



# Planning Committee

Application Address	36 Burnham Drive, Bournemouth, BH8 9EX
Proposal	Alterations and extensions to bungalow to include formation of new 1st floor level with dormer windows and roof lights
Application Number	7-2020-223-AW
Applicant	C Ballantyne & L Brown
Agent	Roger Wilkinson Arch & Bldg Services
Date Application Valid	5 October 2020
Decision Due Date	29 November 2020
Extension of Time date (if applicable)	30 April 2020
Ward	Queen's Park
Report Status	Public
Meeting Date	22 April 2021
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Grant</b>
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Councillor Mark Anderson call in. Reasons as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Design/Appearance</li><li>• Layout/Density</li><li>• Previous Decision</li><li>• Privacy</li></ul>
Case Officer	Katie Lasham

## Description of Development

1. Planning consent is sought for alterations and extensions to bungalow to include formation of new 1st floor level with dormer windows and roof lights.

## Key Issues

2. The main considerations involved with this application are:
  - Impact on character and appearance of the area
  - Impact on residential amenity

3. These points will be discussed as well as other material considerations at paragraph 10 to 26 below.

### **Planning Policies**

4. The following planning policies are relevant to this proposal:

#### **Core Strategy (2012)**

CS41: Design Quality

#### **Supplementary Planning Documents:**

Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders – PGN (2008)

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) - PGN

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

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 Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the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

### **Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals:**

5. 7-2020-223-AV: Alterations and extensions to bungalow to include formation of new 1st floor level with dormer windows and roof lights. Refused.
6. 7-2019-223-AU: Alterations, dormer windows and extensions to bungalow to include formation of first floor level. Refused.

### **Representations**

7. Site notices were posted in the vicinity of the site on 22/10/2020 with an expiry date for consultation of 20/11/2020.
8. Fourteen representations have been received: fourteen raising objections, none in support and no comments. The issues raised comprise the following: -

*Out of character within Burnham Drive/materials not in keeping*

*Infill extension is not appropriate development which appears “boxy”*

*Overbearing*

*Poor design*

*Three island properties no longer the same design*

*Overdevelopment*

*Height/bulk/design out of scale with two neighbouring “island” properties (no.34 and no.38)*

*Dormers (east and south elevation) not and intrusion to surrounding neighbours*

*Overlooking/Loss of privacy*

*Loss of light*

*Overshadowing from roof height increase*

*No other precedents of design on this road of this form of development*

This type of development is common within the area, it must be noted that whilst the height does increase more than surrounding neighbouring properties, the total ridge height is aligned with surrounding neighbouring properties.

*Not posting an amended site notice to declare amended plans*

Re-advertising amended plans which reduce the impact on the development on neighbours does not require re-consultation, it is at the discretion of the Local Planning Authority. In this case the amended plans included a straightforward minor reduction in the ridge height, which was not considered to prejudice any of the original objections.

## **Consultations**

9. There were no consultations requested for this proposal.

## **Constraints**

10. There are no planning constraints at this site.

## **Planning Assessment**

### **Site and Surroundings**

11. The application site is located within an established residential area and is situated in a cul-de-sac. Burnham Drive adjoins Queens Park Avenue, with residential dwellings on this section of the road being on a steep incline. Further south to Burnham Drive, properties level-off and are situated in a circular formation. An island of three properties are located to the centre of this road. No.36, the application site, is one of these three island properties located to the south-east. Due to the separation between the three island properties and properties on the outer edge of the road, as well as soft landscaping on Burnham Drive, this creates an open plan and unimposing street scene.
12. Bungalows and chalet bungalows are the predominant dwelling type on this road, with many properties having roof lights or small-scale signs of roof development to utilise the first-floor space. Front building lines within the immediate context of no.36 do vary slightly and the architectural style of properties differ, creating a mixed design to the properties on Burnham Road. Furthermore, properties front boundaries location reflects the curvature of the road. Notwithstanding the differing architectural styles of properties on this street, the scale of dwellings on this road are similar, with eaves heights retained at ground floor to reflect the bungalow character of Burnham Drive.
13. Despite varied architectural styles to the outer circle of properties, the three island properties (no.34, 36 and 38) are all architecturally similar, with shallow hipped roofs, render with red brick plinths. These properties all sit comfortably within their context and as existing appear in keeping with the outer circle properties of Burnham Drive.

