



Planning Committee

| | |
|---|---|
| Application Address | Craven Court, 8-10 Knyveton Road, Bournemouth, BH1 3QN. |
| Proposal | Demolish existing building and erection of a 3/4 storey block of 24 flats with parking, bin and cycle storage - Regulation 3. |
| Application Number | 7-2020-1707-D |
| Applicant | BCP Council |
| Agent | Anders Roberts & Assoc |
| Date Application Valid | 27 August 2020 |
| Decision Due Date | 25 November 2020 |
| Extension of Time date (if applicable) | 29 April 2021 |
| Ward | East Cliff & Springbourne |
| 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 | Colin Tebb |

Description of Development

1. Planning Consent is sought to demolish the existing building and erect a 4/5 storey block of 24 flats with parking, bin and cycle storage. The application is a Regulation 3 application and therefore has been submitted on behalf of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council Housing Development department, hence coming before Members. The scheme seeks 100% Affordable Housing, replacing the existing care Home on the site.
2. It should be noted that amended plans have been submitted following negotiations and a meeting with Officers during the course of the application, including a re-design of the façade and a reduction in the level of car parking provision, (largely due to its location close to the Town Centre and the newly adopted Car parking SPD), which in turn has allowed the introduction of additional landscaping, plus a new boundary wall and railing to the Knyveton Road frontage. These changes were subsequently re-advertised by Blue site notices.

3. The site also falls within the East Cliff Conservation Area, and being a Regulation 3 (Councils own application on its own land – property) Historic England were consulted, as discussed below. The applicant has provided the following information:

- Design and Access Statement (Amended)
- Heritage Statement (Amended)
- Building Condition report
- Fire Risk Assessment
- Arborists Statement
- Ecology Statement
- Appeal Decisions

| | Existing | Proposed |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Site Area | 0.14ha | 0.14ha |
| Use of building | Care Home | 100% Affordable Housing |

Key Issues

4. The main considerations involved with this application are:

- Impact on character and appearance of the East Cliff Conservation Area, in terms of demolition and substantial or less than substantial harm
- Living conditions for Residents
- Trees
- Highway safety
- Refuse and recycling
- Ecological and sustainability issues
- Affordable Housing

5. These points will be discussed as well as other material considerations in paragraphs 30 to 79 below.

Planning Policies

6. Core Strategy (2012)

- CS1: NPPF – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CS5: Promoting a Healthy Community
- CS6: Delivering Sustainable Communities
- CS12: Retaining Community Uses
- CS18: Increasing Opportunities for Cycling and Walking
- CS31: Recreation, Play and Sports
- CS35: Nature and Geological Conservation Interests
- CS38: Minimising Pollution
- CS39: Designated Heritage Assets
- CS41: Quality Design

7. District Wide Local Plan (2002)

- 4.25: Landscaping

- 6.10: Flats development
- 7.10: Sport and Recreation

8. **Supplementary Planning Documents:**

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) - PGN
East Cliff Conservation Area Appraisal (draft)
Conservation Area Management Plan (2015)
Dorset Heathland Planning Framework SPD 2020
BCP Parking Standards SPD (2021)
Affordable Housing DPD and SPD
Residential Development: A Design Guide PGN (2008)

The National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

9. 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.
10. 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 applies to this proposal. The site is located within a conservation area outlined in footnote 6 to Paragraph 11 (of the NPPF), so if there is sufficient harm identified to the conservation area then in terms of the 'tilted balance' the harm caused by any proposal must be sufficient to provide a clear reason for refusal, as considered and discussed below.
11. Paragraph 192 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
12. Paragraph 193 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.

13. Paragraph 194 states any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
14. Paragraph 195 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.
15. Paragraph 196 further states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Paragraph 197 then states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals:

16. There are no relevant historic applications on this site.

Representations

17. 2 site notices were erected initially for the statutory period in September 2020, then blue Site notices were also erected, following the receipt of amended plans, erected on 23rd February 2021, with a consultation expiry date of 5th April 2021.
18. 1 public comment was received stating:

“The new allocation is far too high. No more than the current 3 storeys and no more than 11 flats.”

19. A response was also received from the Bournemouth Civic Society, commenting in respect of the original drawings:

“This is an application to construct a very modernist four storey block of 24 flats for elderly people by BCP Council on the site of a nineteenth century detached residence that was part of the original layout of the East Cliff Meyrick Estate. The present building has been a hotel and latterly a home for elderly residents; it is within the East Cliff Conservation Area.

Although the present architectural value of the building has been considerably compromised by numerous alterations and extensions made to it over the years and the Society fully accepts that old people deserve to be housed in the best conditions possible; nevertheless, in view of the existing architectural significance of Knyveton Road, we question the need for such a particular design and whether or not the existing building could not be radically renovated and extensively rebuilt for its continuing purpose.

