



# Planning Committee

Application Address	98 Gladstone Road East, Bournemouth, BH7 6HQ
Proposal	Single and two storey rear extensions to the dwellinghouse and construction of a garden room using the existing detached garage footprint.
Application Number	P/25/00153/HOU
Applicant	Mr Martin Wybrow
Agent	Martingales
Ward and Ward Member(s)	Boscombe East & Pokesdown Councillor Eleanor Connolly and Councillor George Farquhar
Report Status	Public
Meeting Date	25 September 2025
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	<b>Refuse for the reasons set out below.</b>
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	<p>Councillor Call In: Cllr Farquhar and Cllr Connolly. For the following reasons, unconditionally:</p> <p>Boscombe Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan CS19, CS20, CS21, CS24 BAP1 Scale &amp; Density BAP8 Houses of Multiple Occupation Article 4 Direction 2011</p> <p>A registered HMO is applying for 2 storey as if they were a single occupancy residence.</p> <p>Single and two storey extensions to dwellinghouse, extension to garage and conversion to garden room and erection of a single storey outbuilding comprising gym/playroom</p> <p>Local resident reports concern for loss of light but may wish to remain anonymous</p>
Case Officer	George Sanders
Is the proposal EIA Development?	No
For the purposes of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017	No

has the application been subject to an appropriate assessment	
---	--

### **Description of Proposal**

1. The proposal is for a two-storey rear extension and a small single storey extension beyond this element. It also includes the demolition of the garage and erection of a garden room which utilises and extends upon the existing garage footprint.

### **Description of Site and Surroundings**

2. Gladstone Road East is a residential street in Boscombe, Bournemouth. Dwellinghouses are typically detached, with some having driveways extending down the side from the highway to garages which are located towards the rear gardens. Material finishes are typically brick, render or a mixture of both. Roofscapes are pitched in a variety of shapes.
3. Number 98 is typical of the dwellinghouses along the road. It is a detached dwelling finished with grey render. There is a small conservatory attached to the rear elevation. In the garden, the west boundary (between the garage and the rear boundary) is hedging. The east boundary is a breezeblock wall, which forms a boundary separating the garden from a row of dwellings on Haviland Mews whose walls would otherwise back onto it.

### **Relevant Planning History:**

4. The relevant planning history has been outlined in the table below:

Issue Date	Application Number	Description of Development	Outcome
31/03/2023	PRE-6052	Change of use to an 8-bedroom HMO (Sui Generis Use)	Written Response Given: Not Supported
09/07/2007	7-2007-6052-C	Alterations, extensions and conversion of premises to four flats and erection of a bin/ cycle store.	Refused
05/04/2007	7-2007-6052-B	Alterations, extension and conversion of dwellinghouse into 4 flats, erection of cycle store and formation of parking spaces.	Refused

### **Constraints**

5. There are no relevant site constraints

### **Public Sector Equalities Duty**

6. 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.

## **Consultations**

7. The following consultation responses have been received:

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Tree Officer	04/07/2025	Trees of low visual amenity will be lost. Limited scope for new soft landscaping at the site.  No Objection
Highways Officer	06/06/2025	The existing garage is not used for parking and the conversion is therefore seen as acceptable.  The previous iteration of the scheme showed a front extension which prevented car parking. Despite the Zone A nature of the proposal (Parking Standards SPD), no parking is lost under the new plans, and no changes are made to the existing parking layout.  No Objection

## **Representations**

8. Site notices were displayed in 3 locations on the 29/05/2025. Several representations were received from residents. These consisted of:

<b>Representation Type</b>	<b>Number</b>
Support	0
Objection	12
Other/ Comment	1

9. The issues and objections raised are summarised below, grouped by concerns.

<b>Concern</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Dwellinghouses use as an HMO	Existing dwellinghouse is being used as a HMO and not as a family dwellinghouse.  The application is a method of increasing occupancy rates.  The (initially proposed) 2 garden rooms will be used and rented as contained annexes (this has since been reduced to 1 garden room).
Character and appearance of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The footprint of development is large and not in keeping with the area.</li><li>• The dwellinghouse is already one of the largest in the street, the proposal would make the size out of character.</li></ul>
Neighbouring Amenity	Comments regarding the impact on 96 Gladstone Road East: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The application dwellinghouse shares a driveway to the garages to the rear with number 96. The development will cause noise and an unwanted traffic of people on the driveway.</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of privacy.</li> </ul> <p>Comments regarding the impact on 100 Gladstone Road East:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bulk and massing with lead to a loss of light. The proposed extension would be 1m away from windows, including habitable rooms.</li> <li>• The proposal would create overlooking over the garden.</li> </ul>
Landscaping and Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The east boundary includes a 2x Fir Trees which would need to be addressed due to being overgrown and within falling distance of the garden rooms (now single garden room).</li> <li>• The rear boundary includes 1 Fir Tree which would need to be cut down to accommodate the garden rooms (now single garden room).</li> <li>• A smaller tree may perish to give access for works.</li> <li>• All these trees are established and shown on the 2007 rejected planning application for flats.</li> <li>• The rear garden is sizeable and the only space on the block for wildlife such as nesting birds.</li> </ul>

### **Key Issue(s)**

10. The key issues involved with this proposal are:

- The impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- The impact on neighbouring residential amenity
- The impact on existing and future occupiers
- The impact on trees
- The impact on highways
- The impact on BNG

These issues will be considered along with other matters relevant to this proposal below.

### **Policy context**

11. Local documents:

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan for an area, except where material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in this case comprises of:

#### **Bournemouth Core Strategy (2012):**

- CS30: Promoting Green Infrastructure
- CS41: Design

## **Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (2019):**

- BAP1: Scale and Density of Development
- BAP2: Good Design for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

## **Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:**

- Parking Standards SPD (2021)
- Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008)

## **12. National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF” / “Framework”) (2024)**

Including the following:

- “Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development: Paragraph 11
  - i. “Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
  - ii. 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 strong 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, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.”
- “Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places: Paragraph 135
  - Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:
    - a. will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
    - b. are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
    - c. are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
    - d. establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
    - e. optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

- f. create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience."

## **Planning Assessment**

### The impact on the character and appearance of the area.

13. Although the proposed extension would increase the footprint, bulk and massing of the dwellinghouse by a substantial amount, it would do little to impact the character of the area.
14. The extension is to the rear and would be largely unseen from Gladstone Road East except for oblique angles between gaps in the houses. There would be some views from surrounding roads such as potentially from Haviland Mews, but this would be from the rear windows of dwellings and any views from the public domain would be distant.
15. The use of render would match the existing dwelling. The proposed roofscape would be visible from the front elevation, but only a small amount which is pitched to match the existing roof. From the rear, the roof will be subject to more substantial changes, but a gable design is not alien to the area with examples on Gladstone Road East and Portman Road.
16. The garden room would not be visible from the highway except when viewed between the gap between number 96 and 98. From this view, it would appear similar to that of the existing garage in form, due to the distance and orientation of the garden room.
17. From the properties of Portman Road, the garden room would be visible from the rear windows. The garden of number 98 is long and open; the garden room would slightly detract from this feeling of openness for properties along Portman Road (specifically those closer to the junction with Gladstone Road East). However, despite the additional built form, there is still a substantial amount of green and open space to the south and east of the garden room which helps maintain the areas open feel. Crucially, enough to maintain a buffer to the properties of Haviland Road. The garden room is also single storey in height.
18. Although the design would increase the bulk and massing of number 98, it is felt that the site can accommodate the proposed extensions. The design and placement of the development would mean it would not impact on the character and appearance of the area negatively. This makes the proposal compliant with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012) as well as the Policy BAP2 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (2019).

### The impact on neighbouring residential amenity

#### *Haviland Mews*

19. These properties back onto the side boundary of the application site. However, there are no overlooking ground floor windows facing towards the application site. Each of these dwellings have roof lights some of which face towards the applicant property.
20. Due to the angle and positioning of the rooflights, it is unlikely that any new windows on either the rear extension or garden room will increase overlooking of these neighbouring properties.

