.
37. The impact of the development on the adjacent conservation area is explored in a separate section below. The site otherwise sits alone in an underused area of land adjacent to the main road, and with a 10 storey block of flats immediately to the south. The adjacent block of flats to the west on the northern side of Princess Road (number 125) is lower at two storeys with roof accommodation, but it is considered that this is not a significant constraint to development and building height. A significant gap will also be retained between the development and this neighbouring building. Proposed Block A is 6 storeys in height so there is a step down from the peak height of Block C down to the west. It is considered that the development is sufficiently detached from other development that it can accommodate taller buildings.
38. The peak height of the four blocks is Block C, with the other blocks stepping down to each side. It is considered that this is an acceptable approach, with development stepping down to 125 Princess Road to the west as mentioned, and also stepping down to reflect the more human scale of the Westbourne Conservation Area where Block D meets Prince of Wales Road. The variation in heights also creates interest to the development rather than having four identical scale blocks. It allows for some variation in the designs, yet they are all still read as a group.
39. Overall, it is considered that the height, scale and mass of the blocks are acceptable in principle, and the development would accord with the aims of the relevant policies in this respect, including CS41 and 6.10.

Density/spacing

40. The site has an area of approximately 0.87ha, with an overall density of development of approximately 145 dwellings per hectare (dph), including an allowance for the emergency accommodation. This is relatively high: higher than the 97dph of the adjacent flats at 125 Princess Road, but also some way below the approximately 250dph of Westbourne Heights. It is considered acceptable in principle for a town centre location. It would make an efficient use of this brownfield location close to a designated District Centre.
41. There are four blocks proposed, with a single basement running through all four, and the centre two blocks linked on the ground and first floors. The spacing between the blocks is a little low; for example, there would be a minimum of approximately 10 metres between Block A and Block B at the closest point, rising to 12 metres at the outer edges. Similarly, there would be between 11-13.5 metres between Blocks B and C, and 12-15.5m between

Blocks C and D. The blocks have a slightly angled form, such that from the front they will appear more widely spaced. The angled form also helps with light and outlook to the flats.

42. Overall, it is considered that while the spacing is a little low between the blocks, the design helps to reduce the impact of this. It is also accepted that the alternative of having a lower number of larger blocks would potentially be more harmful in terms of massing and living conditions.

Layout

43. The basement level feeds all the way through the four blocks, providing parking, cycle and bin storage and other plant at the basement level. This means that the courtyard areas between blocks are raised with brick linking walls between. The courtyard area between blocks B and C has a taller, more formal two storey link, with brick archway detailing to provide some design and articulation. This presents a physical barrier between the blocks, with raised inaccessible platforms, but it does provide a distinction between public and private areas for security, and these areas are set back from the street (between 9-13 metres), with a landscaped frontage setting.
44. There are a network of pathways and ramps to access the blocks (7 pedestrian accesses). There are two bin collection areas to the frontage which will detract a little from the landscaped setting overall, but these appear to be a functional necessity given the distance from the bin stores being too great for collection otherwise.
45. The ground floor of Block D lacks a little in terms of active frontage, because the 'basement' level at this point is above ground, with gridded windows serving parking areas, bin stores and plant rooms. However, the main front entrance remains on this level which is considered sufficient in this case to articulate the ground floor and not provide a completely blank ground floor appearance. Blocks A and B have their main entrances to the side, but Block C has a main front entrance.
46. There are two large external cycle stores: one to the western side of Block A, and one to the front of Block D. There are a large number of cycles that need to be accommodated on the site in accessible locations, so a balance needs to be struck in terms of the location of these. Although it would be better if they were located internally to the building, it is accepted that ground floor active uses are also an important consideration. The cycle stores are lightweight structures with a mix of matching brickwork and steel grille sides and doors in a colour to match the balcony and window detailing on the main buildings. That to the side of Block A obscures the main entrance a little, but overall the location is satisfactory.
47. A surface car park is retained on the western end of the site, which would have more limited landscaping opportunities around it, but is no change to the existing situation. It also helps to retain a significant buffer to the adjacent block of flats to the west.

Detailed design considerations

48. The proposed buildings have different heights but share a similar aesthetic in terms of design and materials. Buildings are to be predominantly brick built, using a buff coloured multi stock brick to provide some historic context and links to the Bournemouth area. This would have a warmer and brighter appearance than the originally proposed grey brick. Brick slips should be avoided as they don't turn corners well and they require movement joints, which gives away that they are not true bricks but are just a facing panel. This has not been detailed but full details of materials can be provided by condition (condition 8). Upper recessed floors use a greater proportion of cladding for variation and to provide a

different and more lightweight appearance to these upper floors. Timber cladding is used as a supplementary material to the arch details. This is considered an acceptable approach.

49. Elevations are articulated through the use of brick arch details in places, and strong brickwork header patterns over window openings. Windows are all full height windows, providing a more modern appearance and a strong vertical rhythm to the development. Balconies and Juliet Balconies are used extensively and add depth to the elevations and additional detailing. There is a strong gold/brown colour theme running through the development, which ties it together. Deep window reveals will add further depth to the elevations and create more of a high-quality appearance.
50. The references in the design statement indicate that the development is intended to reference the Victorian precedent of the 'mansion block', though in this case the development is taller than the typical scale of those.
51. The proposed development has a mix of modern and traditional forms. The buildings are all angled to promote the best possible living conditions for occupants, but this also adds interest to the design. There are also curved elements to blocks C and D, which again adds further variety and interest. There is enough shared design elements to clearly read all four buildings as a family, but equally enough design variation to give each their own identity. The level of architectural interest in each is perceived to increase from west to east, with Block A being a relatively simple block form.
52. Blocks A, B and C share a common vertical emphasis due to the height and fenestration pattern. Block D has more of a horizontal emphasis with its wider and lower form. The height of blocks B, C and D has been lowered during the application process, in part to create a better balance between the main building and the recessed upper floors. In the case of Block D there are two on the eastern side, but it is accepted that while the building lacks symmetry, it is preferable to demonstrate that the building steps down to respect the lower scale of development in the conservation area, and to continue the pattern of the buildings stepping down each side of Block C. Block D has a strong central entrance arch feature running up the building.
53. The proposals have been considered by the local Design Review Panel at the pre-application stage. The submitted scheme has addressed most of the panel's concerns, with the exception of some concern about the spacing between buildings. Overall, it is considered that the detailed design of the proposed buildings is acceptable and accords with the aims of the relevant development plan policies, including CS41 and 6.10.

Heritage considerations

54. Paragraph 190 of the NPPF states that "*Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset)*". In this case the main relevant heritage asset is the Westbourne Conservation Area, and the setting thereof.
55. The site is close to, but outside the boundary of, the aforementioned Westbourne Conservation Area, which was designated in 1993. Properties at 3 to 9a Prince of Wales Road opposite part of the site are included in the conservation area, though Princess Road itself is not included (illustrated on the following page, with the conservation area boundary hatched beige):



© Crown copyright and database rights 2021 OS 100000019829 BCP Council

56. There is no Conservation Area Appraisal for the Westbourne Conservation Area. A summary is however provided at Appendix 1 of the 2002 District Wide Local Plan:

“This area was laid out in the 1860s as a gracious, low density residential area. Since then it has been heavily redeveloped, at a much higher density. To the north is a very popular, compact shopping area, of the late Victorian to Edwardian period, with two main shopping roads linked by a ‘listed’ arcade. Projecting south from here are three residential roads with modest, contemporary houses in the centre section and grander houses in the south, around Alum Chine. The area forms a strong neighbourhood, with a cross section of period development under threat from unsympathetic redevelopment”.