What is proposed is a rectangular block in which a brick/concrete frame forming the lower three floors, embraces a generally symmetrical fenestration scheme consisting of large, vertical, rectangular, double and quadruple windows.

Above is the recessed penthouse storey which displays an asymmetrical window pattern and an abstractly angled roof design above. The Society does not deny that in absolute terms, the proposed design has merit. Our point is that because the general proportions of what is proposed are so relatively near to a more traditional design, what is the point of not following such a course – especially in the more established architectural context of Knyveton Road? We feel that balanced formulations that walk a tightrope between modern needs and good aesthetic principals, certainly are achievable.

Consequently, since this application does not fulfil the conservation policies of the Bournemouth Local Plan, it should be deferred for further discussion.”

Consultations

20. Policy Comments:

“The site is in a sustainable location and falls in 400m of a key transport route, as shown in Diagram 3 of the Core strategy. The criteria for residential development is set out in Policy CS21. This includes an expectation that development will reflect the housing size demands of the Borough as identified in the SHMA. The proposal is for 10 x 1 bed and 14 x 2 bed social or affordable rent. If this is a 100% affordable flats scheme this would be a great benefit in assisting in meeting affordable housing need, for which there is an acute need for in Bournemouth. The SHMA 2015 Bournemouth Report identifies a particular need for 1 bed affordable units, as well as 2 bed.”

21. Conservation Officer: concerns raised to original and amended plans, and provided the following comments/concerns:

- *The demolition of this period building reflective of the positive buildings of the conservation area is harmful.*
- *Even if the building were to be accepted as neutral, it's loss would still be at the upper end of less than substantial harm.*
- *Loss has not been sufficiently justified in terms of why the building cannot be re-used*
- *Amount of hard standing at the front and not enough soft landscaping*
- *Increased articulation is welcomed through the bays but it increases the footprint slightly*
- *Buff brick positive but the cladding is not characteristic of the area*
- *Not enough reference to local area/historic character*
- *Proposal is not exemplary modern design under the NPPF definition*
- *The presented scheme does not adequately take into account section 16 of the NPPF, including the need to minimise harm and ensure work is justified. The NPPF places great weight on the conservation of heritage assets;*
- *Any benefit of an increased level of accommodation/affordable accommodation would not outweigh the harm to the significance of the heritage asset.*

22. Historic England were notified in respect of the amended plans, as the development involves a Local Authority own property – building and proposed demolition of a building within a Conservation Area, (Regulation 3 application) and their advice was:

- *“Despite significant extension and alteration, Craven Court makes a modest but positive contribution to the character and appearance of the East Cliff Conservation Area.*

- *The conservation area's character and appearance is derived from its large Victorian villas set in generous landscaped gardens, and Craven Court typifies that character. The proposed replacement building offers little acknowledgement of its historic context. Its anodyne, anywhere, architecture would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, conflicting with the statutory requirements of the 1990 Town Planning Act.*
- *It may be that the demolition of Craven Court could be justified if the proposed replacement building were of an appropriate quality and design. But in our view, the proposals fails to respond to local character and distinctiveness. This is a council-owned site and a council-promoted application. We encourage BCP Council to apply best practice, and either promote the retention and restoration of the existing building, or secure a replacement building sympathetic to the historic context.*
- *Recommendation Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas."*

23. Urban Design Officer: has no objection to the original or amended drawings:

- *I welcome the proposed affordable housing and contemporary design.*
- *As mentioned at pre-app Stage I do not find the existing building to be of particular architectural merit as it has lost most of its original detailing and has an unattractive, heavy mansard roof.*
- *The proposed height seems reasonable. However, the roof storey should be significantly set in from the floors below on all sides and as currently proposed this is not the case. I am also not convinced by the irregular form of the top floor which bears no relation to the character of the area and looks odd to me. A simple, well recessed and detailed flat roof would be better in my view.*
- *I welcome the inclusion of recessed balconies which add depth to the elevations as well as providing direct access to outdoor amenity space for residents. However, it is unfortunate that some of the flats would not have balconies, especially in light of recent and potential future lockdown restrictions.*
- *I am generally comfortable with the contemporary design and feel that the use of buff brick, large windows and recessed balconies would work well in the conservation area. • However, in my view the cladding on the top floor looks poor quality and unrelated to the character of the area;*
- *Car parking dominates the site – there should be a much better balance between hard and soft space. Is there scope for a lower level of parking provision?*

24. It should be noted that, in the light of the comments and concerns from your Conservation Officers, a meeting was held with the Applicants, resulting in a number of important changes, received on 4th February 2021. These amendments were re-advertised by Blue site notices, and the main changes included:

- The reduction in car parking from 1:1, (18 spaces), reduced down to 9, in the light of the recently adopted Parking SPD, but including 2 disabled persons bays and 2 Electric charging bays;
- The roof amended to show PV system installed on top of the roof;

- Amended design to the façade of the proposed building, including improved articulation- to create more of a vertical emphasis to the building, with projecting bays and recessed balconies, recessed entrance lobby;
- Improved soft landscaping to the site frontage, to break up the existing and proposed parking area, along with hedging to the site frontage, and in front of the building, to ensure vehicles cannot park right in front of the ground floor flats;
- A new front wall, piers and railings;
- A new footpath along the eastern boundary, with hedge separating it from the car parking area.