## Key Issues

### Impact on character and appearance of the area

14. This is the third application within the last year on this site which has sought redevelopment to create a first floor living space. This planning application has sought to overcome issues from the previously refused application (7-2019-223-AV). The previous application was deemed harmful for the following reason:

*“It is considered that the proposed development, by reason of the, bulk, scale and design of roof alterations including prominent side gables of significant size, and the immediate context of visually prominent corner open plan situation, would form unsympathetic alterations which would have an incongruous appearance and be out of keeping with the character of the area. The weatherboard cladding to the gables further removes the assimilation of this property with the predominant character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area and is therefore contrary to the Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008), Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.”*

15. This planning application must overcome most recent planning application refusal to be acceptable. As submitted, the scheme demonstrates a more simplistic and less developed roof form with the removal of the side gables and long flat roof form which has addressed concerns of excessive bulk. However, the plans originally demonstrated that the existing ridge height of 5.2m was to increase to a total ridge height of 7.05m, an increase of 1.85metres. This was deemed an inappropriate height of development which was taller than the previously refused scheme and surrounding properties, therefore failed to provide a design which appropriately overcame previous scale concerns.

16. The applicant has now submitted amended plans which reduce the height of the ridge to 6.4metres; this meaningful reduction of 0.65m to the roof height is considered acceptable to ensure that the development appears in keeping with its surroundings. Whilst it is recognised that the roof height will increase by 1.2 metres, which is a slightly higher increase than other properties developments within the area which have increased their ridge height by 0.7-0.8metres, the overall ridge height is similar - as an example, no.26 Burnham Drive is 6.5metres after roof alterations (7-2019-27549). The difference is that the existing roof form of no.36 Burnham Drive is lower as existing. It's therefore considered that as the height of the property will not appear overbearing or unduly higher than its neighbouring properties within the immediate vicinity. This reduced height is therefore considered acceptable to not create a harmful appearance to the street scene. Furthermore, unlike the previously refused application which proposed a long flat roof, this new pitch design only has 2.6m of flat roof, demonstrating an improved design which is in accordance with the locally adopted 'Residential Extensions. A Design Guide' (2008).

17. Measurements were undertaken on the angle of the roof slant; the existing dwelling has an angle of 41 degrees, with the proposed roof at 38 degrees. Despite the height increase, the angle of the roof form is well assimilated to that of the existing dwelling roof form and two neighbouring island properties, demonstrating a nod back to the other island properties.

18. There are two hipped roof dormers proposed to provide additional first floor accommodation, one to the south and east elevation. These are considered an appropriate size and roof form of dormer, as within the context of Burnham Drive there are a mixed of dormers in the vicinity. The dormers are set down from the ridge and up from the eaves,

providing good design which is in accordance with section 3.3 of the locally adopted 'Residential Extensions. A Design Guide' (2008).

