

# Planning Committee



Application Address	8 Meyrick Park Crescent Bournemouth BH3 7AQ
Proposal	Partial demolition of existing building, alterations and conversion to 5 flats, erection of 2 dwellinghouses and a block of 5 flats (10 flats and 2 houses in total) with associated access, car parking, bin and cycle stores
Application Number	7-2021-4211-G
Applicant	Stour Developments
Agent	Ken Parke Planning Consultants
Ward and Ward Member(s)	Talbot & Branksome Woods
Status	Public Report
Meeting Date	3 February 2022
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	<b>GRANT, in accordance with the details set out in the recommendation below</b>
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	At the request of Councillor Karen Rampton, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mass and scale</li><li>• Overlooking/loss of privacy</li><li>• Dominance and overbearing appearance</li><li>• Car parking</li></ul>
Case Officer	Tom Hubbard

## **Executive Summary**

The key planning issues for Members to consider are set out below. Members will have to balance all of the planning issues and objectives when making a decision on the application, against policy and other material considerations.

### **Representations received**

Objections were received from 3 individual addresses, as well as one letter of support and one with further comments. A summary of the objections have been provided within the consultation section of the report.

### **Principle of Development**

The site is within a residential locality and is considered a sustainable location close to a key transport route. It is a large site with scope for potential additional development, supported by Policy CS21, subject to careful consideration of the heritage and

conservation area issues, and any other material considerations. The development would contribute towards BCP Council housing targets.

### **Impact on the character and appearance of the area**

The existing villa on the site makes a positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would remove poorly contributing extensions and replace with additional residential buildings on each side of the original villa. In principle this is considered acceptable based on the siting and spacing, and original plans for the area which illustrated three plots across the site. The development would also include a rear extension to the original villa but this is balanced against the retention of the main core and other positive enhancements to this building. It is considered that the development overall would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

### **Trees and Landscaping**

The site is located within a conservation area and is covered by an area Tree Preservation Order. Three individual trees, three groups of trees and one part of a hedge are to be removed. Hedging and groups of smaller trees to the front of the site are to be mostly retained. The car parking area to the rear requires the provision of hard surfacing within the root protection areas of a number of trees along the rear boundary of the site. The Tree Officer has raised concerns that this level of tree felling and works within root protection areas is high and will be of harm to trees on and surrounding the site. However, it is considered that the trees to be removed are either small or of no particular amenity value, and that the remaining trees can be suitably protected by condition. Replacement trees are also proposed. The overall impact in this regard is one of slight harm, and in relation to relevant development plan policies, including CS41 and 4.25 presents a mild conflict. The issues are balanced against the other benefits of the scheme in the conclusion of the report.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

The new buildings would be visible to the neighbouring properties on each side, beyond their rear building lines. However, the separation distances and site levels mean that on balance this impact is acceptable. There are no harmful issues of overlooking identified. Car parking is proposed to the rear of the site, but with adequate separation to neighbouring properties. Overall, the proposed development would not have a materially harmful impact on neighbouring properties.

### **Residential Living Standards**

The properties proposed are all good size units with acceptable outlook. The two houses will have their own private garden areas. A number of flats have access to small private balconies. There is also some communal garden space retained around the site, although this is not generous with the parking area taking up most of the rear area of the site. However, the site is close to the public open space of Meyrick Park and the living conditions for future occupants is otherwise considered acceptable.

### **Transport Considerations**

The application includes 18 on site car parking spaces. The proposed access and parking arrangements are sustainable and would not be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety. The site would provide for cycle storage and electric vehicle charging, which would be sufficient to comply with Policies CS16, CS17 and CS18.

### **Ecology/biodiversity**

A bat survey has been provided which concludes that the site is confirmed as a bat roost for low numbers of Soprano pipistrelle bats. A mitigation plan is therefore required for the protection and relocation of the bat roost on site including the acquisition of an

appropriate European Protected Species Licence (ESPL). an appropriate level of biodiversity enhancement would be secured by conditions.

## **Summary**

The proposal seeks development within an area supported by the Local Plan, as defined by Policy CS21. The proposed scheme would make an efficient use of the site and would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Having recognised the collective benefits of the proposed scheme and having regard to the tilted balance and presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that the proposals would achieve the economic, environmental and social objectives of sustainable development, in compliance with the adopted policies of the Development Plan as a whole and the relevant provisions of the NPPF and should therefore be recommended for approval.

## **Description of Proposal**

1. Full Planning Consent is sought for the partial demolition of the existing building, alterations and conversion to 5 flats, erection of 2 dwellinghouses and a 3 storey block of 5 flats (10 flats and 2 houses in total) with associated access, car parking, bin and cycle stores. The partial demolition includes removal of the later added extensions to each side of the building and garage blocks to the rear of the site, leaving the original Victorian core of the building in place.

## **Description of Site and Surroundings**

2. The application site is located within the Talbot Woods/Meyrick Park Conservation Area (designated 1988). The area contains a substantial number of detached houses principally dating from the mid-Victorian period up to the 1930s. The character of the area is attributed to the quantity of remaining original buildings and the spacious verdant setting of the mature trees and shrubs. Meyrick Park Crescent is a tree lined road with fine Victorian and Edwardian houses that links Wimborne Road to Meyrick Park. The application property at 8 Meyrick Park Crescent is a large Victorian villa on a larger than average plot. The property has been significantly extended, with a 1920s extension to the northern side and a substantial 1960s extension to the southern side. It has also been converted to a mix of flats and HMO accommodation. The land slopes down to the south.

## **Relevant Planning History:**

3. 1964 – Proposed alterations and additions to form two self contained flats and double garage - Granted
4. 2004 - Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing use of premises as 7 self-contained flats, 1 self contained flatlet, 6 non-self contained flatlets and 1 maisonette – Lawful (7-2004-4211-F). This is considered the current established use of the site.

