



Planning Committee

Application Address	49 Parkway Drive, Bournemouth, BH8 9JS
Proposal	Alterations and single storey extension to dwellinghouse
Application Number	7-2021-27839-A
Applicant	Mr Hunt
Agent	Samways Surveying Ltd
Date Application Valid	11 February 2021
Decision Due Date	7 April 2021
Extension of Time date (if applicable)	24 June 2021
Ward	Queen's Park
Report Status	Public
Meeting Date	17 June 2021
Recommendation	Grant
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	This application is brought before the committee at the request of Councillor Anderson, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Layout• Privacy• Design• Traffic
Case Officer	Katie Lasham

Description of Development

1. Planning consent is sought for alterations and single storey extension to dwellinghouse.

Key Issues

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

- Impact on SUDS
3. These points will be discussed as well as other material considerations at para 11 to 31 below.

Planning Policies

4. The following planning policies are relevant:

Core Strategy (2012)

CS16: Parking Standards

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. 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are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless: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.

Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals:

5. 7-2020-27839: Planning consent for alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse. Refused on 22 October 2020:
- Ridge height increase and front extension out of keeping with the street scene and harmful to the character of the area
 - Materials out of keeping
 - Impact on number 47 Parkway Drive due to scale of extensions and overlooking
6. No.47 Parkway Drive: 7-2011-12441-B: Alterations and single storey extension to dwellinghouse. Granted on 01 November 2011.

Representations

7. Site notices were posted in the vicinity of the site on 12/03/2021 with an expiry date for consultation of 02/04/2021.

8. Two representations have been received: two raising objection, none in support and no comments. The issues raised comprise the following, which will be considered in the relevant sections of the report except where mentioned: -

Design

Overbearing

Loss of privacy / overlooking

Loss of light

Trees

SUDS

Traffic

Hedge inaccurately represented on plan

Construction impact creating noise/dust/disturbance/extra vehicles

Response: This is not a material planning issue. Notwithstanding this, an informative note has been added to ensure that no vehicles park unsafely within an immediate proximity of the junction.

New en-suites proposed must have obscure glazing

Response: A condition has been added with the recommendation to grant (Condition 3).

Potential balcony and bedroom at first floor over flat roof could be subsequently proposed

Response: The application does not propose these alterations. If this was proposed this would be appropriately considered in a separate planning application.

Conservatory turned to utility room without plans showing materials

Response: The application has a condition attached stating that materials need to match those as existing (Condition 2). Therefore, if the materials are to alter, this would be materials aligned with the host building. Furthermore, the application form states proposed materials are render, this would be an acceptable alteration which is in keeping with the existing dwelling.

Consultations

9. None

Constraints

10. Located within a Queens Park TPO area

Planning Assessment

Site and Surroundings

11. The application site is located within the Queens Park ward of Bournemouth and is residential in character. The immediate vicinity of the application site on Parkway Drive

comprises what appear to be bungalows from the front elevation but are two-storey properties to the rear of the property due the change in levels. Levels are of importance on this road as Parkway Drive is on a slope. Properties on this road respect the slope and are designed around it whereby ridge heights of bungalows drop as the road slopes downhill. Properties have a similar front building line and are similar in architectural style and design, with very few signs of development visible from the road. Properties mostly comprise hipped or ridged roofs but there are some examples of partial gabled front elevations. As buildings are set back from the front curtilage of the properties and appear single storey, this provides an open and spacious appearance to the street scene.

12. No.49 is located directly opposite a junction where Parkway Drive meets Copsewood Avenue and therefore the front elevation is prominently visible from the street scene. No.49 is a detached dwellinghouse, which is single-storey level to the front of the building and two-storeys to the rear of the site. As existing, the roof scale and height of no.49 is well proportioned in relation to its two neighbouring properties at no.51 and no.47 in accordance with the slope. Due to the levels in the area, the garden is very steep and therefore there are different levels of height to the gardens on this road. An existing, decking seating area is provided to the rear of the property with grassed areas further down the slope.

Key Issues

Impact on character and appearance of the area

13. This planning application proposes alterations and single storey extension to the dwellinghouse. A previous planning application, reference number 7-2020-27839, was refused for the following reasoning, which this proposal seeks to overcome:

“It is considered that the proposed roof alterations, the changes to the front elevation, the ridge height increase and front extension would form large and unsympathetic alterations which would be out of keeping with the design of the property and the other similar single storey bungalows in the street scene in this part of Parkway Drive. The materials proposed further remove the relationship of this building with neighbouring properties, and as such it would be an incongruous development of poor design which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the proposal is considered to be materially harmful and overbearing to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, particularly of no.47 Parkway Drive, which as existing is at a lower level than no.49, by reason of the scale of extensions and the two windows to the side elevation at first floor level within such a small distance to the side building line of no.47 creating a perceived level of overlooking and loss of privacy. For these reasons the proposal is considered contrary to Policy CS41 of the adopted Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) as well as the provisions of the Residential Design Guide (2008) and the NPPF (2019)”.