57. The Council’s Heritage Officer has raised an objection to the proposals (in their original taller form), stating that:

“In drawing up any redevelopment scheme focus needs to be paid to what is significant about the setting and how any new development can enhance this setting. ‘Westbourne Heights’ by virtue of its height & footprint is out of keeping with the rest of the street, it sits as the ‘odd man out’ and is a negative feature within the setting of the conservation area. This is an area characterised by low density properties, with some openness provided by car parking and a sylvan softness through a strong presence of trees.

In views towards the conservation area and within the street scene adjacent to the 2 storey domestic scaled building of the conservation area, the proposed buildings would appear grossly overscale. It is somewhat unclear why this development would step up in the middle when this is at odds with the built form along the road. The height of any replacement buildings needs to reflect the height of properties across the road and any stepping up should be limited to that part beyond Westbourne Heights. Even Westbourne Heights steps down along Princess Rd with a lower easterly 6 storey wing. The development would be visually dominant adjacent to the conservation area and at odds within the street scene.

The footprint of large singular blocks is also considered out of step with the general pattern of development and contrary to the character of the area. Whilst lots of work seems to go into how to finish the flat blocks, the principle of a redevelopment scheme of this scale/massing is objected to. Further, concern is expressed that little consideration appears to have been given to the importance of trees to the setting of the conservation area.

The heritage statement doesn't fully consider the impact on views, relying solely on views out of the area and doesn't identify key views and the impact on these. Whilst the statement still identifies harm, the conclusion that this is only within the lower end of less than substantial harm is not agreed with. The harm through completely changing the character at this point and introducing tall buildings just metres from a conservation area of domestic scaled period properties is deemed bordering on substantial harm to the significance of the setting of the conservation area".

58. Since these comments there have been some changes to the scheme including reducing a storey from three of the blocks and the retention of some more trees on the site. This has not led to a change in the overall view of the Heritage Officer in terms of the heritage impact. Some additional key views were produced, which informed these changes.
59. The scale of the proposed development does mean that the proposed buildings may be visible from areas within the conservation area. It is considered that on careful examination the development would not block any important townscape views into the conservation area, or block any key views of any listed buildings or other heritage assets. The main potential impact is therefore the impact of the development when viewed from within the conservation area, and whether the scale and form of the development would detract from the setting of the conservation area. In this respect the applicant has provided key views, including one from within the conservation area in the area of Seamoor Road. Blocks B and C can be seen to rise taller than the foreground historic development on Poole Road. In the case of Block C this was considered relatively significant, so the height of this block has been reduced a little further so that it does not loom over so significantly. The height of Blocks B, C and D has been reduced during the application process.
60. The distance between the proposed buildings and the front of development on Poole Road in this view is about 80-85 metres. It is considered that the conservation area is sufficiently robust and self-contained that the distant view of the top of the buildings would not be significantly harmful to its setting.
61. Much of Westbourne is domestic in scale with houses, terraces and mansion blocks at a human scale. The proposed development is therefore of a much greater scale than the original development within the conservation area. However, the area feels quite self-contained with development on Poole Road and Seamoor Road forming the core of the denser commercial area. The conservation area runs much further to the south with a different character of residential avenues with larger dwellings.
62. The area to the north of Poole Road on the conservation area edge is less well defined. For example, the rear of properties on Poole Road on Milburn Road do not address the street well and contain parking and servicing areas which do not have a positive impact on the character and appearance of the area. There is a strong peripheral feel to the area on Milburn Road with the rear of Poole Road properties, and the surface car park opposite on Milburn Road providing limited active frontages. The only development of character and lower scale in close proximity to the application site are the five dwellings on the opposite side of Prince of Wales Road to the immediate south of the site, which mostly contribute positively and provide some definition to the edge of the conservation area here.
63. Block D is the closest to these properties and the conservation area overall. It is one of the lowest of the blocks, with a maximum of seven storeys and set on slightly lower ground than the other blocks such that the 'ground floor' of this block is the basement level running through the development. Of the four blocks it has the greatest amount of articulation with

various stepped elements and a main central entrance arch column feature. The architectural justification includes reference to projecting bays being a prominent feature of original buildings in the area which has influenced the design. These elements together with the materials and the stepped approach to the built form is considered to respond to the townscape in an acceptable manner. Therefore, the scale and appearance of this block would not detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.

64. Trees on the site could be argued to make some contribution to the character of the conservation area, with many mature trees on the frontage providing a softer edge to the boundary of the conservation area. These will be eroded to a degree but retained and replaced where possible. The landscaped area to the far eastern edge of the site will also be retained.
65. A Heritage Statement submitted with the application concludes that *“Ultimately, the proposed buildings would introduce change within the setting of the CA... While the proposed built form will provide its own distinctive contemporary architectural contribution to the heritage context, it is acknowledged that the scale and massing of the proposed buildings will result in a degree of impact in terms of setting. The core of the CA’s significance (i.e. any form, layout of the road important spaces between buildings and any remaining fabric of significance) will be not be impacted upon. Where impact is identified, the public benefits (as set out in the planning submission) will outweigh harm, in accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF. Impact on the setting of the CA will be less than substantial, at the low-medium end of the scale”*.
66. This summary is agreed with. It is considered that the scale, mass and amount of development will lead to a change to the townscape and setting of the conservation area. This will lead to a modest level of harm which is ‘less than substantial’ overall. This means that Paragraph 196 of the NPPF is relevant. This outlines that where a proposed development results in less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, the harm arising should be weighed against the public benefits accruing from the proposed development. In this case the main public benefit is the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing and an overall large contribution towards local housing need in a sustainable location. The Council has a significant affordable housing need and few suitable locations in which to provide this.
67. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF also needs careful consideration. It states that *“when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”*. In this case the proposed development would not remove the heritage asset or affect the setting to an unacceptable degree.
68. Overall, it is therefore considered that the level of harm to the Westbourne Conservation Area is identified as less than substantial, which means that there will be some harm and conflict with Policy 4.4 of the District Wide Local Plan. However, it has been assessed as not sufficient to warrant refusal of the application in this case, particularly with the identified benefits. The proposed development therefore accords with the provisions of the relevant policies and national guidance.

Trees/landscaping

69. The site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order (1040/2015). The site contains many trees and other mature vegetation. A Tree Report and Arboricultural Method Statement has been provided and demonstrates that to enable the development a relatively high level of tree loss is required to facilitate the development. Many of the trees to be lost are in the centre of the site and would otherwise preclude development, and those around the site edge have mainly been retained.
70. The tree report suggests that 59 trees will be retained and 33 will be felled. Of those 33 none are the highest quality Category A trees, 6 are in Category B, and the rest are mostly in Categories C (low quality with limited life left of young trees) and U (unsuitable for retention).
71. The proposals have been assessed by a Landscape and Tree Officer, who has raised an objection at the level of tree loss proposed, and the limited potential for meaningful replacement planting. The loss of a third of the trees on the site is considered harmful on a site with trees of high visual value. The Officer also considers that there are some concerns with the long-term retention of other trees on the frontage, with construction impacts and long-term issues of trees being in close proximity to the proposed buildings.
72. It is stated that *“A harmonious relationship between tree retention and the buildings locations cannot be achieved with this current proposal. It will lead to a very poor relationship, leaving retained trees under threat. Issues of anxiety due to trees close proximity to buildings will be caused, light loss / view restrictions by trees will be relevant as this will be a significant issue to the new build. Debris fall from trees close to the buildings will also be an issue... If an approval of these proposals were to be given there would be very limited scope for a high-quality, future tree planting and soft landscaping scheme. It will be only feasible to plant limited small sized trees and shrubs when what is required is an extensive tree planting scheme using trees of stature for the future along with extensive shrub and other plants planting”*.
73. The applicant’s tree consultant has responded to say that, in their opinion:
- The use of swales improves the rooting environment for the trees that are retained and provides the opportunity to improve and enhance the biodiversity of the area by means of new planting with new species trees and shrubs.
 - A large percentage of the existing trees on site are shown to be removed but these are primarily low-quality trees that have a short safe future life expectancy and which were not worthy of an individual Tree Preservation Order. Trees of low quality are removed to increase light levels to the site and provide space for new planting and landscaping
 - Large areas of existing hard surfacing are returned to soft landscaping.
 - The proposed landscaping using swales and natural topography rather than soakaways overcomes the need for multiple excavations, and provides an opportunity to improve the rooting environment of retained trees and introduce new species of tree and shrub.
 - A large number of new trees all of which are over 2M in height have been proposed. At this size a high rate of survival is anticipated. Within a short period of time these trees will add significantly to the amenity of the area.