## **Constraints**

5. The site is subject to the following constraints:
  - Located within the Meyrick Park and Talbot Woods Conservation Area
  - Tree Preservation Order (area order 270/1992)

6. With respect to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area – section 72 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

### **Public Sector Equalities Duty**

7. In accordance with section 149 Equality Act 2010, in considering this proposal due regard has been had to the need to —
- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
  - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
  - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

### **Other relevant duties**

8. In accordance with section 40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, in considering this application, regard has been had, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of this function, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.
9. For the purposes of this application, in accordance with section 2 Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, regard has been had to the register that the Council maintains of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots in the Council's area for their own self-build and custom housebuilding.

### **Consultations**

10. Heritage – No overall objection, many positive elements but also some concerns raised:
- Restoring the main villa and losing some unsympathetic modern additions and large older extensions should really help to lift the appearance of this site.
  - Care has again been taken with the design/detailing of the new properties, giving a characterful appearance that should fit fairly comfortably into this context of well detailed period dwellings.
  - Amendments during the application process are positive enhancements such as the front boundary, and removing external bin stores and car ports.
  - Outstanding concerns relate to the loss of the original rear elevation of the original villa, and the amount of car parking on the frontage.
11. Trees – Some concerns raised:
- Works are proposed in root protection areas for the following trees: T14, T15, T18, T13, T16 and G19, and a root protection area has been adjusted for T9 rather than showing the development within its root protection area. In their opinion this level of tree felling and works within root protection areas is high and will be of harm to trees on this and neighbouring sites.
  - There is a substantial boundary retaining wall to the southern boundary of this site that will have lessened tree root growth, therefore limited harm will occur across the rear boundary due to this. There is still some concern that root damage could occur but the retaining wall will have lessened root ingress to a certain degree.

- 6 new trees are proposed for planting on this site. New tree planting is supported, however it is not considered that this mitigates the loss of 3 individual trees, 3 groups of trees and one part of a hedge. However, if an approval is recommended then conditions for a detailed soft landscaping scheme that includes tree planting and boundary planting information along with a condition for a detailed soft landscaping maintenance scheme is required.
- The car ports at the rear have been removed from the scheme, but the parking areas will still be present near trees with associated issues. They will be located beneath the crowns of the rear boundary trees. It is proposed to use a no dig cellular confinement system for this area. If these proposals are to be recommended for approval a detailed scheme for this, produced by a structural engineer in conjunction with the arboricultural consultant will be required.

12. Highways – No objection, subject to conditions

13. Waste and Recycling – The bin store does not meet all the Council’s collection requirements. A private collection will be required for the flats, though the houses would be likely to work with a presentation point.

14. Biodiversity Officer – Ecology report does include a Biodiversity Mitigation Plan but some more detail required by condition.

15. Historic England – Do not wish to make any comment

### **Representations**

16. Site notices were posted in the vicinity of the site on 28/01/2021 with an expiry date for consultation of 26/02/2021. Following the receipt of amended plans, an additional period of publicity was undertaken between 28/10/2021 and 18/11/2021.

17. A total of 5 public representations have been received, 3 raising objection; 1 in support and 1 with other comments. The issues raised comprise the following:-

- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Area does not need more flats
- Overbearing/dominating mass of building close to the boundary
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Noise and disturbance
- Rear parking is out of character
- Additional traffic/parking demand
- Development will improve the existing buildings and land and provides a good level of off-street parking

18. In addition, a response has been received from the Bournemouth Civic Society, with the following comments:

General support for the proposals. The removal of the poorly designed extensions is welcomed: *“the Society have not seen a more worthwhile project than this for quite some time. If it is successfully carried out it will fully restore an important but slighted building in a road already well endowed with characterful Edwardian residences to the full finery of its original appearance during the Belle Epoque period. We acknowledge the full compliance of this application to the conservation policies of the Bournemouth Local Plan and strongly recommend its acceptance”*.

## **Key Issue(s)**

19. The key issue(s) involved with this proposal are:
- Principle of the proposed development
  - Impact on the character and appearance of the area
  - Impact on trees
  - Impact on neighbouring residents
  - Living conditions for future occupants
  - Parking/traffic/highway safety issues
  - Ecology/biodiversity issues
  - Drainage/flooding
20. These issues will be considered along with other matters relevant to this proposal below.

## **Policy context**

21. Bournemouth Core Strategy (2012):

Policy CS2 – Sustainable Homes and Premises  
Policy CS4 – Surface Water Drainage  
Policy CS16 – Parking Standards  
Policy CS17 – Encouraging Greener Vehicle Technologies  
Policy CS18 – Encouraging Walking and Cycling  
Policy CS20 – Encouraging Small Family Dwellinghouses  
Policy CS21 – Housing Distribution across Bournemouth  
Policy CS30 – Promoting Green Infrastructure  
Policy CS33, CS34 and CS35 Heathland and designated sites  
Policy CS39 – Designated Heritage Assets  
Policy CS40 – Local Heritage Assets  
Policy CS41 – Quality Design

22. Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002):

Policy 4.4 – Development in Conservation Areas  
Policy 4.25 – Landscaping  
Policy 6.8 – Infill Residential Development  
Policy 6.10 – Flats Development

23. Supplementary planning guidance/documents:

Meyrick Park and Talbot Woods Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)  
The Dorset Heathland Planning Framework (2020)  
Residential Development: A Design Guide (adopted September 2008)  
BCP Parking Standards SPD (2021)  
Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) - PGN

24. National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF” / “Framework”)

Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

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 of this Framework taken as a whole.”

The following sections are also particularly relevant:

#### *Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment*

*Paragraph 199 – “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.*

Paragraphs 201 and 202 relate to the level of harm. Paragraph 202 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use*”.

Paragraph 203 relates to ‘non-designated heritage assets’ and states that “*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*”.

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

- Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Chapter 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Chapter 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Chapter 11 – Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places

### **Planning Assessment**

#### Principle of the proposed development

26. Both paragraph 11 of the NPPF, and CS1 of the Core Strategy place a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The site is considered acceptable in principle for residential intensification, as acknowledged by Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy because it is within 400 metres of a key transport route (Wimborne Road). The development would make a contribution towards local housing supply in a sustainable

location on an under-used site. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states “*planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land*”.