#### *96 Gladstone Road East*

21. The occupier of this property has submitted a representation raising issue with the development being of detriment to his privacy. The proposal seeks to create 3 new windows facing this property. Two of which are on the original dwelling and a third within the new extension.
22. The two windows proposed on the main dwelling would be for a kitchen at ground floor and a bedroom at first floor. The kitchen window would be considered a habitable room and there is currently a 2m separation distance (the shared driveway) between the dwellinghouses. This window would be opposite 2x windows, one for a bathroom (which is obscure glazed) and the other a lounge. The sightlines from the proposed kitchen window, which would be of high usage compared to other rooms, would create additional harmful overlooking and impact on the amenity of the residents of number 96. There are no mitigating factors to this as there is a lack of any boundary treatments and a small separation distance.
23. The proposed first floor bedroom window is opposite a bathroom window. This bathroom window is obscure glazed at the lower part, but the upper pane is not and can be opened. This could potentially lead to some overlooking. Furthermore, the 2m distance and clear view would at the very least create the perception of being overlooked.
24. The new side elevation window to the living room/ diner in the extension would look over the shared driveway of both 96 and 98, including the area in front of number 96's garage. This loss of privacy is raised by the occupier. Currently, the rear conservatory does offer some views over this land, but I noted on my site visit there were blinds in the down position which removed the scope for overlooking of this space. The new window would be further south towards the garden and offer more direct views over this shared space. This could be harmful to this neighbour's residential amenity. However, I note that the window is a secondary window serving the living room/ dining room and therefore it would be reasonable to condition this window to be obscure glazed. This would not be to the detriment of the applicant because they would retain an outlook and good light levels from the bi-fold doors and other window in the rear elevation.
25. The removal of the garage and replacement with a garden room would create a wall which faces the boundary of 96. However, no new windows will impact this dwellinghouse. Any increase in noise would be residential and to ensure this the garden room could be conditioned (if the application is approved) to remain ancillary to the dwellinghouse. The positioning and entry point (off the shared driveway and the rear doors of number 98) would mean any non-ancillary use would raise further concerns over its access, noise and privacy issues regarding number 96.
26. It is noted the property is subject to an enforcement complaint and representations have raised concerns over the dwellinghouse operating as an HMO. Conditioning the garden room to be ancillary and not for separate rental use would avoid exacerbating these concerns and problems associated with increasing occupancy numbers. The alleged use of the premises as a HMO is a separate Enforcement matter at this time.
27. In conclusion it is considered the harm to the neighbouring amenity of number 96 would be of such a detriment that it can be considered a reason for refusal. The new kitchen and bedroom windows would lead to excessive overlooking over number 96.

#### *100 Gladstone Road East*

28. This dwellinghouse is to the east of the property. The proposal does not seek to add additional windows to the facing elevation. However, the two-storey extension would be in close proximity to number 100 (1.25m at the narrowest point). Number 100 also has windows on the facing elevation, which will be impacted by the proposal.
29. There is an obscure glazed window on the projecting bay. This would not be impacted as any impact on light levels in the room this window serves comes from the existing building.

30. The ground floor has a large window on the facing elevation towards the rear of the dwellinghouse. This window is level with the rear corner of the application dwelling and has been demonstrated as being a window for a kitchen/ diner. The proposed rear extension due to its two-storey height and additional rearward projection would negatively impact this window. The distance between the two properties, height and footprint of the extension would create a massing which is considered harmful on the amenity of number 100. This is by way of appearing overbearing and oppressive, as well as resulting in a loss of light and outlook. The kitchen/ diner is a high use area and the extension would have a significant impact on this room.
31. At first floor there is another large window above the ground floor window. Again, due to the height and additional reward projection of the proposed extension this window would be significantly impacted. The distance between the two properties, height and footprint of the extension would create a massing which is considered harmful on the amenity of number 100. This is by way of appearing overbearing and oppressive as well as resulting in a loss of light and outlook.
32. The garden room bi-fold doors will face number 100 and are taller than standard windows. However, the distances between this new room and the neighbouring property and garden, coupled with the boundary treatment (a wall) between the properties mitigate against any harmful overlooking.
33. Therefore, the impacts on the amenity of number 100 due to the large size of the two-storey extension make this development unacceptable in terms of impact on existing windows. It causes detrimental harm to the neighbouring amenity for these neighbouring residents.