25. It was these amended plans which were re-advertised by Blue Site Notices, and both Urban Design and Heritage, reconsulted and Historic England were notified.

26. Tree Officer: No objection:

“These proposals should not cause any tree harm subject to compliance in full with the submitted arboricultural method statement and a condition will be required for this.”

27. Waste and Recycling Officer: no objection subject to conditions:

“If a suitable presentation point is created with a WMP detailing a caretaker/ presentation and return to store service or a WMP detailing private collection conditioned in a grant of planning permission.”

28. Highway Officer: discussions were held following receipt of amended plans, showing reduced parking, but also 2 x new electric car points and 2 x disabled spaces, and more recently the Highways officer has confirmed there are no objections subject to conditions.

Constraints

29. East Cliff Conservation Area and TPO on trees outside the site in the Highway verge, and with regards the ECCA draft Character Appraisal, Heritage have advised:

‘A draft Character Appraisal and Management Plan for the East Cliff Conservation Area was published by BBC in 2018, and the public consultation period closed in August 2018.’ To clarify, the status of the document is what is known in policy terms as ‘emerging’. It has not been adopted however it has been through public consultation and therefore carries some weight in the planning process.”

Planning Assessment

Site and Surroundings

30. The building known as Craven Court is situated on the northern side of Knyveton Road, just east of the Lansdowne Area and St. Swithun’s Road South, with St. Swithun’s Road South forming the western boundary of the East Cliff Conservation Area. Knyveton Road itself is broad avenue, with wide grass verges both sides and mature, and some TPO trees within this verge and more widely contains a range of buildings and uses, including professional service providers, flats and care homes, such as here at Craven Court.

31. Craven Court has been operated as a Care Home since 1977, with a caretaker's flat, and an open tarmac parking area to the front. To the sides and rear is a similar tarmac storage (rather than parking area), with bins storage, and small seating area. Along the rear boundary is a tall belt of mature evergreen trees.
32. The original Victorian villa has been altered by an unsightly Mansard roof, which wraps around the original frontage and the three storey bays. Craven Court previously operated as the Craven Court Hotel, but was converted to the current Care Home in 1977. Also to the rear, the original building was extended by two large flat roof wings, also 3 storeys high. The supporting Design and Access Statement provided with this application includes commentary upon the current 'need' – justification for the replacement building, and during the course of the application a detailed condition and costing report was provided (in confidence) into the condition of Craven Court, and why repair/restoration was not possible or viable.
33. Immediately to the west is an attractive pair of further Victorian Villas, which is used as a children's nursery, whilst to the east is the Elstead Hotel, which also appears as a more modern 'infill' development, also with a Mansard roof. There are then further traditional buildings both sides of Knyveton Road, and another more modern flatted development two doors down, away at The Pines, 16 Knyveton Road, as discussed below.

Key Issues

Impact on character and appearance of the Conservation Area

The Existing building, its contribution to the area and its demolition:

34. The application site falls within East Cliff Conservation Area (ECCA) and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out a general duty for the decision maker to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area (S72). The NPPF at Chapter 16 then provides guidance upon *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, including Designated Heritage Assets, which includes Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings*, although Craven Court itself is not listed.
35. As eluded to earlier by the BCP Heritage officer comments and Historic England advice, there is some debate regarding the question of Craven Court, its current contributions towards the character and appearance of the ECCA, and specifically whether or not the existing building has a "positive" "negative" or indeed "neutral" impact, and therefore its contribution towards the visual amenities of the ECCA. The second main issue then is the consideration of the quality of the building which replaces it.
36. Paragraphs 196, 197 and 201 of the NPPF respectively relate to the assessment of the potential impacts of a proposal on designated heritage assets, which in this case is the broader East Cliff Conservation Area:

"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including..."

"...the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement

will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”

“Loss of a building which makes a contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area...should be treated as substantial harm or less than substantial harm, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution towards the Conservation Area...as a whole.”