14. In order to provide an acceptable planning application, the proposal must overcome these issues.
15. This proposal has now removed all alterations that are visible from the street scene, with the roof height retained as existing, no roof alterations or dormers proposed and no change in material palette to the frontage. As all development proposed under this application are solely related to the rear of the site, there is no harmful impact on the street scene, with the rear elevation not visible from any street scene viewpoints.
16. The single storey rear extension is appropriate in scale and design for the original property. The materials match that of the host building, whilst the flat roof doesn't accord with the

host dwelling, as this entirely screened from view of the street scene, this is deemed acceptable. Accordingly, the character and appearance of the area is considered acceptable and is in accordance with policy CS41 – Quality Design of the Core Strategy and Section 3.1 of the “Residential Extensions. A Design Guide”.

Impact on residential amenity

17. Residential amenity of all neighbours except no.47 Parkway Drive were considered acceptable under the previous scheme. The previously refused scheme’s single-storey rear extension was 2.6 metres in length and spanned the full width of the dwellinghouse, with a further 1.4metre of raised decking. This proposal differs from the previous scheme, seeking a deeper 4.3 metre single-storey rear extension with a further 1.4metre area of decking to the rear of the proposed extension. However, unlike the previous scheme, this extension is set in from each side of the property, giving separation distances to the side of no.47 of 3.15 metres, and 2.5 metres from the flank wall of no.51. This single-storey rear extension is a similar length to that of the previously approved (but not built) scheme at 47 Parkway Drive, planning application number 7-2011-12441-B, as is demonstrated on the block plan of this application’s drawing number Ss1097 002 rev F.
 18. Due to the steep levels of gardens in the immediate vicinity, there is a general level of overlooking which is accepted as existing, with certain views into neighbouring gardens from no.49 already well established.
- No.47 Parkway Drive*
19. No.47 is located to the east of the application site and is set lower down the slope than no.49, with the ridge height of no.49 set higher than no.47 as existing which respects the sloped characteristic of the road. This property is considered to be the potentially most impacted by the proposal due to the levels. Under this scheme there are no alterations to the ridge height and all development is to the rear single-storey extension. The two windows proposed on the facing side elevation on the previous application, reference number 7-2020-27839, have been removed under this proposal; accordingly, the issue of perceived sense of overlooking onto no.47 has been overcome and is therefore acceptable in this regard.
 20. Although the total decking and built form does project out 1.6 metres further in length than the previously refused scheme, the rear extension has also been set in 3.1 metres from the side elevation of this neighbouring property and 4 metres from the side boundary, to ensure that the built form is less imposing or overbearing on no.47 which is situated at a lower level than no.49. This set in of built form from the side building line is considered acceptable to not cause undue harm to no.47’s residential amenity or materially impact on loss of light. A small outdoor area that leads to a set of steps is proposed to this side, with 1.8 m privacy screens to ensure there is no harmful impact on loss of privacy or overlooking. This small external decked area to no.47’s side is considered acceptable to not cause undue harm to residential amenity, as compared with the rest of the garden this is more of an entrance to the stairs for the lower levels of the garden.
 21. Condition 4 has been added to remove Permitted Development rights for side facing windows of the proposed extension to ensure that no side facing windows can be added without a planning application being made to the Local Planning Authority, that would impact no.47’s residential amenity.

No.51 Parkway Drive

22. No.51 is set naturally at a higher level than no.49 and is separated from no.49 by substantial hedging which will screen some of the built form of the proposed extension. There was a discrepancy raised in a representation about plan heights of the hedge which has been accordingly updated and is accurately reflected on drawing number Ss1097 002 rev F.
23. The decking and single-storey rear extension extends further in length by 1.9 metres from the previously refused scheme, to a total of 4.2 metres. However, unlike the previously refused scheme, which had built form spanning the full width of the property, this scheme sets the extensions in substantially from each of the side elevations. Privacy screens have been placed along this side too to ensure no harmful overlooking, accordingly, neighbouring residential amenity is considered acceptable. Furthermore, whilst the hedging will screen some of the built form, it is recognised the extension will still have a visual impact on no.51, but as this is naturally at a higher level and with softening through natural boundary treatments, this is not considered to have a materially harmful overbearing impact on no.51. Moreover, this development was based on a similar scheme approved in 2011 at no.47 (application number: 7-2011-12441-B), which extended out a very similar distance. Whilst this wasn't built out, the principle of the development was deemed acceptable. It is also noted that although this scheme was approved 10 years ago, relevant planning policy has not altered.
24. No.51 has a glass conservatory to the rear elevation. As the new development is set a sufficient distance from this neighbouring property and the rear extension is primarily glass, the new development is not considered to have any material impact on loss of light of this conservatory or any windows on the property.
25. The previous application proposed the existing conservatory would alter to a utility area that increased in footprint, spanning to the rear building line, which was the built form nearest no.51. The existing conservatory is to be altered to a utility area but does not expand in footprint, accordingly the built form nearest no.51 remains unaltered. Thus, this scheme is considered a betterment to no.51 in this respect with no new built form proposed on their affected side boundary.
26. As previously mentioned, Condition 4 has been added to remove Permitted Development rights for side facing windows of the proposed extension to ensure that no side facing windows can be added without a planning application being made to the Local Planning Authority, that would impact no.51's residential amenity.