74. It is considered that while there may be some small particular areas of benefit, the overall level of change in hard surfacing is not significant to form a net benefit here. Similarly, the trees that are proposed to be lost are not all of low quality as there are some good quality mature trees that will be lost.
75. A total of 24 new trees are proposed on the landscaping plan, not including those in the courtyard areas between the buildings. It is accepted that these trees will not in all case have the space to grow to large mature specimens, but they would provide some additional softening to the proposed development.
76. There will be some conflict between trees on the frontage and the buildings themselves as it is accepted they are in quite close proximity in places, but this is not significantly different to the relationship between the existing trees and the previous buildings on the site. In addition, as discussed in the living conditions for future occupants section below, the lower floors of the buildings in affected areas at the front do not in many cases contain residential flats meaning that the level of potential conflict with living conditions is reduced.
77. Overall, the proposed level of tree loss is considered harmful in terms of the number of protected trees lost and the lack of meaningful opportunities for new tree planting that will enable mature tree growth. The development is therefore contrary to the aims of policies including 4.25 and CS41, but this is balanced in the conclusion with the other material considerations and benefits of the proposals.

Proposed landscaping

78. The plans show a variety of landscaped areas around the site, using the existing trees and vegetation as a starting point. To the east end of the site, beyond the access lane to the highway retaining wall, existing vegetation will be thinned out where it does not provide a positive contribution to the amenity of the scheme. New planting and informal play equipment is proposed, to provide an engaging space for residents, particularly children, to play amongst the trees.
79. To the western end of the site, the existing car park will be retained. To the south of the blocks fronting the street, the landscaped spaces form part of the SUDs strategy, planted to provide a soft buffer between the street and the front of the blocks, building on the existing shrub planting and introducing new planting beneath the canopy of the existing, mature trees.
80. To the rear of the blocks, existing trees and vegetation will be retained where it makes a positive contribution and will be re-enforced to provide as soft a buffer to the Wessex Way as possible. Amidst this planting a raised walkway will link the ground floor level to a series of paths meandering through an informal landscape with seating areas for residents to use.
81. Between the blocks raised courtyards will provide some additional informal space between buildings, mostly hard surfaced but with some additional planting.
82. It is considered that the landscaping scheme is acceptable overall to soften the appearance of the large blocks proposed, with sufficient space around retained for trees and mature landscaping. From the front of the site the front boundary can be reinforced with more hedge planting to provide a defined front boundary, and other retained trees and added trees and vegetation will enhance the appearance of the site. At the rear the useability of the landscaped areas will be compromised a little by their limited area, existing tree planting, the scale of the buildings and the Wessex Way. Living conditions including access to external amenity space are considered at paragraphs 89-102 below, but the quality of the landscaping proposals are considered acceptable overall.

83. One of the more significant aspects is the provision of a three metre tall acoustic fence to the northern boundary abutting the A338 Wessex Way. This is required to provide adequate noise mitigation to residents but would present a relatively tall and harsh boundary on the road side compared to the existing view of trees and vegetation. In this respect there is scope to provide additional planting on the road side of the fence to screen it, as well as painting the fence green so it blends in more with the landscape. A hedge has now been shown on the landscaping plan.
84. Overall, therefore the loss of a number of existing trees on the site does create a level of harm, as these are protected trees which make a contribution towards the visual amenity of the area and soften the appearance of the site. While the landscaping proposals overall are acceptable to soften the appearance of the buildings on the site, there will not be space for sufficient mature tree planting to replace those lost. The proposal conflicts with policies 4.25 and CS41 in this respect, and this issue is assessed in the overall balance at the conclusion of this report.

Impact on neighbouring residents

125 Princess Road

85. The site occupies a position between Princess Road and the Wessex Way to the rear. The only directly adjoining neighbouring property to the site is 125 Princess Road to the west of the site, which is separated from Block A by a distance of approximately 27-30 metres, with a car parking area between. There is a public (permit holders) car park in the same location at the present time so this would not be a fundamental change to the level of activity on this part of the site. Block A is six storeys in height with a number of side windows and balconies facing the side of 125 Princess Road. However, at the distance proposed it is not considered materially harmful to occupants of this neighbouring block.

Westbourne Heights

86. On the opposite side of Princess Road is a large block of flats known as Westbourne Heights. This is 6-10 storeys in height and is sited quite close to the road. The overall separation between the front of Block A and Westbourne Heights would be approximately 18.4 metres, with tree screening between. The separation between the taller Block B and Westbourne Heights is 22.2 metres. These distances are considered acceptable in this case for the development on opposite sides of the road, and there would not be a material impact on residential amenity to occupants of this block.

3 – 9a Prince of Wales Road

87. There are several two storey dwellings in Prince of Wales Road opposite the site. Block D will be a minimum of approximately 26 metres from the front of these properties, and Block C over 34 metres. The general scale and density of development will be more imposing, but would not have a directly negative impact on occupants of these properties in terms of overshadowing, visual intrusion or overlooking for example at the distances proposed.

General impact

88. The provision of 119 flats and a 20 bed emergency accommodation shelter would increase the level of activity on the site over the historic development here. However, it is a relatively busy district centre location with many other blocks of flats and commercial uses. Residential development is not generally seen as noise generating or incompatible with other residential uses, and the emergency accommodation shelter is relatively modest in size and subject to management measures. There will be more comings and goings and the scale of development is increased, but overall it is not considered that it would have a

direct impact on any residential properties in the area. The proposed development therefore accords with the provisions of the relevant policies, including Core Strategy policies CS6, CS21 and CS41, District Wide Local Plan policies 6.10 and 6.17, and the NPPF.

Living conditions for future occupants

Mix of units

89. The mix of units in the development is as follows:

1 bed	2 bed (3 persons)	Larger 2 bed (4 persons)	3 bed	Total
26	52	37	4	119

90. It is considered that this forms a reasonable mix of unit sizes to reflect local housing need. It would be beneficial to have more 3 bed units in the development, but it is also recognised that the higher density flat development may not be appropriate for significant numbers of larger family sized units.

Size of units

91. The one-bedroom units all meet the minimum space standards of the Government's 'Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard' (March 2015), so there are no unacceptably small units. Not all of the two-bedroom units meet this standard, but they do not fall significantly below. The Council does not have locally adopted space standards. To fall some way below these standards would indicate that there is an insufficient level of space and poor living standards but that is not considered to be the case here.

Light and outlook

92. There are a number of single aspect flats, including some that are only north facing, but this does not represent a large proportion of the overall number of units, as the number of blocks and narrow form of the buildings helps to prevent this. Spacing between buildings is a little low in places, but not to a degree that would be unacceptable in terms of privacy and outlook. Rooms facing to the sides are typically bedrooms, and living spaces have a dual outlook.

93. The level of tree cover to the site, as well as the levels and retaining wall to the eastern end of the site at the rear, will have some impact on light and outlook in places. The rear of Block D is around 12-14 metres from the Wessex Way retaining wall at the rear. There are no flats on the ground floor of this building, with first floor flats therefore some way off the ground here. It is considered that although there are some lower floor units at the rear facing the retaining wall and trees, the separation distance is sufficient to ensure that the impact is not overly oppressive.