37. In this case it is the East Cliff Conservation Area that is the *Designated Heritage Asset*, and therefore the assessment of this proposal must be made in the light of this broader area, and whether the loss of the building would result in harm. If harm is identified this would need to be considered whether it would form “*substantial harm or less than substantial harm (to the Conservation Area)*).
38. The East Cliff Conservation Area was designated in 1987 and contains buildings of a varied range of ages, architectural styles, heights, with newer infill development too, which have replaced (demolished) other buildings within the ECCA. One such development is almost immediately to the east, The Pines, 16 Knyveton Road, which is a relatively modern infill flatted scheme, with similar landscaping to the front, railings, and both protruding and recessed balconies. The Elstead Hotel next door also has a modern 1960's style Mansard, with modern top hung metal windows.
39. In this case, the application site contains an original late Victorian era building. It was originally constructed as two semi-detached dwellings, before being converted to a hotel in the 1930s. A mansard roof was added at this time. In terms of positive aspects the building represents part of the original late-Victorian development of the East Cliff, forms one of a run of original villas on this site of Knyveton Road, and retains some elements of its original form in terms of the canted bay windows for example.
40. In terms of less positive elements, the existing building is not known to have any intrinsic historical links, other than being a hotel typical of the broader Bournemouth tourism offering, and has also been dramatically altered with an unsightly mansard which has considerably tainted its appearance and does diminish the original bays, plus two substantial flat roof rear additions. Original windows have been replaced with casement upvc windows, the building has been rendered over the original buff brickwork, and the frontage is mainly tarmac, used for parking. Therefore, in your Officers opinion, and whilst recognising both Heritage concerns and Historic England advice, the original architectural integrity has been compromised to a degree, particularly when comparing them to the original attractive Villas next door to the west, such that its description as being a ‘*positive contributor*’ within the emerging ECCA Character Appraisal is questionable.
41. Consideration has also been given to whether the building should have merit as a ‘non designated heritage asset’ within the conservation area, but overall it is not considered to be sufficiently original in form to merit such status, and is if limited overall historic importance in the area.
42. Furthermore, whilst viability of repair and upgrading to retain the building has not been forwarded as a formal justification for the loss of the building, the existing Buildings survey and associated costings to repair do appear substantial, and a valid material consideration. Within the Heritage comments there is concern that:

“This is a building needing investment; it has not been demonstrated it is structurally unsound or incapable of re-use. Without a compelling argument that a lessor option of conversion/extension is not possible, harm has not been minimised.”

43. In response to this specific point, two detailed supplementary (but confidential) reports have been provided, in terms of a detailed Buildings Survey, and Fire Risk Assessment which includes a detailed photographic survey of the interior showing some serious building (Electrical, water, etc) defects and alongside detailed costings for the requisite modification to the existing building, which concludes on the Fire Assessment aspect there is potential for :

“Extreme harm – Significant potential for serious injury or death of one or more occupants...” and also “Fire damage will extend throughout a significant part of the building involved, and viable repair of building will be unlikely.”

44. The Buildings Condition report runs alongside the Fire Risk Assessment and concludes there is also Asbestos within the building, Lift Shafts that essentially need replacing at significant cost, and other major defects, then the report concludes the cost to repair and restore the building, but with no end user guaranteed to take on the building, (particularly with much more modern purpose built offices available in the Lansdowne and the major recent shift to home working as a result of the Covid pandemic), the only ‘viable’ option stated by the applicant is to replace it.

Recent Appeal caselaw:

45. As part of their case, the Applicants have cited several recent appeal decisions across the wider BCP area, of which, one case at 2 Wilderton House, Poole in November 2020 (APP/18/01072/F) seems particularly pertinent with similar viability issues, and an Inspector concluding:

“The Council suggests that there could be other viable schemes or alternative uses that would allow the building to be retained. However, no such schemes have come forward and I have not been made aware of examples of any possible or probable alternative uses that might be viable, bearing in mind the predominantly residential context of the site that might also limit the types of alternative uses that would be appropriate. Whilst I acknowledge that the degree to which alternative schemes have been explored in this case is limited, I am conscious of the significant costs of repair of WH that has been highlighted by the appellant. This cost would only repair the building and make it safe for use as 9 flats. It does not, of course, include the cost of any alterations and development that might be needed to allow an alternative use.

Having regard to all of the above, whilst I acknowledge that sustaining and enhancing the significance of this heritage asset is the preferred outcome, the evidence before me suggests that, on balance, it is unlikely that this can be achieved in this particular case or that there would be a viable use of the building that is consistent with its conservation”.

46. On this basis, with such detailed reports into the current poor condition of the building and cost to completely restore and repair, then the Inspector also considered that it is indeed a relatively cost effective and compelling argument to demolish and in the case of Craven Court the loss of the building is concluded to have less than substantial harm upon the ECCA, overall providing that a replacement acceptable scheme is provided, which also provides considerable Public benefits.