181 Queens Park Avenue

27. This neighbouring property is to the rear and set at a much lower level than that of no.49 Parkway Drive. The single-storey extension is set roughly 35metres from the rear building line of no.181 and is screened by substantial foliage and TPO trees, accordingly this is acceptable to not cause undue harm to their residential amenity. Furthermore, the two proposed windows for the en-suite windows at first floor level will not provide any harmful overlooking to this neighbouring property, or any other neighbouring properties, notably as this has been conditioned (condition 3) to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7metres from finished floor level, for both the occupants benefits of privacy and the neighbouring residents.

28. Accordingly, in respect of residential amenity this development is considered in accordance with CS41 of the Core Strategy and with section 3.1 of the “Residential Extensions. A Design Guide”.

Impact on trees

29. The tree officer was consulted on this proposal due to the proximity of TPO trees to the application site. The tree officer has assessed the proposals and immediate context of the TPO trees, which are located to the rear of the garden at the bottom of the slope, set at a much lower level than that of the host dwellinghouse. Due to the differing levels of the tree and the dwellinghouse, meaning the roots are much lower down than that of the proposed development and the distance of the trees from the proposed development, the tree officer required no details for tree information. Accordingly, the proposal is acceptable to not cause harm to the TPO trees.

Highway Safety

30. As the property remains a dwellinghouse with no material changes to occupancy levels and proposes a single-storey extension only, the property will not materially impact on highway safety. The application does not propose any changes to the existing parking and garaging at the front and would not have an adverse impact on traffic or highway safety. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 and CS41 of the Core Strategy.

Impact on drainage (SUDS)

31. The application proposes significant extensions to the property. Drainage information has been submitted for this proposal to show the alterations have appropriately considered SUDS requirements. This is deemed acceptable and in accordance with Policy CS4.

Summary

32. It is considered that:

- Impact on character and appearance of the area is acceptable.
- Impact on residential amenity is acceptable.
- There are no tree impacts
- There are no highway impacts
- Impact on SUDS is acceptable

Planning Balance

33. The development is considered to have no material impact on the character and appearance of the area. It is also not considered to have a materially harmful impact on residential amenity. Whilst its recognised due to the changes in levels, this will have a slight visual impact on neighbouring residents, it's not considered so unduly harmful that it would be unacceptable. 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 occupiers. The Development Plan Policies considered in reaching this decision are set out above.

Recommendation

- 34. 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: Ss1097 001 rev C, Ss1097 002 rev F.

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

2. Materials to Match

Notwithstanding the details included on the application form the materials and colours to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match the elevation(s) to which the extension is to be added and such work shall be completed prior to occupation of the development granted by this permission.

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. Windows in South Elevation serving en-suites to be Glazed with Obscure Glass & non opening below 1.7metres from finished floor level

The proposed windows at first-floor level in the south elevation of the building serving the proposed en-suites shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Pilkington Level 3 or above (or the nearest equivalent standard) and fixed shut below 1.7metres from finished floor level and shall be permanently retained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of adjoining properties and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

4. No Permitted Development for Windows.

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 additional windows to the east and west elevation of the single-storey rear extension shall be installed without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid loss of privacy for adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

5. Privacy Screens

Prior to occupation, the proposed ground floor raised decking area on the east and west side elevation shall be provided with 1.8m high privacy screens in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screens shall be sited on the outer side (east and west side) elevations facing onto no.47 Parkway Drive and no.51 respectively, before the decking area hereby approved is first used in full or in part, and thereafter maintained and retained for that purpose.

Reason: To protect the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining dwelling in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

6. Informative Note: TPO on site

INFORMATIVE NOTE: The applicant's attention is drawn to the existence of a Tree Preservation Order affecting this site.

7. 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, and that no vehicles park unsafely on the yellow lines outside the property, due to the immediate proximity of the junction.

8. 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 was provided with pre-application advice. 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.

Background Documents:

Case File – ref 7-2021-27839-A

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