94. Similarly, at the front of the site the trees are around 5 to 8 metres from the front of the buildings, with canopies that will be quite close to the front of the building in places. This again is less of an issue at the eastern end of the site where the basement level is raised, and equally there are bin and bike stores to the front of Block A on the ground floor. Blocks B and C have the hostel accommodation on the ground and first floors, and other flats to Block C at the front do not have a single aspect. Therefore, while some flats to the front of Blocks A and C will be relatively close to the trees on the lower floors, this does not affect a large number of units, and those on higher floors are not affected by this.

95. Therefore, it is considered that despite quite close proximity to the buildings in places, shading from trees would not affect a large number of residential units. The proximity of the blocks themselves will create some shading between buildings at times and there are some single aspect and north facing units. However, windows in the flats are generally full height windows, helping to allow maximum light into the units. Overall, it is considered that the units in the development will have an acceptable level of light and outlook.
96. A Daylight and Sunlight report has been submitted. In terms of the residential accommodation, the report states that *“around 98% of all rooms achieve or surpass their Average Daylight Factor targets in the winter months”*, and while *“not all living rooms will receive ideal levels of sunlight”*, it is concluded that *“the proposed design achieves a high level of compliance when taking into consideration all the of the requirements set out in the BRE guide ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight’”*. The report suggests significant overshadowing of the garden courtyard areas adjacent to blocks A and B due to the buildings and tree cover on the site frontage. However, there is not significant planting to these areas, and they will still serve a purpose as additional external amenity space.
97. The amenity level for the temporary hostel accommodation is not such a significant consideration given that stays are only intended to be very short term while more permanent accommodation is sought. Nevertheless, the units here will also have a reasonable level of light and outlook and adequate facilities for the anticipated length of stay. There is a secure ground floor courtyard between Blocks B and C to be used as private amenity space for this facility. It is a little cramped and enclosed and very overlooked, but overall would be acceptable for this purpose.
98. Some flats have access to balconies for amenity space, though not all flats have direct access to private amenity space. However, there are extensive landscaped grounds around the buildings. There are a number of constraints including the buildings and trees, but a landscaped trail along the rear of the site is to be created, with seating areas and planting, and an informal play space is to be created in the woodland area to the eastern end of the site. These areas will provide a reasonable level of amenity, if quite shaded with trees and with traffic noise from the Wessex Way.

Noise

99. The main source of noise is road traffic noise from the A338 Wessex Way to the rear of the site. A Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted giving details of existing daytime and nighttime noise levels, and the required reduction in sound levels to provide acceptable living conditions to future occupants. The report concludes that the road does present a noise constraint but acceptable noise levels in line with the British Standard 8233:2014 can be achieved through the provision of acoustic fencing along the northern boundary with the Wessex Way, as well as fencing to the car park area to the west end of the site. To achieve acceptable noise levels, adequate internal ventilation would need to be provided so that windows can remain closed. They will remain openable but appropriate alternative ventilation would need to be provided. A higher glazing specification will also be provided for greater acoustic performance.
100. The development does include the provision of balconies, which would be affected by noise from the road. BS8233:2014 contains guidance on balconies, and states:

“Other locations, such as balconies, roof gardens and terraces, are also important in residential buildings where normal external amenity space might be limited or not available, i.e. in flats, apartment blocks, etc. In these locations, specification of noise limits is not

necessarily appropriate. Small balconies may be included for uses such as drying washing or growing pot plants, and noise limits should not be necessary for these uses.”

101. The document recognises that the guideline noise levels are not always achievable, and that consideration should be given to *“a compromise between elevated noise levels and other factors, such as the convenience of living in these locations or making efficient use of land resources to ensure development needs can be met....”* In this scheme it is considered that the provision of some external amenity space with some noise disturbance would be preferable to providing no external amenity space. External balconies are not provided to the rear elevation of the blocks, which is the most noise sensitive.
102. The noise assessment also suggests that internal sound insulation will meet acceptable Building Regulations standards, and that noise from plant equipment is not likely to be an issue in the development.

Wind

103. A wind microclimate report has been produced which indicates that private balconies will generally be acceptable in terms of wind safety. The only areas where safety exceedances were observed was to two small areas of the roof terraces (the NW corner of the roof terrace of Block C and on the N side of the roof terrace of Block D), which can be prevented by altering the balustrading to prevent access to those corner areas. Modelling suggests that the street at ground level would not be detrimentally affected

Overall

104. Overall it is considered that living conditions for future occupants would be acceptable in terms of space, light, outlook, overlooking, noise, and wind impacts, and the development would therefore accord with the provisions of the relevant policies, including CS21, CS41, 6.10 and the NPPF.

Parking/traffic/highway safety considerations

105. On the 5th January 2021 the Local Planning Authority adopted a BCP wide Parking Standards SPD replacing the previous Bournemouth Parking SPD. The proposals have been amended during the process in light of the adoption of these new parking standards. In this area the new standards mean a reduced level of parking, but an increased level of cycle parking required. The proposals have been assessed by the Local Highway Authority (LHA).

Access

106. The site is accessed off Princess Road, an unclassified road that leads into the Wessex Way on the western end and meets a staggered crossroads at the junction with Prince of Wales on the eastern end.
107. The site itself would be accessed from an entrance via the existing car park which leads to a ramp under Block A and serves all the basement parking beneath Blocks A, B, and C. This route is proposed to be a two-way loop exiting back via Block A and the existing car park. The proposed access appears sufficient and swept path analysis has been provided for typical medium sized vehicles demonstrating this. Provided vegetation is maintained at low level near the exit on Princess Road adequate visibility is possible. There are trees retained on the plans but the higher canopies should not affect the visibility splays.

108. The existing entrance off Princess Road on the eastern side of Block D is retained as an inspection location for the retaining wall supporting the A338 Wessex Way and adjoining embankment, but not used to serve the development.

Car Parking

109. For the proposal to satisfy the Local Planning Authority's Core Strategy Policies CS16 and CS41, on-site car parking provision including the layout and design should be in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD. The site is within Zone A of the Parking Standards SPD.
110. The parking requirement derived from Table 9 C3 indicates no parking required is for the residential element. A total of 41 car parking spaces are proposed at basement level and 23 in the retained surface car park. The applicant indicates that the housing mix, historic census information, and a need to prevent overspill parking justify providing parking on an approximate 0.5 per unit basis. The applicant has provided justification to support an overprovision based around the housing mix, historic census information, and a need to prevent overspill parking justify providing parking on an approximate 0.5 per unit basis. The parking has been reduced in relation to the previous version.
111. The Parking Standards SPD does not provide a specific requirement for the 20-bed emergency accommodation. Previously the Bournemouth Parking SPD suggested a requirement of 1 per FTE staff member, according to the application form 2 FTEs are proposed, leading to a requirement for 2 spaces. The applicant has proposed two car parking spaces for staff associated with the hostel.
112. Turning to the parking spaces there is a dedicated surface parking area within the current footprint of the existing permit car park for 23 vehicles. Each space appears to be 2.6m wide with lengths of 4.8m, this accords with the Parking Standards SPD. There is a 6m aisle width which is sufficient.
113. The basement parking each space also appears to be 2.6m wide with lengths of 4.8m in line with the Parking Standards SPD. A total of 41 spaces are provided in the basement. The aisle widths are variable between 5.5m and 5.6 typically. This is less than the 6m aisle width normally sought, but most spaces have an offset from the walls indirectly increasing the bay length to make this more acceptable.
114. The car park ramp to the western entrance is subject to a maximum of 1:10 gradient which is considered acceptable. Previously a height restriction barrier limiting vehicles to 2.1m was shown but it is not clear on the amended plans if it is retained.
115. It is noted that the Parking Standards SPD, requires residential development with 10+ spaces to provide electric vehicle charging on a 50% active and 50% passive basis. Active charge points should be equitably spread out in the car parks. However, no electric vehicle charging has been provided. This can be provided by condition. In addition, developments Zones A (and B) with greater than 50 units on site provision are expected to provide at least 2 car club bays. A contribution should be secured via an appropriate legal mechanism for 2 spaces in vicinity to Princess Road. The Car Club operator in Bournemouth, Co Wheels, has advised that the cost per vehicle is £9,360pa. Any contribution should be secured for a minimum of 5 years to ensure the on-going sustainability of the spaces. The Car Club operator in Bournemouth, Co Wheels, has advised that the cost per vehicle is £9,360pa. Three years would be £28,080 per vehicle. Two vehicles would therefore be a total of £56,160.