27. The existing property is large and contains flats and an HMO, so would not result in the loss of a family dwellinghouse. As recognised by the 2004 lawful development certificate, there are 9 flats plus a 6 bedroom HMO use within the building. The site has no specific constraints that would preclude redevelopment for alternative residential use, subject to assessment of the other material considerations below.

#### Impact on the character and appearance of the area

##### *Contribution of the existing building and impact of the demolition elements*

28. The history of the building at 8 Meyrick Park Crescent can be summarised with the following points:
- Original plans deposited 1896, amended 1899
  - Once owned by the son of Sir-Russell Cotes (former mayor/left art collection to the town)
  - Additions 1914/1920s including single storey side addition to northern side
  - 1930s in use as guest house, 1942 converted to a maternity home
  - 1960s large brick first floor extension on southern side added in a modern style with tower element and building converted to flats.
  - 2004 certificate of lawfulness granted for 7 s/c flats, 1 s/c flatlet, 6 non s/c flatlets & 1 maisonette.
  - The 6 ‘non self-contained’ flatlets form an HMO element, giving 10 units in total on the site.
29. The contribution of the existing building to the Conservation Area needs to be assessed to determine the level of harm that would arise from the proposals. The starting point is the adopted Meyrick Park and Talbot Woods Conservation Area Appraisal, in which the building is identified as a positive contributor. The Meyrick Park Crescent area is part of a Victorian phase of development and contains large dwellings in generous sized plots, with mature trees and vegetation being a feature which give a spacious verdant feel to the area.
30. 8 Meyrick Park Crescent is a prominent building of a grand scale, keys views of which afforded from the top of the Crescent from the north in particular. It is a large wide site so the building has a strong presence in the street.
31. The building has been extended and altered on both sides and to the roof over the years. The most harmful additions are the large and wide flat roof dormer to the front roof slope which cuts through the eaves, and the 1960s two storey flat roof extensions to the southern side, which do not integrate well in terms of width, scale and design. These extensions have affected the building’s appearance, but nonetheless the original main ‘core’ of the building continues to make a positive and interesting contribution to the street scene, particularly from the north where the 1920s single storey extension does not diminish or obscure the significance of the original Victorian Villa.
32. The main Victorian core of the building in the centre retains a wealth of original features. It is a well detailed building, characterised by a black and white tudor style upper floor with decorative timber framing against a render background, clay tile roof, timber sash windows, feature turrets and bay windows, grand entrance porch, red brick lower floor and brick stacks.

33. The single storey 1920s addition on the northern side has a feature square bay window to the front and utilises red brick and timber windows to blend with the main villa. This addition allows views through to upper floor & roof and overall is not deemed to detract from host property.
34. The 1960s flat roof extension does detract from the building but is clearly a later addition. The design is such that there is a clear distinction between it and the original villa, it can be easily 'read' as a separate element. Even with the 1960s extensions and other alterations the existing building clearly sits comfortably in the Conservation Area and represents the historic development in this area. It is of an age, style, scale and material and architectural detail that reflects other positive elements found in the Conservation Area.
35. The building is therefore considered to be positive contributor to the character and appearance of the conservation area, as recognised by the adopted 2009 conservation area appraisal. Due to its prominence and significance as well as the positive features it could also be considered as a 'Non Designated Heritage Asset'. Paragraph 203 of the NPPF is therefore relevant.
36. The proposals would see the historic Victorian core of the building retained and refurbished with some of the later additions removed. The Victorian core is the main part of the building which results in the positive contribution to the conservation area. The loss of the later additions and refurbishment of the building has the potential to enhance the significance of this positively contributing non-designated heritage asset by removing the extensions which are either neutral or negative and detract from the appearance of the building, particularly those to the southern side, subject to consideration of the proposed alterations in the report below. There is also no objection to the removal of the later garages and outbuildings to the rear of the site as this would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area or the building itself.

#### *Proposed new development*

37. Having considered the contribution of the existing building and the individual elements to be removed, the proposed new development now needs to be assessed in relation to the overall impact and whether it would be acceptable, or whether it would result in harm to the conservation area. Any harm identified would need to be assessed as to whether it would be substantial or less than substantial in relation to paragraphs 199-200 of the NPPF, and in relation to the impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset under paragraph 203.
38. In order to facilitate the improvements to the original building and removal of the negative extensions, two new buildings are proposed on the site, either side of the original building. Extensions are also proposed to the rear of the existing villa and to its roof.
39. The applicants have submitted a heritage statement which includes historic plans indicating that there were originally three intended plots on the site when the area was planned, but subsequently one large villa was built in the centre of the three plots. Policy 4.4 of the District Wide Local Plan aims to resist plot subdivision within conservation areas, but in this case it is considered that the justification has been made based on the large wide plot and the original intentions when the area was planned for residential development.