The proposed replacement development

47. The proposed replacement building is a four storey block of a modern design. It would have three full storeys and a smaller set back top floor. In terms of height there are a mix of building heights in the street, from the smaller two storey original villas to taller post war blocks of flats up to six storeys or more. The proposed street scene drawing indicates that the building would be a similar height to the existing overall and would sit comfortably in the street scene in terms of height.
48. The main material will be a traditional buff brick to tie it to the historic character of the original Victorian villas next door, while the top floor would have a contrasting grey 'slate' clad appearance. Large areas of glazing including full height windows give a more overtly modern appearance.
49. As originally proposed, there were concerns about (A) the lack vertical emphasis to the front elevation, and (B) the retained expanse of hard landscaping to the site frontage and a potential missed opportunity here. In respect of point A, this has been amended during the application process to add some forward projecting bay elements to provide more articulation and depth to the elevation. It would also introduce more of a vertical emphasis, although overall the width of the building still has a relatively horizontal appearance. It is considered that subject to high quality materials as well as detailing such as deep window reveals, the proposed modern design would be of sufficiently high quality for the area.
50. In respect of point B, the existing frontage is entirely given over to an unbroken tarmac car park, with absolutely no relief in the form of landscaping to screen it from the Public domain, so its contribution towards the character and appearance of the existing conservation areas must be questionable. With this in mind, the amended scheme now considerably reduces the level of parking provision, in the light of the recent Parking Standards SPD (as discussed below) from 18 to 9 spaces, although they could have actually provided zero parking.
51. However, as amended, the scheme would introduce some important visual improvements from Knyveton Road, including the closure of one access and the introduction of entirely new soft landscaping across the entire frontage, with planting directly in front of the building, a separate footpath now for occupants and visitors, and importantly a completely new front boundary treatment, with low plinth, piers and railings.
52. Ultimately, in terms of (A) the scale, height and footprint of the replacement building would be similar, whilst (B) the site frontage would be enhanced and as such in your officers view making a positive contribution towards, and enhancement of the ECCA, particularly in the context of the broader range of existing buildings that make up the East Cliff Conservation Area.
53. Ultimately, the proposed building is a purpose-built structure with the applicant advising that the Affordable Housing scheme will meet the ever more onerous Building Regulations and DDA requirements, which cannot be 'retro-fitted' to the existing building, without substantial cost. Therefore, then in this case there are potentially the substantial Public benefits, with an entirely 100% Affordable Housing scheme, which is also strongly supported by Policy too:

“The proposal is for 10 x 1 bed and 14 x 2 bed social or affordable rent. If this is a 100% affordable flats scheme this would be a great benefit in assisting in meeting affordable housing need, for which there is an acute need for in Bournemouth.”

54. In this specific case, the Public benefits are that this scheme would provide 24 affordable units, in this sustainable location, adjacent to the Lansdowne area and a short walk from Bournemouth town centre itself, with main bus routes passing close to the site and Bournemouth Railway Station also a relatively short walk away, just to the north of the site.
55. This would also meet the broader NPPF long standing objectives of encouraging Councils to provide developments in sustainable locations, close to non – car modes of transport.
54. It is also acknowledged that the emerging ECCA Appraisal does accept replacement buildings, provided of an *“exemplary modern design”* and provided *“it is well detailed, using good quality materials and carefully responds to the historic setting.”* Following discussions with the applicants the design was amended as shown, to provide much more vertical emphasis and improved detailing too, to reflect the adjacent Victorian Villas, plus using a decent potential yellow stock brick too, which is a common material in the ECCA. So, in this specific case, a condition (No5) is recommended requiring a sample panel of brickwork to be constructed, to ensure the main brickwork is to a high standard and quality, and therefore to be inspected and agreed by Officers.
55. In summary, the concerns which have been raised, including from the Heritage officer and also the advice from Historic England regarding its utilitarian and ‘anodyne’ appearance are recognised, however we also note the Urban Design Officer also advises that the replacement contemporary design should be welcomed. These concerns would need to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme, and in this case, a significant – 100% Affordable Housing scheme is an important factor in making this positive recommendation, along with the physical improvements to the site frontage, which is clearly visible to the Public domain, with the introduction of new hard and soft landscaping, thereby reducing the current visible large expanse of car parking.
56. For these reasons, in this specific case, it is considered that there would be less than substantial harm to the broader East Cliff Conservation Area as a whole, and that any harm would be outweighed by the Public benefits accruing from this particular scheme, including the important physical improvements to the site frontage and a scheme which would deliver 100% Affordable Housing.
57. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF requires 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 it is considered that, having regard to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the proposed replacement building would be of sufficient merit to justify the loss of the original building on the site. The proposal would result in the loss of an original building, but as demonstrated this building does not contribute so strongly to the character of the conservation area that it would affect the overall asset (the conservation area) to a materially harmful degree. A small degree of harm has nevertheless been identified due to the loss of the building, which is considered as stated to be ‘less than substantial’. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF requires that where

there is less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

58. It is considered that there are sufficient public benefits to the proposal to offset the limited level of harm in this case. As such, the proposal would not therefore conflict with the relevant Paragraphs of the NPPF, or Policy CS39 and Policy CS40, and in the Officers' view would lead to less than substantial harm to the conservation area, whilst in this specific case, providing significant public benefits to outweigh that harm. In terms of Paragraph 11 of the NPPF this also means that the 'tilted balance' would remain relevant as the proposal would not "provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed" in terms of the impact on the heritage asset.