Cycling

116. Overall, the cycling provision is improved in relation to the previous plans with all cycle storage being Sheffield type stands. The cycle stores are now all at 'ground' level across the site. However due to the topography the storage for Blocks C and D is at basement level of parking but has level access from the Prince of Wales Road. The provision of level and where necessary suitably ramped access is welcomed. The use of adequate width doorways at 1.2m or greater is welcomed along the routes to the cycle stores.
117. The ramps appear sufficient to allow most cycles to use them. The ramp to Block A which has a pair of 90° bends the pathway is sufficient to allow access and improved compared with previous plans. Similar concerns were evident for the cycle parking in front of Blocks C and D where 90° bends, again the accessway widths are broadly acceptable with at least a 1.5m minimum. It is not entirely sure if this is a nominal width or a usable width of 1.5m. The use of swept path analysis for a Cycle Design Vehicle would have been beneficial to confirm the useability of the accessways.
118. It is noted that the secure store adjacent to Block A is an area for the storage and charging of electric bicycles and scooters. This is welcomed. The visitor cycle parking is located between Blocks A and B and also in front of Block C. This provision at the destination is welcomed. From the drawings it is unclear as to the locking mechanism for the secure cycle stores, as the illustrative details appear to suggest unlockable systems. The secure parking under Blocks C and D is well laid out.
119. Turning to the numbers, the requirement is 1 cycle space per bedroom within the new Parking Standards SPD. The requirement is as follows:

	Requirement	Resident/Staff	Visitor
27x 1 beds	Secure Covered	27	2.7
52x 2 beds	Residential: 1 / bed.	98 (49x2)	4.9
38x 3 beds	Public (visitor): 0.1/Unit	114 (38x3)	3.8
5x 4 beds		20 (5x4)	0.5
Residential total		259	12 (11.9 unrounded)

120. The revised scheme includes 255 residential spaces (including 7 electric) and 24 visitor cycle spaces. The 4 space resident cycle spaces shortfall is offset by the 12 visitor space overprovision. The cycle requirement for the hostel use is 0.5 per bedroom equating to 10 cycle spaces and so as a whole the scheme has a 2 space shortfall which is considered on balance acceptable.

Servicing

121. A dedicated loading bay was previously provided along Princess Road. This has been removed. It is noted that the existing traffic restrictions do not prohibit loading. A loading and servicing management plan has been added as a condition (condition number 19).

Princess Road Car Park

122. The site includes Princess Road car park, which is a permit-only Council-owned car park. Permits can be purchased by anyone for periods of 1 month, 6 months and 12 months. No specific usage data is available on the occupancy nor has it been supplied by the applicant. Further information should be supplied by the applicant. Consequently, any current occupiers will be expected to use Milburn Road car park once Princess Road is no longer available. The LPA has a saved policy (Policy 8.22) of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan 2002 that sets out a sequential test for loss of off-street car parking. The policy states

that the parking should be replaced on site, in the vicinity of the site, or by the provision of alternative transport measures.

123. In this case the parking is not being replaced on or off site, and the applicants have stated that it is not viable to provide a further contribution towards alternative transport measures beyond the car club contribution and other public realm alterations and pedestrian/walking improvements proposed (detailed below). This means that the proposal would be in conflict with Policy 8.22.
124. The applicant has not supplied occupancy data for this car park. However, it caters for permit holders only so is not fully 'public'. It likely caters for local workers, but Westbourne is a sustainable location with alternative parking and public transport options. The impact of the loss of this car park is therefore regrettable but weighed up in the overall balance.

Other highway improvements

125. Within the immediate vicinity the existing walking and cycling infrastructure has been reviewed as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan (LCWIP). The infrastructure is considered as being substandard with a number of areas for improvement. In addition, a section of the Transforming Cities Fund C2 route runs near to the development site.
126. The shared use path adjacent the Wessex Way leading to the junction with Princess Road requires improvement. A contribution towards either a contraflow cycleway or a No Entry exemption should be provided. A financial contribution of £5,000 is to be secured to enable this, secured via an appropriate legal mechanism. Additional improvements have been identified at the Princess Road / Prince of Wales Road. The two sets of junctions are recognised as requiring treatment to reduce the vehicle dominance and facilitate easier movement for pedestrians. Furthermore, given the intensification of pedestrian movements towards Westbourne the provision of formal crossing locations is likely to be needed. Consequently, the provision of a new zebra crossing located in proximity to the junction of Princess Road and Prince of Wales Road, and the junction of Prince of Wales Road and Milburn Road is required. A contribution of £50,000 is to be secured to enable this, secured via an appropriate legal mechanism.
127. Throughout the pre-application process the applicant was advised to widening the footway to 2m. The development would benefit from the footway being widened and this should be provided across the frontage of the development through appropriate tree sensitive techniques. Alternatively, the footway could be widened by reducing the carriageway width. Full height kerbs should be reinstated along the entire site frontage (where vehicle crossovers or pedestrian/cycle accesses are not required) together with reinstatement of the adjacent footway. In addition, there is a street lighting column adjacent to 131 Princess Road that is located at the front of the footway. This should be relocated to the back of the footway to aid pedestrian movement. Such works are provided by way of a Grampian condition.

Wessex Way widening

128. Saved policy (Policy 8.4) of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan 2002 relates to a scheme to widen the A338 Wessex Way between the former borough boundary and Cambridge Road roundabout. Following extensive negotiations with the LHA in the lead up to the pre-application discussions the extent of the proposed widening scheme has been revised and is shown as a blue dashed line on the submitted plans. A servicing margin was accounted for on the superseded plans as a dashed red line.

129. There are 11 parking spaces to the surface car park on the western side of the site which would be lost if the future highway scheme comes into effect. Two additional spaces may also be unusable in the buffer area adjacent to the amended boundary. The LHA consider that these 13 affected spaces should therefore be removed from the scheme at the current time. However, it is considered that this can satisfactorily be dealt with by condition (condition 16) to maintain the car parking spaces in Council ownership by not allocating to individual units or selling off these spaces

Overall

130. In summary the proposals are considered broadly acceptable by the Local Highway Authority following a number of amendments. The use of specific conditions will address other matters outstanding. The proposed development therefore accords with the aims of the relevant policies including CS16, CS18, and 8.4. There is a conflict with Policy 8.22 but this is weighed up in the overall planning balance. The required S106 contributions are summarised in the recommendation section of this report.

Refuse collection

131. The refuse arrangements have been changed significantly during the application process. The collection points are much closer to the public highway with more convenient ramping than previously suggested. The presentation points are not suitable for keeping bins other than for collection, so a caretaker will need to be employed to move bins to the collection points and return them to the property after collection. The Waste and Recycling Officer has assessed the proposals and considered that the application fails to meet the requirements of the Councils' waste collection guidance in some areas, but there is no objection subject to a detailed refuse management plan identifying a private commercial collection service for the hostel element on the development along with caretaking to maintain the bin stores and to present and the return the bins from the residential block.