40. The proposed buildings are a pair of semi-detached houses to the northern side and a block of five flats to the southern side. The new buildings are set well back from the road, reflecting the pattern of development in the area. The proposed block of flats is set a little further forward than the existing villa and neighbouring property at 10 Meyrick Park Crescent, but there is no strict building line to adhere to and it would still be set well back from the road.
41. The proposed dwellings to the northern end of the site are stepped slightly further back, which will enable a strong appreciation of the original villa to remain when viewed from the north on Meyrick Park Crescent, which is a key view of the site. It is considered that there is adequate spacing between the new buildings and original villa which will also enable the significance of this building to be retained. The proposed frontage contains a mix of parking and landscaping. There are opportunities for additional planting to enhance the appearance of the site from the street. Parking to the front has been kept to a minimum, although there are still 7 spaces proposed. This is not uncommon however, and the parking is screened by front boundary hedging and landscaping. A low front boundary wall is proposed which varies in height with the slope of the road but is overall considered to be in keeping.
42. The design of the new buildings is traditional in style, and it is evident that care has again been taken with the design/detailing of the new properties, giving a characterful appearance that should fit comfortably into this context of well detailed period dwellings. They are 2-3 storeys in scale but not taller or larger than the original villa, ensuring that this remains the dominant building on the site. The proposed development includes strong gable features to the front. That to the block of flats is a little large, but overall it is considered that the proposed buildings are well articulated and have a good level of period detailing and high quality materials. Facades will have a mix of brickwork to the lower levels and mock tudor detailing to the upper floors, consistent with the original villa.
43. Extensions are proposed to the rear of the existing villa and the roof is to be substantially rebuilt. Due to the stepped form of the existing building at the rear, the extension would result in a depth increase of between 1.5 and 6.5 metres. The extensions would increase the bulk and mass of the building, but would be designed to match and integrate with the existing building in a positive manner. The rear elevation does contain some positive elements and detailing, such as the attractive original oriel window. This elevation would be lost to the new extensions. Other detailing such as chimneys would also be lost at the rear.
44. However, the loss of these elements is balanced against the other improvements such as the replacement of the poorly designed and bulky flat roof dormer windows on the front and north sides, which would be changed to three small dormer windows on the front and a gable feature on the side. A turret is also reinstated to the top of the front bay window on the south western corner. Such alterations and other general refurbishment will overall improve the appearance of the building and enhance its contribution to the conservation area. The extensions to the rear are significant but would not be readily visible from the street. An acceptable gap to the rear of the site would also be retained.
45. A surface parking area is proposed to the rear of the site, with a main access to the south of the original villa. 11 spaces will be provided here. It is considered that this is acceptable to minimise the impact of visible parking on the frontage of the site. Rear parking is also evident to other blocks of flats within the conservation area. In this case it will be surrounded by trees and landscaping to soften it.

#### *Overall impact on the conservation area*

46. Overall, it is considered that the restoration works to the main villa, including the removal of some unsympathetic modern additions and large older extensions, would help to significantly enhance the appearance of this site. It is acknowledged that with the loss of the earlier extensions and the refurbishment works some additional development is required to replace the accommodation lost in the demolished elements. Additional plot subdivision within the plot would not normally be supported in principle, but in this instance there is a clear benefit in the restoration works, and a case has been made that the site was originally intended as three development plots.
47. The extensions to the rear of the villa remove some original elements, but this is balanced with the other enhancements to the more prominent and visible parts of the building. The new buildings are designed to be in keeping with the original building with a good level of articulation and detailing. The proposed development would have a neutral impact overall, with no harm overall to the conservation area identified and an enhancement of the main core element of this non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, justification in relation to paragraphs 199 or 200 is not considered necessary in this case.
48. Trees and landscaping are an important feature of the conservation area but the proposed development would not result in visual harm in this respect, particularly with the retention of front boundary hedging and trees. This issue is considered in more detail in the section of the report below. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in harm to the existing building, would preserve the character and appearance of the Meyrick Park and Talbot Woods Conservation Area, and would accord with the aims of the relevant policies including 4.4, 6.8, 6.10, CS21 CS39, and CS41.

#### Impact on trees

49. The site is located within a conservation area and is covered by an area Tree Preservation Order. A tree survey and arboricultural method statement has been provided. Three individual trees, three groups of trees and one part of a hedge are to be removed. Two of the groups are effectively hedge screens to each side boundary of the site. Of the three individual trees one is a small holly tree at the front of the site, and two other small trees at the rear of the site. The TPO is an area order and dates from 1992. It is not clear if all the trees to be removed are protected by the TPO as they are relatively small, but they do have conservation area protection in any case. It is considered that the trees to be removed are either small or of no significant quality or particular amenity value within the conservation area. Hedging and groups of smaller trees to the front of the site are to be mostly retained, while hedging to the side boundaries is to be removed and replaced. The car parking area to the rear requires the provision of hard surfacing within the root protection areas of a number of trees along the rear boundary of the site.
50. The Tree Officer has raised concerns that this level of tree felling and works within root protection areas is high and will be of harm to trees on and surrounding the site. Concern is also raised at the amount of hard surfacing proposed to the front and rear of the site at the expense of the existing soft landscaping.
51. It is acknowledged that the parking will be within root protection areas, but special surfacing has been proposed in the form of a no dig cellular confinement system (eg "Cellweb"), which is a surfacing which ensures that the loads placed upon it are laterally dissipated rather than transferred to the soil and roots below and is commonly used in situations such as this where there is surfacing or parking in root protection areas. It is

therefore considered possible that any impact on the trees can be mitigated. A condition has been added to require prior approval of a detailed scheme for this, produced by a structural engineer in conjunction with the arboricultural consultant (condition 7) as per the Tree Officer's recommendation.

52. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that trees should be retained wherever possible. In this case it is considered that the tree removal is necessary to enable the development to go ahead, the trees lost are not considered significant, and six new trees are also proposed for planting which will help to mitigate the loss of the other trees on the site. The retention of those on the front boundary is positive. There are few other trees of note on the site itself. There are more significant trees outside the site to the east and south, which are considered to be adequately protected by the proposed method statement. The new block of flats is very slightly within the root protection area of T9 to the south, a mature Scots Pine, but the Tree Officer acknowledges that there is a substantial boundary retaining wall to the southern boundary of the site that will have lessened tree root growth ingress to a certain degree.
53. Overall, it is considered that although there are some concerns from a tree perspective, in terms of the loss of and potential harm to protected trees as well as loss of existing landscaping and lawned areas, these are overall relatively limited and can be both mitigated to a significant degree with protection measures and replanting. The overall impact in this regard is one of slight harm, and in relation to relevant development plan policies, including CS41 and 4.25 presents a mild conflict. The issues are balanced against the other benefits of the scheme in the conclusion below

#### Impact on neighbouring residents

54. The site is flanked on both sides by neighbouring dwellings, and there are other residential properties to the rear in Rushton Crescent.