Living conditions for future occupants

59. With regards this aspect, then the units range from 50sq.m for 1 bed units to 93sq.m for 2 bed flats, which all meet or far exceed the Technical Housing Standards of 39sq.m and 61 to 70sq.m for 2bed, 4 person single storey dwellings. The outlook from all rooms would be acceptable, being served by reasonable sized windows to all aspects, so provided with adequate sunlight and daylighting, and the introduction of balconies to serve main habitable room will provide floor to ceiling height, full apertures, affording excellent light to the main habitable rooms.
60. In addition, the amendments secured to the car parking layout to the frontage and the introduction of low hedging – shrubs immediately to the front of the units will also create a natural break between car parking here and the ground floor forward facing flats, of benefit to the enjoyment of their habitable rooms here.

Trees

61. The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objections to these proposals subject to a condition requiring full compliance with the submitted arboricultural method statement albeit which would need to be updated to reflect the amended plans; the Tree Officer is happy for this to be conditioned. Conditions requiring a detailed soft landscaping scheme that includes tree planting and a condition for a soft landscape maintenance scheme are also requested. On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with policy 4.25.

Highways

62. The Local Highway Authority were re-consulted on the amended plan, and have now raised no objection advising:

"The BCP Council adopted the new Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 5 January 2021, which came into immediate effect. The SPD takes a new zonal approach to parking standards under which the site falls within Zone B.

For the proposal to satisfy Core Strategy Policy CS16, car parking provision including the layout and design should be in accordance with this Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted Jan 2021.

For flats in zone B the benchmark parking standards are outlined in the SPD Table 9 C3: Flats, there is a zero-car parking requirement for flats with 3 or less habitable

rooms, therefore no off-street parking is required to be provided, however the applicant is proposing 9 on-site car parking spaces which is acceptable.

The council requires applications for new development to provide EV charge points that comply with Table 1 to future-proof development ahead of the expected transition to electric vehicles. For flats, development with less than 10 spaces 20% of bays should be with active charge point provision and the remaining 80% of bays all with passive charge point provision.”

63. So, in this case, zero parking could have been provided, and as discussed following a recommendation by Officers, the parking was halved from 18 spaces to 9, enabling a considerable enhancement and improvement to the existing unsightly expanse of tarmac covering the entire frontage/forecourt of the building. This has enabled a vast improvement to the site frontage, with the frontage now broken up by new soft and hard landscaping, which in turn will be of broader benefit to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, 2 spaces are retained for EV charge points, when the necessary technology is in place, and also 2 spaces of an adequate width for disabled persons vehicles are shown too. A lower level of parking is also considered appropriate as discussed earlier, given the proximity to other Public transport and Bournemouth Town Centre.

Refuse and Recycling

64. The proposal meets the requirements of the Waste Collection Authority although a Waste Management Plan is required, and which can be conditioned if permission is granted.

Ecology and sustainability:

65. A detailed Ecological statement was provided, which found no evidence of protected species or their habitats, including bat roosts, amphibians, etc, and therefore in this case no requisite measures are required to protect them. However, the report does conclude:

“The proposed demolition and a future development provide an opportunity for a significantly net gain in biodiversity within the site, which meets the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF[7]). 7.1.1 The significant net gain can be achieved through the enhancements below that are appropriate for the site:-

- 1. Providing habitats for bees by placing bee bricks in some of the walls of new buildings/dwellings;*
- 2. Providing permanent nesting opportunities for birds by placing bird boxes in some of new buildings/dwellings ;*
- 3. Providing nesting opportunities for hedgehogs by placing hedgehog nest boxes in sheltered locations on site.”*

66. A condition (No15) is therefore recommended as part of the potential approval. With regards sustainability, the Applicants have agreed to provide Photovoltaic Panels on two large sections of the roof, and the supporting Design and Access Statement states:

“The building is anticipated to be heated by highly efficient district or centralised heating system. This in conjunction with the insulation will have the effect of significantly

reducing energy costs and reducing CO2 emissions. The buildings will be as air tight as possible to reduce potential heat loss and carbon dioxide emissions. Both internally and externally intelligent lighting will be used wherever possible. The internal and external lighting will be low energy and include new LED technology. This will be installed in the majority of the units and is expected to exceed the 30% requirement under current (Building) regulations.

With regards to white goods within the units it is very likely that the Fridge/Freezers will be A+ rated, the washing Machine will be A rated and the Tumble Dryer B rated under the EU Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme. Internal & External Water: fixed fittings will be used within the dwelling which will have the effect of reducing the water use in taps and showers.”