Energy/Sustainability

132. Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy require developments to be sustainable and to embrace the use of renewable/low carbon energy generations. The Applicant has provided an energy and sustainability statement stating that the development construction will exceed Building Regulation requirements.
133. The Energy Statement states that PV Panels will be used on roof areas of all blocks to provide energy to the development. Heating will be via a communal heating network. It is regrettable that this will partly rely on gas-fired boilers, but some other more sustainable options have been explored and discounted on this particular site. A condition will be required to demonstrate the final design of sustainable energy use to meet the requirements of policy CS2 (condition 21)

Ecology

134. A comprehensive ecological appraisal and protected species assessment have been provided as part of the application. Bat surveys were completed before the original buildings on the site were demolished and no evidence of bats were found in these buildings, which have since been demolished. The report concludes that no endangered species were found present on two separate site surveys, no old or in-use birds' nests were found, and no other rare plant species discovered, with the main ecological features of interest being the mature trees.

135. Landscaping proposals include replacement tree and vegetation planting and swale planting areas, but do not completely replace the amount of vegetation cover previously seen on the site. Applications are required to provide a net gain to biodiversity where possible. In that respect the ecological appraisal makes a number of recommendations to be included within a condition of consent (condition 13). The level of mitigation is considered satisfactory by Natural England and the proposal would therefore accord with the relevant provisions of the NPPF in this respect.

Drainage/flooding

136. The site does not lie in an area that is noted to be of particular risk of surface water flooding. Nevertheless, the principles of Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy aim to ensure that development deals with surface water sustainably on site. In this case a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report has been provided, which provides a robust SUDs system comprised of a network of swales to the front and rear of the building. The report states that the proposed system will form a betterment on the site and reduce discharge to the surface water sewer. The final design will be provided by condition (condition 6).

Affordable housing

137. All applications proposing residential development of 10 units or more (net) will be subject to the Council's adopted affordable housing policy. The affordable housing DPD sets out an approach to achieving contributions towards the delivery of affordable housing in the borough. Policy AH1 contained within DPD requires all residential development to contribute towards meeting the Borough target of 40% affordable housing. When considering residential development the Council will seek a 40% contribution except where it is proven to not be financially viable. The DPD was revised in November 2011 and sets out in greater detail how the DPD will be implemented.
138. In this instance, the development is a Council proposal which is designed to provide a significant amount of affordable housing (82 units, or just under 70%). Blocks A, B and C will provide affordable housing for rent, while Block D will provide accommodation for the private rented sector (PRS) to provide a mix of tenures and allow a viable scheme. The policy only requires 40% which can be secured by condition.
139. Affordable housing provision forms a significant public benefit of the scheme. For example, an upcoming Cabinet report states that "*Levels of unmet housing demand in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole (BCP) are very high, with housing demand exceeding supply. Providing more housing is a key priority of the council... There is a need for additional homes across all tenures and in particular, the demand for 'affordable housing' at sub-market rates is very high. There are circa 4,300 households on the Housing Register for the Bournemouth area, circa 950 in Poole area and circa 400 in the Christchurch area waiting for 'affordable housing' in the form of either Council Housing or Housing Association properties*".
140. The above headline figures demonstrate a shortage and therefore increasing need/demand for Affordable Housing in Bournemouth, and this scheme will therefore contribute towards meeting this specific housing tenure shortage. This will be secured by a condition (condition 28), as set out below.

Heathland Mitigation

141. The site is within 5km of a designated Dorset Heathlands SPA (Special Protection Area) and Ramsar Site, and part of the Dorset Heaths candidate SAC (Special Area of Conservation) which covers the whole of Bournemouth. As such, the determination of any application for an additional dwelling(s) resulting in increased population and domestic animals should be undertaken with regard to the requirements of the Habitat Regulations 1994. It is considered that an appropriate assessment could not clearly demonstrate that there would not be an adverse effect on the integrity of the sites, particularly its effect upon bird and reptile habitats within the SSSI.
142. Following a European Court ruling relating to the need or otherwise for appropriate assessments, Natural England require an appropriate assessment to be undertaken for all new residential schemes proposing a net gain of units. As such following advice from ecological consultants and Natural England a standard Appropriate Assessment proforma has been developed. The proforma concludes that in order to mitigate the likely impacts of the additional residential units provided by major development schemes such as this one where there are greater than 50 units provided, a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) will be required as well as the required financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures towards the designated sites. As such it is proposed that should the application be granted, suitably worded conditions are applied requiring the provision of a SANG be approved prior to commencement of the development, and provided prior to occupation of the residential units. It is stressed that such an approach is now required for all residential schemes of a certain scale and a strategic SANG will be required to accommodate the associated impacts. The Parks Section have confirmed that it is their intention to provide the required SANG at Hicks Farm in the Stour Valley which is a key area identified in the adopted Heathlands SPD and Local Plan to provide for improved access. A condition has been added to secure the required SANG mitigation (condition 29) either in the form of Hicks Farm or an alternative suitable site.
143. A capital contribution is required for the SAMM element and in this instance is £32,011, plus a £1,000 administration fee. A signed legal agreement has been drafted to provide this contribution.

The Equalities Act 2010

144. The public sector Equality Duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act requires "*public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different groups*". The Council uphold these values very strongly and apply them in consideration of such matters.
145. The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered and may be balanced against other relevant factors. It is considered that the Council has had due regard to the PSED in the determination of this application.
146. In consideration of a planning application an impact assessment has been undertaken. It is not considered that the proposed development on this vacant site would impact or discriminate upon any persons in protected groups. The removal of the public car park has been considered, but will have a limited impact as it is not a car park open to the general public and permit holders will be able to use other car parks in the area, in particular Milburn Road which is 150-220m to the east of the site. The proposed

development itself is designed to be accessible, with lifts and ramps, and easy access to car parking.

Community Infrastructure Levy

147. The application would be liable for a CIL charge.

Summary

148. It is considered that:

- The proposed development would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the area
- The proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the Westbourne Conservation Area, and this small level of harm is balanced by the public benefits of the proposals
- The proposed development would be harmful to the level of tree provision on site
- The proposal would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents
- Living conditions for future occupants would be acceptable overall
- There are no parking, traffic, or highway safety implications of the proposal
- Other considerations such as drainage, ecology, affordable housing and heathland mitigation do not present any issues.

Planning Balance

149. In terms of the overall planning balance, it is recognised that there are some impacts in terms of the change to the character of this part of Westbourne on the boundary with the conservation area, from the scale and density of the proposed development, harm from the loss of a number of protected trees, some minor amenity concerns for future occupants, and a lack of replacement public parking provision, which conflicts with Policy 8.22.
150. In terms of the benefits, it is considered that the proposal provides residential development in a highly sustainable location, and the 119 flats will contribute significantly towards local housing supply. Furthermore, the contribution towards affordable housing provision (82 units) is significant with few sites available in the built-up area for such a significant provision.
151. It has been demonstrated that the design of the buildings has been carefully considered, and it is concluded that the impact on the character and appearance of the area would not be materially harmful overall. There are also significant benefits in terms of making use of a vacant and otherwise difficult to develop site, improving the activity, vitality, and viability of the Westbourne commercial area, making contributions towards highway improvement schemes, and improved safety and security in the area. There will still be a number of existing trees retained and a positive landscaping scheme proposed to soften the appearance of the large buildings.
152. Highway and parking matters have been assessed in detail in respect of the relevant policies including the recently adopted Parking Standards SPD, and are considered acceptable overall with some planning gain in terms of highway and public realm improvements.

