

Planning Committee – 6 February 2025

Addendum Sheet

Item	<p>5 St. Clair Road</p> <p><u>Newly submitted public comments</u></p> <p>The revisions do not alleviate original objections, they remain valid.</p> <p>No datum levels shown on drawings</p> <p>Ridge height now higher than all previous versions</p> <p>Eaves height 0.8 higher than neighbouring properties</p> <p>Roof pitch 50 degrees much steeper than adjacent properties</p> <p>Rear build line is full 3 storeys with no cut back of second floor rooms – resulting in a sense of enclosure which dominates No.3 amenity space. This is emphasised by the tree in the rear garden which will reduce the gap as it grows.</p> <p>Diagonal garden boundary disorderly and highlights overdevelopment of the plot.</p> <p>Much larger than Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).</p> <p>Materials are out of keeping with the area and Canford Cliffs village setting</p> <p>Prevailing street scene is large traditional type single dwellings on side plots of 2-2.5 storey houses and low pitch roofs. This is at odd with these. More recent developments maintain modest understated approach that is harmonious with area</p> <p>Impact on light levels into No.3.</p> <p>Detrimental impact on adjoining properties – outlook from properties and amenity space creating overbearing effect and sense of enclosure.</p> <p>Insufficient land.</p> <p>Construction impacts on trees T1, T2, T3 and T4 and T9</p> <p><u>Case officer response to comments</u></p> <p>The character of the area, height of the dwelling, roof and materials as well as design of the garden is covered within the case officer report. As is the impact on neighbouring properties and trees.</p> <p>In terms of NDSS – these are minimum space standards, not maximum.</p> <p><u>Updated Trees response partially verbally, partially written</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">A) Need an AIA and method statement to address all changes including removal of soakaway system in the driveway and use of cellular confinement system to construct new car parking spaces for existing house.B) Use of less glass to the front of the building would be better due to potential to restrict light into the front of the building but tree officer defers to planning officer judgement on this aspect. <p><u>Case officer response to trees</u></p> <p>With regards to point A – this can be conditioned as below:</p> <p>Condition 15:</p>
-------------	---

	<p>Notwithstanding the information already submitted, an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to any work on site including clearance of vegetation. The agreed details shall be accorded with and implemented.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the protection of trees in accordance with Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan November 2018.</p> <p>With regards to point B – this is covered in paragraph 68 of the report.</p> <p><u>Plans List</u></p> <p>An amended site plan and street scene was received and should form part of Condition 2 as follows:</p> <p>“The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>Floor Plans and Elevations, Drawing No: 9810/101 rev E, received 3 February 2025 Street Scene, Drawing 9810/103 Rev C, received 3 February 2025 Plot comparison and DRA, Drawing No: 9810/105 Rev A, received 15 July 2024 Site, block and location plans, Drawing No: 9810/100, rev C, received 24 January 2025 Updated TPP and AMS, ref: DS/14624/AC, received 2 September 2024 Updated AIA and AMS, Ref: DS/14624/AC, received 2 September 2024 Drainage Plan, ref: 9810/104 rev B, received 21 November 2024 Energy Statement, by Anders Roberts Associates Ltd, received 15 July 2024</p> <p>Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.”</p>
Item	<p>8 Scarf Road</p> <p><u>New relevant appeal decision</u></p> <p><u>Appeal reference APP/V1260/W/23/3333330 – APP/23/00718/F. Appeal dismissed</u></p> <p>The related application to this included a front elevation facing No. 10.</p> <p><i>In relation to the pattern of development the inspector noted:</i></p> <p>proposed dwelling would be attached to No 8, and as its principal elevation would face directly towards the side elevation of 10 Scarf Road (No 10) rather than towards the green space in front of No 10, its layout would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the vicinity. It would also erode much of the open space between No 8 and No 10 which presently serves to break up the mass of built form in the vicinity...</p> <p>although the resulting plot size would be similar to those at 4 and 6 Scarf Road, as the proposed dwelling would be in clear view when seen from Tait Close and the footpath adjacent to the site, harm to the character and appearance of the area would result...</p>

I have had regard to the examples of planning permissions put forward by the appellant. I observed the relevant sites from public vantage points during my site visit. I saw that none of these examples relate to an existing layout with dwellings *arranged around a green space or where a dwelling is facing the side elevation of a nearby dwelling at close proximity*. As these examples are not directly comparable with the proposed development, they do not change my findings above...

Case officer response: Please note the italic wording, the main issue is the dwelling facing the side elevation of a nearby dwelling at close proximity.

In relation to loss of privacy the inspector noted:

The principal elevation of the proposed dwelling, including a large window to its kitchen, would directly face the side elevation of No 10. At such close proximity to the side elevation of No 10, outlook from that window would be considerably constrained. This would make the kitchen an unpleasant space to occupy, resulting in harm to the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling...I therefore find that the proposed development would not provide satisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, with particular regard to outlook.

The sole window facing No 10 at first-floor level would serve a bathroom. A *planning condition could be imposed requiring this window to be obscure-glazed. As such, no direct overlooking towards No 10 would occur*. As a single obscure-glazed window situated in a residential area where some degree of overlooking between dwellings and their rear garden areas is commonplace, the occupiers of No 10 would not suffer from an undue perception of being overlooked...Consequently, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 10, with particular regard to privacy.

Case officer response

Please note wording in italics. The obscurely glazed windows facing No. 10 at first floor level is accepted as suitable. It follows that the obscurely glazed windows on the ground floor in the current proposal, as it only serves a downstairs WC, is also suitable.