67. So, such matters are covered by Building Regulations legislation now, so will form part of a potential application for Building Regulations approval in due course. Finally, on this aspect, then 2 x Electric charging points are to be provided, in accordance with recent Government guidance on all new housing developments, to ‘future proof’ such emerging technology, to be incorporated into new housing developments such as this, and Condition 12 requires such installations here, and two such Electrical charging points are shown on the amended block plan.

Affordable Housing:

68. On the specific question of the ‘Public benefits’ of this particular scheme, the Applicants have provided an extract of a recent report, which is (at the time of writing this report) to be presented to the Housing Development Cabinet meeting on 14th April 2021:
- 1. “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.*
 - 2. The government has set out a new methodology for calculating Local Plan housing targets and as a result the BCP Council area will need to increase its housing delivery significantly to approximately 2,600 new homes to be built every year. This will need a step change from current delivery levels and is one of the key housing challenges locally, as well as nationally.*
 - 3. 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.*
 - 4. 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.*
 - 5. Therefore there is a significant demand for the provision of affordable housing in the Bournemouth Area and in BCP overall. The development of 24 affordable housing units will contribute towards decreasing the number of households on the housing register.”*
69. 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, and of a major ‘Public benefit’, which could be said outweighs the less than substantial harm to the ECCA discussed earlier. This will be secured by a condition (No2), as set out below.

Heathlands:

70. 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.
71. Therefore as of 17th January 2007 all applications received for additional residential accommodation within the borough is subject to a financial contribution towards mitigation measures towards the designated sites. Therefore, a capital contribution is required, which has been calculated on the basis of 18 existing flats, plus 24 proposed units, therefore a net gain of 6 units, plus the usual Administration fee.
72. This will be the subject of a Unilateral Undertaking in this case, as this is an application by BCP in respect of its own property, and which, at the time of this report, is nearing completion, ahead of signing and sealing in due course. The recommendation below reflects this.

Summary

73. In its amended form, the scheme would;
- Result in less than substantial harm to the East Cliff Conservation Area as a whole, bearing in mind the broad range of buildings within that area, of varying styles, ages, materials heights and so on;
 - Bearing in mind the alterations to Craven Court itself, both externally and internally, then the value and contribution that building makes towards the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is also questionable;
 - There would, in this specific case, be a significant Public Benefit to outweigh any harm to the Conservation Area, in terms of 100% Affordable Housing and an improvement to the appearance of the site, as described above.
 - The location of the development is a sustainable one, close to the Town Centre and Public transport.

Planning Balance

74. The 'balance' in this case is indeed a difficult one, with the loss of the building and its impact upon the significance of the wider Conservation Area, although the NPPF specifically advises that this should relate to the broader "Designated Heritage Asset" as a whole and not just Craven Court itself. In this case, the intrinsic historic and visual amenity value of the existing building (and consequently its contribution towards the character and appearance of the ECCA) has in my view been compromised, by the major alterations to the building, both front and rear, but particularly the mansard roof.
75. To reiterate, paragraphs 196, 197 and 201 of the NPPF states respectively that:

"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm...this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal..."

“In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”

“Loss of a building which makes a contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area...should be treated as substantial harm or less than substantial harm, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution towards the Conservation Area...as a whole.”

76. With this in mind, then it is considered less than substantial harm will occur to the broader ECCA, as a whole, and that the public benefits of a 100% Affordable Housing scheme (and the replacement building and the improvements to the appearance of the frontage of the site), which in turn would contribute towards meeting the housing shortfall in Bournemouth, would outweigh the loss of the existing building.
77. The description within the emerging ECCA Character Appraisal of Craven Court being a positive contributor is questionable, and may be better described as ‘neutral’, and therefore only limited weight can be given to this emerging document too.
78. Also, the various reports provided do also suggest the internal layout and cost to viably upgrade the building would be significant, which Inspectors have agreed recently on similar appeals in respect of developments elsewhere within the BCP area.
79. Therefore, having considered the appropriate development plan policies and other material considerations, including the NPPF, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the development would be in accordance with the Development Plan, would not materially harm the character or appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring and proposed occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The Development Plan Policies considered in reaching this decision are set out above.

Recommendation

80. **GRANT** planning permission with the following conditions, and subject to signing of a Unilateral Undertaking, 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:

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:

9083/200I (received 11th February 2021), 201H, 202F, 203C, (all received 4th February 2021), 204 and 205 (received 27th August 2020) and 206F (received 4th February 2021).

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

2. Affordable Housing Scheme

In this specific case 100% of the approved units on the site shall be provided as affordable housing. 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
- v. 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).

3. Access/Turning/Parking.

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, the access and areas for turning, and parking including the marking out of spaces, shown on the approved plans shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained and kept available for the residents and visitors of the development hereby permitted, at all times.