#### *4 Meyrick Park Crescent*

55. This neighbouring property is set further forward in its plot compared to the existing property at 8 Meyrick Park Crescent and the proposed dwellings to the northern part of the site. The proposed pair of dwellings are set back in order to retain the significance of the existing villa, but this means that the entirety of the flank wall is behind the rear building line of number 4. In terms of the impact on the dwelling itself it is not considered that there would be any significant issue due to this forward siting, as well as the distance of number 4 to the side boundary (8-9 metres). There are side and rear facing windows to this property but it is therefore considered that there would not be a detrimental impact on these.
56. The main potential impact is therefore to the garden area of this property. The north side elevation of the proposed building has a first floor bathroom window as well as roof lights serving a dressing area and bathroom. It is considered that these can be obscure glazed by condition and non-opening unless the opening elements are greater than 1.7 metres above the adjacent floor level (condition 13). It is considered that this would be sufficient to ensure that privacy is retained here. There is a small first floor rear balcony area which would have a side screen to limit sideways and backward overlooking over the more private areas of the adjacent property (condition 12). There would be oblique views over the rear of number 4's plot including an outdoor pool area, but mutual overlooking down rear garden areas is common in residential areas and generally acceptable, compared to overlooking across plots to more private areas immediately to the rear of dwellings. It will also be mitigated in this case to a degree by trees and planting along the boundary as well as the fact that the land rises to the rear so the

proposed building will appear a little set down in relation to the land levels at the rear of the site.

57. The proposed pair of semi-detached dwellings is two storeys in scale with roof accommodation and a relatively steeply sloping roof. It would be located to the south of number 4's garden, at a distance of approximately 1.9-3.5 metres from the boundary. The closest section is adjacent to a detached garage on the neighbouring side and the boundary then steps and widens to the rear of that. There would be a degree of additional shading to the neighbouring garden due to the location of the proposed building to the south west of 4 Meyrick Park Crescent, but this is not considered to be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal of the application due to the amount of the overall garden area that would be affected, and the location of this (the southern side of the plot including the garage and driveway area rather than the area directly to the rear of the neighbouring dwelling for example).

*10 Meyrick Park Crescent*

58. This neighbouring property is located to the south of the application site. The existing building on the application site is located close to the boundary with number 10 but it has a flat roof and does not extend significantly beyond the rear building line. The proposed block of flats would maintain a similar distance from the boundary but would be taller. It would also extend deeper into the plot, by approximately 4.5 metres with a rear section that is stepped in a metre further from the boundary (3.1-3.2 metres in total from the boundary).

59. The greater mass and bulk of building in terms of both height and depth would be visible to occupants of number 10 Meyrick Park Crescent. However, this impact is not deemed to be materially harmful, having regard to the typical design guidance including the 45 degree guideline from the centre of the closest habitable room window for example. Number 10 Meyrick Park Crescent is situated around 5 metres from the boundary so there would be limited impact to views or windows within this property itself. Again, the main potential impact is therefore from within the garden area of this property. The additional height would be mainly in the form of a hipped roof sloping away from the boundary. The additional depth is stepped a little further from the boundary and is viewed in the context of higher land levels at the rear of the site. The garden levels rise significantly at the rear of number 10 with a retaining wall and bank reducing the visual impact. There are also a number of mature trees along the boundary here.

60. The location to the north means that the proposed building would not have any shading impact here. There are some secondary side windows proposed but those at first floor level and in the roof can be obscure glazed by condition (condition 13).

61. There is parking proposed to the rear of the application site, but this is a minimum of approximately 5 metres from the side boundary with intervening vegetation and boundary treatments. It is also towards the rear of the plot and therefore is not considered that this would have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of occupants of number 10.

*16-20 Rushton Crescent*

62. These properties are located to the rear (south east) of the site. Numbers 16 and 18 contain flats while number 20 appears to be a single dwelling. The separation distance to these properties is typically 25-28 metres as proposed, with one corner to corner point between the original villa and 16 Rushton Crescent falling to around 19 metres. The properties in Rushton Crescent are at a higher level and there is a good level of

mature tree screening between the properties. It is not considered that the proposed development would be materially harmful in terms of visual intrusion or overlooking.

63. The car parking area is located close to the rear boundaries of these properties which will generate some noise, but it is not considered that this would be materially harmful given vegetation screening and distances to the buildings from the boundary, which vary between around 6-16 metres.

#### *Other properties*

64. There are other properties on the opposite side of Meyrick Park Crescent and beyond those identified above. However, it is not considered that there would be any detrimental impact on any other neighbouring properties. The intensity of use of the site would be broadly similar to the existing use of the site, with 12 units of accommodation against the existing 9 flats and 6 bed HMO. Overall and on balance it is considered that the proposed development would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and would accord with the aims of relevant policies including 6.8, 6.10, CS21 and CS41.

#### Living conditions for future occupants

65. The proposed houses are good sized three bedroom dwellings with good sized private rear gardens areas. The flats are a mix of generously sized two and three bed units. Flats will have an acceptable degree of outlook and light. The main outlook is either to the front or the rear. There are some rooms with side facing windows with a gap of around 6.5-7.5 metres for example between the two blocks of flats, but the layout has been carefully considered, with obscure glazing proposed to some secondary windows where there would directly face others.
66. A number of flats have access to small private balconies. There is also some communal garden space retained around the site, although this is not generous with the parking area taking up most of the rear area of the site. However, the site is close to the public open space of Meyrick Park and the living conditions for future occupants is otherwise considered acceptable.
67. Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of living conditions for future occupants and would accord with the aims of relevant policies including 6.8, 6.10, CS21 and CS41.

#### Parking/traffic/highway safety considerations

##### *Access*

68. Two existing vehicular crossovers (dropped kerbs) provide access from Meyrick Park Crescent to the site. This proposal requires modification of the existing northern section of dropped kerb, the re-instatement of the southern vehicular crossover to full height kerb and the formation of a new more centrally located access. In addition, the street-light column fronting the site will likely require relocating as a result of the modified northern access.
69. Each of the proposed vehicular accesses incorporate 2m x 2m driver/pedestrian inter-visibility splays which is an improvement upon the initially submitted scheme and existing on-site conditions. The site section (AA) drawing indicates an approximate gradient of 1 in 13 between the back edge of the footway and the building line of the central block of flats thereby incorporating the initial section of driveway and parking area. This gradient is considered to be acceptable to serve the proposed development.