153. The Council is not currently in a position to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply in the Bournemouth area. This means that Paragraph 11 of the NPPF applies. This confirms that permission should be granted unless applying the guidance in the Framework provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. In this regard, in consideration of the 'tilted balance' of NPPF Paragraph 11(d), the proposed adverse effects of granting permission are not, on balance, considered to 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits of the significant contribution to affordable housing supply.
154. Therefore, having considered the appropriate development plan policy and other material considerations, including the NPPF, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the development would generally be in accordance with the Development Plan when read as a whole, 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

155. **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 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) with the following terms:**

UU terms

- Heathland Mitigation measures (SAMM): £32,011 (plus £1,000 administration fee)
- Contribution to car club spaces to be delivered in the vicinity of Princess Road: £56,160
- Contribution of £50,000 towards the provision of a new zebra crossing located in proximity to the junction of Princess Road and Princes of Wales Road, and the junction of Prince of Wales Road and Milburn Road.
- Contribution of £5,000 towards a contraflow cycleway for the shared use path to Princess Road adjacent the Wessex Way.
- Dedication by the Owner of the private land shown in pink on drawing number (to be supplied), immediately upon Commencement of Development as publicly maintained highway.

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:

3711-PEN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0001-S4-P3
3711-PEN-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0002-S4-P3
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-0003-S4 P11
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1000-S4 P8
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1001-S4 P8
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1002-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1003-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1004-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1005-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1006-S4 P7

3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1007-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1008-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1009-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1010-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1011-S4 P7
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2000-S4 P5
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2002-S4 P5
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2003-S4 P5
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2004-S4 P5
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2006-S4 P3
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2020-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2021-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2022-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2023-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2024-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2025-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2026-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2027-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2028-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2050-S4 P5
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2051-S4 P5
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2052-S4 P5
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2054-S4 P2
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2055-S4 P2
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-2056-S4 P2
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-6100-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-6101-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-6102-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-6103-S4 P1
3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-6104-S4 P1
180901-BSC-V1-ZZ-SK-ME-017-P02
RF-086-001 Rev. J

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

2. Phasing of development to be agreed

No development shall take place until a scheme for the phasing of the development to be carried out in successive stages, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing scheme, and each stage shall be substantially completed before the next stage of the development is commenced unless previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall ensure that no site clearance is undertaken unless it can be demonstrated that it is essential to allow the detailed construction to progress and that adequate site screening and hoardings are in place.

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

3. On site working hours limited when implementing permission

All on-site working, including demolition and deliveries to and from the site, associated with the implementation of this planning permission shall only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday - Friday, 0800 and 1300 Saturday and not at all on

Sunday, Public and Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of occupiers of adjoining and nearby properties and in accordance with Policies CS14 and CS38 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

4. Construction management plan

No site clearance or development shall commence until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Method Statement should include the following measures:

- a) parking arrangements for operatives and construction vehicles working on-site;
- b) arrangements for safe access to the site for deliveries, loading and unloading of plant and materials and wheel cleansing of vehicles prior to egress from the site onto the public highway;
- c) noise reduction measures (including times of piling operations);
- d) details and siting of equipment, machinery and surplus materials on the site;
- e) development timetable including any road or car park closure times or necessary periods of longer working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the construction phase of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of occupiers of adjoining and nearby properties and in the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS38, CS41 and CS14 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

5. Off site highway works

Before the development hereby approved is first occupied or utilised the following works must have been constructed to the specification of the Local Planning Authority:

1. Reinstatement of full height kerbs along Princess Road immediate adjacent the site frontage.
2. The widening and resurfacing of the footway on Princess Road to 2m. Alterations to highway drainage as necessary; and alterations to road marking and road signage as necessary.
3. Relocation of the street lighting adjacent 131 Princess Road to the rear of the footway.

Reason: These specified works are seen as a pre-requisite for allowing the development to proceed, providing the necessary highway infrastructure improvements to mitigate the likely impact of the proposal.

6. SUDs

No development shall take place until a scheme for the whole site providing for the disposal of surface water run-off and incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), has been 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 in accordance with the phasing strategy. The scheme shall include the following as appropriate:

- 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 sections, to illustrate the construction method and materials to be used for the hard surfacing (sample materials and literature demonstrating permeability may be required);
- d) Implementation of alternative sustainable drainage initiatives.

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.

7. Contaminated Land

No development shall take place until a remediation scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation scheme shall include:

- a) A 'desk study' report documenting the site history;
- b) A site investigation report documenting the ground conditions of the site and incorporating a 'conceptual model' of all potential pollutant linkages, detailing the identified sources, pathways and receptors and basis of risk assessment;
- c) A detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be taken to avoid risk from contaminants/or gases when the site is developed (if appropriate);
- d) A detailed phasing scheme for the development and remedial works.

The approved remediation scheme shall be fully implemented before the development hereby permitted is first occupied. Any variation of the scheme shall be agreed in writing by the LPA in advance of works being undertaken.

On completion of the works the applicant or their successors in title shall provide written confirmation to the LPA that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out safely in the public interest and in accordance with best practice and with Policy 3.20 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (February 2002).

8. Samples of materials

Prior to the commencement of any superstructure works on site, details and samples of the materials to be used in the development; including the bricks, cladding, balcony finishes, glazing, window/doors, window reveal detail, louvres/grilles, cycle store materials and the detailed design of these components and any other materials or architectural detailing to be used in the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To maintain the character and appearance of the building and 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).

9. Scheme for external pipework

Prior to the commencement of any superstructure works on site, a scheme for external pipe work and flues shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme

and unless shown on the approved elevation drawings any pipe work (with the exception of rainwater down-pipes) shall be internal to the buildings.

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).

10. Tree Protection

The tree protection measures as detailed in the arboricultural method statement dated 24 March 2021 (Revision D and associated plan Revision E 30-03-2021) prepared by Scott Tree Services Ltd 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).

11. Hard Landscaping

Within six months of the date of commencement of the development, or such other time period as might otherwise be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, full details of hard landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Hard landscape details shall follow the design principles set out in the approved drawings and shall include:

- a) Lighting;
- b) Bollards;
- c) Seating;
- d) Tree grills;
- e) Other street furniture;
- f) construction and services details in proximity to trees;
- g) proposed finished levels and contours;
- h) boundary treatments, including details of the acoustic fencing (to be painted/coloured green on the northern boundary)
- i) surfacing materials; and
- j) a timetable for implementation.

The approved hard landscape scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development commencing and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development includes a properly designed scheme of landscaping 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).

12. Soft Landscaping

Within six months of the date of commencement of the development, or such other time period as might otherwise be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, full details of soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Soft landscaping details shall follow the design principles set out in the approved drawings and shall include:

- a) Planting plans;
- b) Existing trees, hedges and shrubs to be retained;
- c) Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
- d) Schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities;

- e) Hedge planting to the front boundary of the site where possible;
- f) Screen planting to the northern side of the 3m acoustic fence adjacent to the Wessex Way as shown on the approved plan;
- g) Programme of implementation; and
- h) Maintenance plan for a minimum period of 5 years.

The approved soft landscape scheme shall be implemented in full, including all tree planting, within the first planting season after the first date of occupation/use of the development commencing and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development includes a properly designed scheme of landscaping 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).

13. Biodiversity enhancements

Within six months of the commencement of the development, details of the biodiversity enhancements outlined in section 11.6 of the approved Ecological Appraisal report including the number and location of the various enhancements to be built into the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in full prior to the occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: To mitigate for the loss of trees and biodiversity habitat on the site, in accordance with policies CS35 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012).

14. Travel Plan

Within 6 months of occupation of the development a detailed Travel Plan shall be prepared in accordance with current best practice and guidance and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Local Highway Authority. The approved Travel Plan and obligations therein shall be implemented and complied with upon occupation of the development, and the Travel Plan shall be retained thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and promoting sustainable modes of transport, in accordance with Policy CS15 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

15. Cycle Store

Before the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, the 24 visitor cycle parking spaces and cycle stores for 255 cycles, which must include 1200mm (min) wide access doors, and step free access to the public highway, shall be erected as shown on the approved plans and thereafter be retained, maintained and kept available for the occupants and visitors of 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) and BCP Parking Standards SPD (January 2021).

16. Unallocated Parking:

All residential car parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall be made available for any resident of the development and those persons visiting residents of the

development, shall remain unallocated to any specific resident or residence for the lifetime of the development, and shall not be sold off separately or individually.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and quality design in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012), and Policy 8.4 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002).