#### *Summary*

34. In summary, the development would cause unacceptable detrimental harm to the neighbouring amenity of numbers 96 and 100 Gladstone Road East. This would be contrary to Policy CS41 (Design) of the Core Strategy (2012), BAP2 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (2019) as well as provisions of the Residential Design Guide (2008) and the NPPF (2024).

#### The impact on trees

35. Large trees were identified during the site visit as being present near the proposed development area. This was also commented on by neighbours (see representations).
36. The Tree Officer commented that trees of low visual amenity will be lost and there is limited scope for new soft landscaping at the site. They raised no objection to the proposal.

#### The impact on highways

37. The demolition of the garage would not impact parking provision. Any development to the front of the dwellinghouse was removed through amendments, therefore not changing the existing parking provision and satisfying the Parking Standards SPD (2021).
38. The Highways Officer has raised no objection. Therefore, the impact on highways is deemed to be acceptable and compliant with the Parking Standards SPD (2021) as well as BAP1 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (2019) (regarding the pressure for on street parking in the area).



## The impact on BNG

39. The NPPF at chapter 15 'conserving and enhancing the natural environment' sets out government views on minimising the impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains where possible and contributing to halt the overall decline in biodiversity. The Local Plan Policy CS30 – biodiversity and geodiversity, sets out policy requirements for the protection and where possible, a net gain in biodiversity.
40. In addition, a 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) is required as per the Environment Act 2021 though exemptions apply. This proposal is exempt as it is a householder application.

## Planning Balance / Conclusion

41. Despite having acceptable impacts on the character of the area, highways, trees and BNG the proposed development does cause detrimental harm to neighbouring residential amenity in terms of appearing overbearing, oppressive and leading to loss of light and outlook from windows and as such this tilts the planning balance in favour of a planning refusal.
42. The harm to the neighbouring amenity of numbers 96 and 100 Gladstone Road East would not be acceptable and contrary to Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012), BAP2 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (2019), as well as provisions of the Residential Design Guide (2008) and the NPPF (2024). Therefore, planning permission must be refused.

## Recommendation

### **Refuse, for the following reasons:**

1. Unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity
2. Contrary to Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (2012), BAP2 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (2019) as well as the provisions of the Residential Extensions: A Design Guide (2008) and the NPPF (2024).

It is considered that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the residential neighbouring amenity of numbers 96 and 100 Gladstone Road East. The two-storey rear extension would be overbearing and lead to a loss of light and outlook from the neighbouring windows at 100 Gladstone Road East. The new windows to the bedroom and kitchen would create overlooking which is of excessive detriment to the neighbouring amenity of number 96. This constitutes detrimental harm to the neighbouring amenity of this dwellinghouse which is contrary to Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Core Strategy (2012), Policy BAP2 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (2019) as well as the provisions of the adopted Residential Extensions: A Design Guide (2008) and the NPPF (2024).

### **Informatives:**

1. For the avoidance of doubt the decision on the application hereby determined was made having regard to the following plans:

J.26.2024-03 Existing Floor Plan  
J.26.2024-04 Existing Elevations

J.26.2024-05 Revision B Proposed Floor Plans  
J.26.2024-06 Revision A Proposed Elevations  
J.26.2024-01 Location Plan  
J.26.2024-02 B Block Plan

### **Background Documents:**

“Documents uploaded to that part of the Council’s website that is publicly accessible and specifically relates to the application the subject of this report including all related consultation responses, representations and documents submitted by the applicant in respect of the application.

Notes.

This excludes all documents which are considered to contain exempt information for the purposes of Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972.

Reference to published works is not included.”