### *Car Parking*

70. For the proposal to satisfy Policy CS16 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), car parking provision including the layout and design should be in accordance with the BCP Parking Standards SPD (2021). The proposed development is located within parking zone D and is therefore considered to generate the following car parking requirement, to which Table 9 – C3: Flats and Table 10 – C3: Houses refer:
- 2 x 5-habitable room houses at 2 spaces/unit = 4 spaces
  - 6 x 3-habitable room flats at 1 space/unit = 6 spaces
  - 4 x 4-habitable room flats at 2 spaces/unit = 8 spaces
  - Total = 18 spaces
71. This application proposes 18 on site car parking spaces comprising of 14 unallocated/visitor spaces and 4 allocated spaces (two each for the houses). This level of provision is considered acceptable.
72. The proposed car parking arrangement complies with section 3.2 Layout and Design Guidance – Cars of the Parking SPD. All parking spaces measure 2.6m in width by 5m in length with associated manoeuvring aisles measuring between 6m and 7.4m in length. The proposed car ports are not enclosed at either end thus allowing for the convenient opening of car doors. Furthermore, all end spaces are offset 0.8m from adjacent objects resulting in additional overhang.
73. Electric car charging facilities are required to comply with Policy CS17 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy. In line with Section 3.6 of the Parking SPD, the proposed development should provide Electric Vehicle Charging Points at the following ratio:
- 100% active provision for the 2 houses (4 spaces); and
  - 50% active provision for the 10 flats (7 spaces of the 14 proposed) with the remainder having passive provision.
74. Submitted information shows 7 parking spaces are to be installed with charge points however, depending on the type of charger, it could potentially serve two adjacent spaces. To comply with *Section 3.6* of the Parking SPD a minimum of 9 spaces require the provision of 'active' charge points, details of which can be secured by condition (condition 15).

### *Cycle Parking*

75. Cycle parking is a key element of any new development as it can significantly encourage cycling, as required by Policy CS18 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and Section 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport of the NPPF (2019). The provision of cycle parking and its security are essential for supporting the development of cycling as a practical transport choice. A lack of appropriate cycle parking facilities is often cited as a barrier to cycle ownership and use and could be a constraint on the future growth of cycling.
76. The BCP Parking Standards SPD (2021) specifies that dedicated cycle parking is required within all new development, this can be either through internal storage as part of a non-habitable room, or within a garage, or a purpose-built cycle store. In this instance, the two semi-detached houses incorporate gated side accesses thereby providing the opportunity for secure cycle parking within the rear amenity space, the type of which can be conditioned.

77. For the flatted development, this application proposes a purpose-built cycle facility at the basement level of block 3 (housing units 8-12). The proposed internal arrangement of 26 cycle spaces, 1.2m wide access door and associated access path comply with the requirements of Section 3.3 and 4 of the Parking SPD. Details pertaining to the slope of the access path can be conditioned (condition 18).
78. There is also a requirement of 2 visitor cycle spaces (0.1spaces/unit) for the 14 flats. Whilst the cycle store incorporates an additional 2 spaces above what is required (24) this is unsuitable for visitors of the development as they will not have access to a lockable store. The provision of 1 cycle stand (2 spaces) in proximity to the flatted buildings would be acceptable, details of which can be conditioned (condition 18).

#### *Bin storage*

79. A bin store for the flats is shown in the basement of the new block of flats, accessed from the southern pedestrian access. This is too far from the street for Council collection and a collection point is also not provided so a private collection would be required (see condition 11). Bin storage areas for the dwellings are not indicated, but there are side accesses to the rear of each property so providing a presentation point is indicated, Council collection may be possible for these.

#### Ecology/biodiversity

80. A bat survey has been provided which identified a number of bats around the site, including a single bat seen to emerge from the building on multiple occasions, with the conclusion that the site is confirmed as a bat roost for low numbers of Soprano pipistrelle bats. A more detailed mitigation plan is therefore required for the protection and relocation of the bat roost on site including the acquisition of an appropriate European Protected Species Licence (ESPL), methodology for demolition, relocation of any bats or protected species, and provision of future bat boxes and habitats within the development. This is required by condition (condition 9). **(consultation response)**. For example the mitigation plan recommends that a "*Schwegler 2FN bat box must be erected on site in a tree at the rear of the garden as a temporary measure to safely place a bat found during the demolition works*" But it does not specify which tree, at what height and aspect. If a bat box is not appropriately located it will be of no use. Additionally this box should then be permanently left to accord with Bournemouth Policy CS30 – "*Connects and enriches biodiversity and wildlife habitats*" and NPPF (2021) paragraph 174 "*Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity*".
81. The report shows a location of where the permanent bat box will be installed on the building, but it is shown on the existing building not the new build, so that detail also needs to be supplied for clarity.
82. The survey did not explore any other species or wildlife habitat on the site, but there is nothing to indicate from the site visit or other information that there are other protected species on the site. The site coverage of buildings and hard surfacing is increasing with the proposals so further information to ensure there is no net loss of biodiversity is required, for example with further tree planting, bird boxes etc. It is considered that the conditions relating to biodiversity and landscaping will be able to cover the issue and ensure that the proposal is acceptable and accords with the aims of the relevant policies including CS41 and the NPPF.

### Drainage/Flooding

83. The site is not in an area that is known to be at risk from surface water flooding in extreme rainfall events and is not close to an existing water course, so no Flood Risk Assessment is required. There appears to be space within the rear of the site for sufficient soakaway capacity to serve the development. The proposal is acceptable in terms of Policy CS4, subject to a condition for the final drainage design (condition 19).