17. Dropped kerb expunged

Before the development is occupied or utilised the existing highway vehicular crossing(s) must be expunged and reinstated to a specification which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate reinstatement of the adjacent highway in the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS41 and CS14 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

18. EV charging

Within 3 months of the commencement of the development details of the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Those details shall be in accordance with the BCP Council Parking Standards SPD (adopted 5th January 2021). The approved details shall be implemented and brought into operation prior to the occupation of any residential unit hereby approved or any commercial use hereby approved commencing. Thereafter the Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be permanently retained available for use at all times.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable development including sustainable forms of transport in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

19. Service & Deliveries Management Plan

Prior to commencement of development a detailed Service and Deliveries Management Plan shall be prepared and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Service and Deliveries Management Plan shall be implemented and complied with by the Applicant, or its successor, upon occupation of the development and the Service and Deliveries Management Plan shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy 8.14 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (February 2002).

20. Refuse Management Plan:

Prior to occupation of the development, a Refuse Management Plan (RMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The RMP shall include:

- a) details of the management company to be set up;
- b) details of the caretaking provision to ensure that bins are wheeled to the collection points on collection day, or the employment of a private contractor to collect the refuse; and
- c) that bins will not be stored in the open or at the collection points apart from on the day of collection.

The RMP shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and complied with at all times thereafter.

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

21. Sustainable energy

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the sustainability and energy measures set out in the Energy & Sustainability Statement prepared by BSC dated 24/09/2019 (ref. 180901-BSC-00-XX-RP-ME-0001) prior to the occupation of the development and retained and maintained thereafter. Within six months of first occupation of the development, written confirmation that the implemented measures set out in the Energy Statement achieve the minimum standards of Policy CS2, and/or details of any additional measures required, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any additional measures shall be implemented within a further period to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging the provision of sustainable homes, premises and the provision of renewable and low carbon energy sources and infrastructure in accordance with the aims of Policies CS2 & CS3 of the Core Strategy (2012).

22. Noise specifications

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the development has been completed in accordance with the recommendations of Sustainable Acoustics Noise Impact Assessment: 18-0135-0 R01 Dated: 22 January 2021, including the recommended glazing types and ventilation specifications for habitable rooms described in Section 5.4, including Tables 2 and 3

Following completion of construction and prior to occupation of any of the residential units of the development hereby permitted, a noise assessment shall be carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The noise assessment, together with any additional mitigation measures shall demonstrate that the noise criteria for the various noise sources outlined in Section 5.1 of the report: "Recommended Criteria for internal noise levels" are met to all areas of the development..

Reason: The implementation of the development without meeting the above specifications is likely to result in an unacceptable scheme which would be detrimental to the amenities of residents occupying the proposed properties.

23. Drainage hard surfaced areas

Any new or replacement hard surfaced area(s) shall either be made of porous materials, or provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the property.

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.

24. No additional louvres or grills

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or

without modification), there shall be no louvres, grills or canopies installed to windows or the façade of the buildings except as shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To maintain the character and appearance of the building and 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).

25. Security gate to car park

A secure gate operated system shall be implemented at the access to the basement car park beneath the residential block A prior to the occupation of development, in accordance with design details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The secure gate shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of security and safety and in particular to provide secure cycle storage in accordance with Policy 8.37 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan

26. Emergency accommodation management plan

The emergency accommodation facility on the ground and first floors of Blocks B and C as shown on plans 3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1001-S4 P8 and 3711-PEN-ZZ-B1-DR-A-1002-S4 P7 shall be operated in accordance with the approved management plan at all times that the use is in operation.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties and in accordance with Policies CS38 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

27. Provision of CCTV

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of CCTV recording equipment to be provided at the premises, including the locations and coverage, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved equipment shall be installed prior to the use or occupation commencing and shall be retained, maintained and used thereafter.

Reason: To help monitor and prevent nuisance and in accordance with Policies CS5 and CS38 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

28. Affordable housing

At least 40% of the approved units on the site shall be provided as affordable housing. The development shall not be occupied until a scheme for the provision of the affordable housing has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex 2 of the NPPF or any future guidance that replaces it and shall be retained as such thereafter. The scheme shall include:

- i. The numbers, type, tenure and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made
- ii. The timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing;
- iii. The arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider or the management of the affordable housing (if no RSL is involved);
- iv. The arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and

iv. The occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.

Reason: In order to deliver mixed, balanced and sustainable communities in meeting the lack of affordable housing provision in the borough and in accordance with the adopted Affordable Housing Development Plan Document (2009).

29. Provision of a SANG

No part of the development hereby approved shall be commenced until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme. The Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme shall only be acceptable if it in particular includes the following:

- (i) Details of all mitigation measures including a timetable for delivery proposed for the purposes of preventing the development hereby permitted from adversely affecting the integrity of any European Site alone or in combination;
- (ii) Evidence sufficient to clearly demonstrate to a level where no reasonable scientific doubt remains as at the time of approval of the Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme that as a result of the proposed mitigation measures the development hereby permitted will not adversely affect the integrity of any European Site;
- (iii) to such extent as the mitigation measures seek to rely in whole or part upon the proposed SANG at Hicks Farm (“the Hicks Farm SANG”), then provisions that no part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied until:
 - a. the Hicks Farm SANG has been granted planning permission for a change of use to a SANG;
 - b. that the public at large have been given general access to the Hicks Farm SANG; and
 - c. arrangements are in place to secure that the Hicks Farm SANG (or any SANG that may at any time replace it) will be maintained and managed as a SANG for the lifetime of the development hereby permitted;
- (iv) in the event of any proposed mitigation measures including the provision of a SANG [other than the Hicks Farm SANG] then provisions that no part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied until:
 - a. the SANG meets all the requirements of the most up-to-date version of the Site Quality Checklist currently set out in Appendix D of The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 and any associated guidance;
 - b. the SANG is available and freely accessible for use by all the residents of the development hereby permitted; and
 - c. arrangements are in place to secure the maintenance and management of the SANG as a SANG for the lifetime of the development hereby permitted; and
- (v) arrangements to ensure:
 - a. consultation with Natural England on all aspects of the proposed mitigation measures prior to any approval of the Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme; and
 - b. in the event of any concerns being raised by Natural England regarding any part of the proposed mitigation measures that these are brought to the express attention of the Local Planning Authority prior to any approval of the Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme.

No part of the residential element of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme has been implemented in accordance with its requirements and the Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme shall thereafter at all times be complied with in accordance within its requirements.

Reason: In order to mitigate the impacts of the development on the Dorset Heathlands international designations in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

30. INFORMATIVE NOTE: Heathland Clarification

For the purposes of the condition relating to the Protected Habitats Mitigation Scheme, reference to “European Site” has the same meaning as the term as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 or any regulations replacing those regulations with or without modification, reference to a “SANG” means a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace further details on which are set out in the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD and reference to Natural England includes any other government department or body that takes on the current responsibilities of Natural England in relation to the protection of habitats in England.”

31. INFORMATIVE NOTE: Grampian

The highway improvement(s) referred to in the recommended condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Local Planning Authority.

32. INFORMATIVE NOTE: Re-siting of a lamp column

The construction of the vehicle access involves the re-siting of a lamp column on the public highway. The applicant must contact the street lighting team to initiate the procedure. Guidance/information is available within the Highway section of the Council’s website (www.bpcouncil.gov.uk).

Statement required by National Planning Policy Framework

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

In this instance:

the applicant was provided with pre-application advice,
the applicant/agent was updated of any issues after the initial site visit,
the applicant was provided the opportunity to submit amendments to the scheme/ address issues.
the application was recommended for approval to the planning committee.

Background Documents:

Case File – ref 7-2020-14899-E

NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.

Background Documents