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

4. Closure & reinstatement of existing access:

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 vehicular [or pedestrian] access to or from the site other than that [those] proposed, [as shown on the approved plan]. All existing and previously existing access(es) to the site shall be closed, the footway [and verge] reinstated to the specification and satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of any part of the development.

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

5. Prior Approval of Materials, Components and Architectural Detailing:

Details/samples of the Rustic buff brick, slate effect cladding, grey window frames, reconstituted stone lintels, dark grey fibre cement cladding, and balustrades and any other materials to be used in the development as well as sections to show the depth of window reveals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any superstructure works on site. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To 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).

6. Sample Panel

A sample panel, measuring a minimum of one square metre, shall be built on site to show a representative sample of details and materials to be used in the proposed wall construction. The materials to be used shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installation.

In cases where the new work is to match in with the existing structure, the panel should be located in a position to allow direct comparison with the existing structure.

Reason: In order to safeguard the architectural and historic character of the building and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).5. On site working hours (inc demolition) restricted when implementing permission.

7. On site working hours (inc demolition) restricted 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 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. Monday - Friday, 8 a.m. and 1 p.m. 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).

8. Cycle stores for flats

Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved details of a secure, fully enclosed, brick-built and walk-in cycle store for at least 24 cycles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle store shall have a lockable door(s) and keys should be made available to all residents. It should also contain a sufficient number of Sheffield stands, spaced at 1000mm centres, and 550mm should be allowed between the store walls and the adjacent edges of the Sheffield stands, to enable the required number of cycles to be stored and each cycle shall be accessible and not obstructed by other cycles in the store. The cycle store shall be in an accessible location and have internal and external illumination and adequate lighting shall be provided along the route to the store. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and completed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved. The cycle store and associated lighting shall thereafter be retained, maintained and kept available for the residents of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, to promote alternative means of transport and in accordance with Policies CS18 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

9. Refuse Management Plan

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a Refuse Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include: details of the management company to be set up; the employment of a private contractor to collect the refuse; measures to be taken if no private contractor is available at any time in the future (such as the employment of a person or persons to ensure bins are wheeled to the collection point); and that bins will not be stored in the open or at the collection point apart from on the day of collection. The refuse management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

10. 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.

11. SUDs

Prior to the commencement of any substructure works on site a scheme for the whole site providing for the disposal of surface water run-off and incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development or in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following 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 section, to illustrate the construction method and materials to be used for the hard surfacing (sample materials and literature demonstrating permeability may be required).

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

12. Electric charging Points:

Before the commencement of development details of electric charge points for the car parking bays shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. The electric charge points shall be installed and laid out in accordance with approved plans and thereafter permanently retained and kept available for residents of the new development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies CS17 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

13. Renewable Energy

Before the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved a detailed statement outlining the confirmed renewable energy sources and energy reduction measures to be employed in the development to meet the 10% decentralized or renewable energy target in line with the submitted Energy Efficiency Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposed renewable energy sources and energy reduction measures shall be installed prior to first occupation and used in line with the approved strategy and retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To meet the requirements of Policy CS2 to provide sustainable and energy efficient development.

14. Implementation of the approved Arboricultural Method Statement

The tree protection measures as detailed in the Arboricultural Method Statement dated 17th August 2020 and prepared by Housing Landlord Services 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).

15. Soft landscaping – Larger Developments

Within 3 months of the date of commencement of the development, or such other time period as 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 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; and (e) programme of implementation. The approved soft landscape scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation use of the development commencing and permanently 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).

16. Hard landscaping – larger developments

Within 3 months of the date of commencement of the development, or such other time period as 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 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, and (h) a timetable for implementation. The approved hard landscape scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation or use of the development commencing and permanently 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).

17. Installation of bird boxes

Within 3 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the design and location of bird boxes in accordance with the recommendations within the 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal' by KJF Consultancy dated 25/02/2020 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The bird boxes as approved shall be installed prior to use of the building for the development as approved commencing.

Reason: In the interest of ensuring a net gain in biodiversity and in accordance with paragraphs 8, 170 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.

18. Screen walls/fences as indicated

Screen wall(s)/fence(s) as indicated on the deposited plan shall be erected in the position(s) shown on the plan prior to the occupation or use of the development commencing and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate privacy for the occupiers of the proposed development and adjoining properties and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

Informative note: Potential Contamination.

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

Informative Note: No storage of materials on footway/highway

INFORMATIVE NOTE: The applicant is advised that there should be no storage of any equipment, machinery or materials on the footway/highway this includes verges and/or shrub borders or beneath the crown spread of Council owned trees.

Informative Note: Highway and Surface Water/Loose Material

INFORMATIVE NOTE: The applicant is advised that in order to avoid contravention of highways legislation, provision shall be made in the design of the access/drive to ensure that no surface water or loose material drains/spills directly from the site onto the highway.