### Heathland Mitigation

84. 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). Working in collaboration with Dorset Council and with advice from Natural England, BCP Council has adopted the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020 – 2025 Supplementary Planning Document, the purpose of which is to set out the approach to avoid or mitigate harm to these protected sites. In this instance, it is considered that the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the Dorset Heathlands; however, having undertaken an appropriate assessment it is believed that the integrity of these sites can be maintained provided appropriate mitigation is secured. In this case, a financial contribution of £668 plus an administration fee of £75 is considered necessary for the purposes of such mitigation, based on the net increase in accommodation over the existing 9 flats and 1 HMO. This contribution is to be secured by way of an appropriate planning obligation.

### Affordable Housing

85. The net gain in accommodation (units) over the existing residential use is only two units, which is below the threshold where an affordable housing contribution would be sought.

### Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015

86. The scheme is not considered to be suitable for self-build / custom housebuilding. It is a small infill scheme involving mainly conversion and development of flats, with only two new large dwellings proposed.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy**

87. The proposed development liable for a CIL charge, based on any net increase in floor space over the existing.

### **Planning Balance / Conclusion**

88. In terms of the overall planning balance, it is recognised that there are some minor impacts in terms of the impact on existing trees and hedging on and around the site with a conflict with policies 4.25 and CS41 in this regard, as well as the increased bulk and mass of building visible to neighbours on either side of the site, and the loss of the original features of the villa on the rear elevation of the building. However, there are also significant benefits including the otherwise sensitive refurbishment of the core original villa, with the removal of negative 20<sup>th</sup> century additions. Together with the high-quality new buildings this will ensure that the contribution of the site is preserved or even enhanced. Living conditions for future residents are considered acceptable and there are no highway safety concerns.
89. The proposal provides upgraded and better quality residential development in a sustainable location, and the net increase in accommodation will contribute towards

local housing supply (The existing HMO taken as one dwelling means a net gain of 2 units). The Council is not currently in a position to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply in the Bournemouth area. This means that Paragraph 11 of the NPPF applies. This confirms that permission should be granted unless applying the guidance in the Framework provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. In this regard, there are no clear reasons for refusal in relation to areas specified in Footnote 7 (Paragraph 11(d)(i)). Therefore, in consideration of NPPF Paragraph 11(d) ii), any adverse effects of granting permission are not considered to 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits.

90. Therefore, having considered the appropriate development plan policy and other material considerations, including the NPPF, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the development would generally be in accordance with the Development Plan, 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**

#### **GRANT permission subject to:**

- (a) the following conditions; together with**
- (b) a deed pursuant to section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) securing the following terms with power delegated to the Head of Planning (or any other officer nominated by them for such a purpose) to agree specific wording provided such wording in the opinion of the Head of Planning (or other relevant nominated officer) does not result in a reduction in the terms identified as required:**

#### **S106 terms:**

**Financial contribution of £668 plus an administration fee of £75 towards heathland mitigation measures (SAMM)**

### **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:

18-990 LP01 Rev. P2 Location Plan  
18-990 BP01 Rev. P2 Proposed Block Plan  
18-990 DP01 Rev. P2 Demolition Plan  
18-990 FB1-e1 Rev. P3 Units 8-12 Rear Elevation  
18-990 FB1-e2 Rev. P2 Units 8-12 Side Elevation  
18-990 FB1.e3 Rev. P3 Units 8-12 Side Elevation  
18-990 FB1.e4 Rev. P3 Units 8-12 Front Elevation  
18-990 FB1.P1 Rev. P3 Units 8-12 Ground Floor Plan  
18-990 FB1.P2 Rev. P4 Units 8-12 First Floor Plan  
18-990 FB1.P3 Rev. P3 Units 8-12 Second Floor Plan  
18-990 FB1.P4 Rev. P2 Units 8-12 Basement Plan  
18-990 FB2.e1 Rev. P2 Units 3-7 Front Elevation  
18-990 FB2.e2 Rev. P2 Units 3-7 Side Elevation  
18-990 FB2.e3 Rev. P2 Units 3-7 Rear Elevation  
18-990 FB2.e4 Rev. P2 Units 3-7 Side Elevation  
18-990 FB2.P1 Rev. P3 Units 3-7 Ground Floor Plan

18-990 FB2.P2 Rev. P3 Units 3-7 First Floor Plan  
18-990 FB2.P3 Rev. P2 Units 3-7 Second Floor Plan  
18-990 P1-P2.e1 Rev. P2 Units 1-2 Front Elevation  
18-990 P1-P2.e2 Rev. P3 Units 1-2 Side Elevation  
18-990 P1-P2.e3 Rev. P3 Units 1-2 Side Elevation  
18-990 P1-P2.e4 Rev. P3 Units 1-2 Rear Elevation  
18-990 P1-P2.p1 Rev. P3 Units 1-2 Ground & First Floor Plans  
18-990 P1-P2.p2 Rev. P1 Units 1-2 Second Floor Plans  
18-990 SE-01 Rev. P3 Proposed Street Scene  
18-990 SE-02 Rev. P3 Site Section A-A  
18-990 SL01 Rev. P4 Proposed Site Plan  
18-990 SL02 Rev. P4 Site Layout Highway Plan

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

**2. On site working hours**

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).

**3. Site levels**

Prior to the commencement of development, plans indicating the existing site levels, proposed finished levels above Ordnance Datum of the buildings, and the finished site levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved finished levels.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development relates satisfactorily to its surroundings in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

**4. Materials and architectural detailing**

Details/samples of the external materials including brickwork, tiles, render, fenestration types, balcony railings and any other materials to be used in the development, as well as architectural detailing including tile hanging, decorative ridge tiles, paintwork, stonework and any other detailed elements shown on the plans 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) and Policy 4.4 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002).

**5. Scheme for external pipework**

Prior to the commencement of any superstructure works on site, a scheme for external pipe work and flues shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme and unless shown on the approved elevation drawings any pipe work (with the exception of rainwater down-pipes) shall be internal to the buildings.