19. The infill of footprint to the principal elevation is considered an acceptable form of development that is set back from the front building line by 1.16 metres. This is in accordance with section 3.2 of the locally adopted 'Residential Extensions. A Design Guide' (2008). With the retention of the single storey to the principal elevation and inclusion of the dormer, the development is not considered to be "boxy" and is an acceptable design.
20. It must be noted for this application, that the three island properties do not have any form of heritage or special protection to them to ensure that the three properties all remain uniform buildings, accordingly this recommendation is made within the immediate context of Burnham Drive, not just the three island properties. Furthermore, as the island is a tear-drop shape, each of the buildings are read individually from different areas of the street scene, therefore the differing designs are not considered to be a jolting addition to the street scene. Within the context of Burnham Drive there is a large array of mixed architectural designs and the development is considered to fit within the context of this road so does not create a new precedent on the road; as such is in accordance with CS41 of the Core Strategy and the locally adopted "Residential Extensions. A Design Guide".
21. This proposed scheme is considered to maximise the use of the plot and whilst not considered overdevelopment, any other form of development on the site would tip the balance of acceptability. Accordingly, a condition has been added that removes Permitted Development Rights to the site for any enlargement to the building. Accordingly, any further development must be appropriately considered by the Local Planning Authority.
22. The materials are not considered in keeping with the local vernacular as currently proposed. This can be dealt with appropriately by way of condition, therefore in order to reduce the apparentness of the building within the street scene, a condition has been added to ensure that prior to commencement of works, materials will be submitted and approved by the council, to ensure that the materials assimilate well with properties on Burnham Drive.
23. Overall, it is considered that the amended design is in keeping with the local vernacular of mixed architectural styles and does not unduly impact the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore addressed previous concerns and refusal reasons raised and is thus in accordance with CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012), the locally adopted 'Residential Extensions. A Design Guide' (2008) and the NPPF (2019).

#### Impact on residential amenity

24. The two properties potentially mostly impacted by this proposal are the neighbouring island properties at no.34 and no.38 Burnham Drive. All other properties on Burnham Drive are considered set far away enough to not cause any harm to their residential amenity.

#### 25. *34 Burnham Drive*

This neighbouring property is located to the west of the application site. This revised application has removed all windows from the west elevation facing onto no.34 which has removed any potential harm of overlooking or loss of privacy. Furthermore, this revised scheme has removed the cropped gable and retained the hip roof form, minimising the increase in bulk onto this neighbouring property. Furthermore, as the roof form is also slightly less steep than the existing roof form, the angle of the roof benefits this

neighbouring property. Although the development has a 1.6 metre height increase, this increase is not for the full length of the property and the height increase of the roof is set in 3.5 metres from the side building line of the application site. As the distance between no.36 and no.34's side building lines are 13 metres and 16.5 metres from the increase of pitch height roof (13+3.5 metres), the height increase is considered to be a sufficient distance away to not cause undue harm to loss of light or overshadowing. A site visit was conducted, and three out of the six windows to this side facing elevation of no.34 are obscure glazed or stained glass, with one window of clear glass serving the kitchen. Accordingly, there is no significant concern relating to loss of light caused by the development.

#### 26. 38 Burnham Drive

This neighbouring property is located to the north of the application site. There are two roof lights shown facing onto this property, proposed to be a minimum of 1.7m above finished floor level. These roof lights serve a landing and shower room, as these are not habitable rooms and the windows are high level and angled on the roof slope, the windows are considered acceptable to safeguard any chance of overlooking or loss of privacy of this neighbouring property. Furthermore, as the property is located a sufficient distance away from the application site, the proposal isn't considered to materially harm the residential amenity of this neighbouring property regarding overshadowing or loss of light.

27. Overall, residential amenity to these neighbouring properties is considered safeguarded and the development is in accordance with CS41 of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that residential amenity is appropriately considered.

### **Summary**

28. It is considered that:

- Impact on character and appearance of the area is acceptable
- Impact on residential amenity is acceptable

### **Planning Balance**

29. The proposed development comprises a design that is in keeping with the local vernacular, provides good design and gives due regard to residential amenity. 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 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. The Development Plan Policies considered in reaching this decision are set out above.

### **Recommendation**

**30. 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:**

#### **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: 20.28.1.C, 20.28.3.D, 20.28.4.D

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

## **2. Prior Approval of Materials (Bricks & Tiles)**

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

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

## **3. No Permitted Development for Enlargements of the dwelling(s)**

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), no enlargements of the dwelling(s) shall be constructed without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development of the site in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

## **4. Statement required by National Planning Policy Framework (APPROVALS)**

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

In this instance: The applicant/agent was updated of any issues after the initial site visit, the applicant was provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer and permission was granted.