**Reason:** In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

#### **6. Tree protection**

The tree protection measures as detailed in the arboricultural method statement dated 1 November 2021 (Ref 20100-AA2-DC and associated plan 20100-3) prepared by Barrell Tree Consultancy 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).

#### **7. Foundation detail cellular confinement**

No development work shall commence within the root protection areas of trees, as illustrated on the tree protection plan ref. 20100-3, until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a method statement and/or detailed drawings from a structural engineer showing details of any proposed excavation and constructional details of any foundations and/or cellular confinement in the root protection areas. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved statement and/or drawings

**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).

#### **8. Landscaping**

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

- a) Surfacing materials;
- b) Boundary treatments;
- c) lighting including bollards
- d) Planting plans, including trees;
- e) Existing trees, hedges and shrubs to be retained;
- f) Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
- g) Schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities;
- h) Programme of implementation; and
- i) Maintenance plan for a minimum period of 5 years.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in full, including all tree planting, within the first planting season after the first date of any occupation/use

of the development commencing and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved plan and retained.

**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).

**9. Biodiversity Mitigation Plan**

Prior to the commencement of the development, a detailed Biodiversity Mitigation Plan (BMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The BMP shall outline details of the appropriate licences acquired in relation to protected species as well as the detailed methodology and timeline for mitigation of protected species during the construction and development process, including bat box locations. The BMP shall also outline details of biodiversity enhancements to be built into the development to ensure there is no net loss of biodiversity on the site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and retained thereafter.

**Reason:** To mitigate for the impact on bat roosts and the loss of trees and biodiversity habitat on the site, in accordance with policies CS30, CS35 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and paragraph 174 of the NPPF.

**10. Bin store**

The bin store hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the proposed development and shall be retained and maintained for that use thereafter.

**Reason:** To preserve the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

**11. Provision of a 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 if Council collection criteria cannot be met; 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); details of bin storage and presentation locations for the two dwellings, 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).

**12. Balcony screening**

The proposed first floor balconies on the rear elevation serving the bedrooms of Units 1, 2 and 10 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 northern sides of the balconies relating to Units 1 and 2 and the southern side of the balcony relating to Unit 10 before the development hereby approved is first occupied 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 6.8 and 6.10 of the District Wide Local Plan, and Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

**13. Obscure glazing**

The following windows shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Pilkington Level 3 or above (or the nearest equivalent standard) and fixed shut unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed:

First floor window in north elevation of Units 1-2 serving bathroom of Unit 1;  
Second floor roof lights in north elevation of Units 1-2 serving bedroom and en-suite bathroom of Unit 1;  
Second floor roof lights in south elevation of Units 8-12 serving bedroom and bathrooms of Unit 12; and  
All other windows marked to be obscure glazed on the approved floor plans relating to Units 3-7 and 8-12.

The windows 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).

**14. Vehicular Access/Parking**

Notwithstanding details shown on the submitted plans, within 3 months of the commencement of the development, details of the specification (including a cross-section of the surfacing) of the access and parking areas shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. These areas shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with the approved details. 14 no. parking spaces shall be made available for residents and visitors of the flatted development, and 4 no. parking spaces shall be made available to residents of the dwelling houses. The access and parking areas shall be permanently retained and made available for their intended purposes at all times.

**Reason:** In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies CS16 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

**15. Electric Vehicle Charging Points**

Notwithstanding details shown on the submitted plans, within 3 months of the commencement of the development details of the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Those details shall be in accordance with the BCP Council Parking SPD (adopted 6th January 2021). The approved details shall be implemented and brought into operation prior to the occupation of any residential unit hereby approved or any use hereby approved commencing. Thereafter the Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be permanently retained available for use at all times.

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

**16. Footway Crossing**

Details with specifications of the lowering of the kerb and footway at the proposed access crossing of the highway in relation to the accesses shown on plan 18-990- SL02 Rev. P4 shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. These areas shall be constructed and surfaced in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development. The existing vehicle crossover made redundant by this proposal, shall be reinstated with full height kerbs in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the development.

**Reason:** To prevent danger to road users and in accordance with policies CS16 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

**17. Pedestrian inter-visibility splays**

Notwithstanding details shown on the submitted plans, within 3 months of the commencement of the development, details of the provision of pedestrian inter-visibility splays to either side of the vehicle accesses, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The splay areas shall be cleared of all obstructions over 0.6m in height above ground level prior to occupation of the development and no fence, wall or other obstruction to visibility over 0.6m in height above ground level shall be erected within the area of the splay at any time. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

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

**18. Cycle Parking**

Notwithstanding details shown on the submitted plans, within 3 months of the commencement of the development, details of secure, covered residential parking for at least 24 cycles and secure visitor parking for 2 cycles and associated accesses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include sections to illustrate a suitable access gradient. The provision of the cycle parking and associated accesses shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and completed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved. The cycle parking shall thereafter be retained, maintained and kept available for the occupants of the development at all times.

**Reason:** To promote the cycling mode of transport and in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

**19. Drainage**

Prior to the commencement of any substructure works on site or such other timescale as has otherwise previously been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, a scheme for the whole site providing for the disposal of surface water run-off and incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) together with a timetable for such provision, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water disposal and SUDS works including all hard surfacing and roofed areas 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:

- 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.

## **20. Drainage hard surface 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.

## **Informatives**

1. **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.
2. **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.
3. **INFORMATIVE NOTE:** The applicant is advised that the development is liable for a payment in respect of heathland mitigation measures secured by an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in compliance with Policy CS33, as well as the adopted Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD
4. **INFORMATIVE NOTE:** The applicant needs to be aware that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied to development on this site. The amount of levy due will be calculated at the time the reserved matters application is submitted. Further information about CIL can be found at <https://www.bpcouncil.gov.uk/Planning-and-building-control/Planning-policy/Community-Infrastructure-Levy/Bournemouth/Bournemouth-Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>

## **Background Documents:**

**Case File – ref 7-2021-4211-G**

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

Background Documents