



Planning Committee

Application Address	65A Richmond Wood Road, Bournemouth, BH8 9DQ
Proposal	Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to Sui generis eight person HMO
Application Number	P/25/03589/FUL
Applicant	J McCarthy
Agent	Mr O Farr
Ward and Ward Member(s)	Queens Park Cllr Sharon Carr-Brown Cllr Alasdair Keddie
Report Status	Public
Meeting Date	22 January 2026
Summary of Recommendation	Grant in accordance with the details set out below for the reasons as set out in the report.
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Cllr Call In: Sharon Carr-Brown This conversion involves bulky and unsympathetic extensions to maximise HMO capacity. This is fundamentally not in keeping with the character of the area, over-intensifies the site and HMO capacity and sets the wrong precedent for the road. We lose a much-sought after 3/4-bedroomed family house in the process. The way this application has been done also has wider ramifications for BCP planning control.
Case Officer	George Sanders
Is the proposal EIA development	No

Description of Proposal

1. Planning permission is sought for the change of use from a dwellinghouse (C3) to Sui generis eight person HMO. The built development itself, including the dormers, would be completed under the existing Permitted Development (PD) rights, whilst the dwellinghouse remains under C3 use. Post construction, the planning permission would be enacted to trigger the conversion of the dwelling into a Sui generis eight person HMO.

Description of Site and Surroundings

2. Richmond Wood Road is a residential street within the Queens Park area of Bournemouth. Dwellinghouses are typically detached or semi-detached, with traditional roofscapes and building finishes. 65A features a brick and render material finish, hipped roof and two storey bay feature to the front elevation.

Relevant Planning History

Date	Description of Development	Decision
27/08/2025	Single storey rear extension which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original semi-detached dwelling house by 6.00 metres, for which the maximum height would be 3.00 metres and for which the height at the eaves would be 3.00 metres.	Prior Approval Not Required
19/06/2025	Prior notification procedure - Single storey flat roof rear extension extending beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m	Prior Approval Required-Refused

Constraints

3. Relevant site constraints:
- Within Tip Sites Buffer Zone
 - Within Parking Standards SPD (2021) Zone D.

Public Sector Equalities Duty

4. 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

22/09/2025 | Strategic Waste Officer | No Objection:

“The plans are suitable from a Waste Collection Authority perspective.”

12/11/2025 | Highways Officer | No Objection, subject to condition:

“Despite the lack of car parking, on balance this proposal for a change of use to an eight-bed HMO is seen as acceptable by the LHA and no objections are raised on highway grounds, subject to the imposition of a condition”.

Representations

5. Site notices were displayed on the 9th October 2025 and a site visit was conducted on the 6th November 2025. 50 representations were received from the public, all in objection. The key issues raised are summarised in the table below.

Issue	Summary
Parking & Highway Safety	The proposal would add more vehicles to an already busy street for parking, with no off-street parking provision provided.
Noise & Disturbance	There would be an increase in noise from additional residential activity. This includes from increased departures and arrivals to the dwelling and the limited communal space pushing socialising to outdoor spaces.
Residential Character	The HMO would undermine the family orientated nature of Richmond Wood Road. The proposal would set a precedent for future conversions.
Waste & Refuse	Limited space for bins will risk overflowing and on street waste issues.
Loss of Amenity	Concerns have been raised from overshadowing from extensions. This can also include a loss of privacy from overlooking.
Licensing & Management	There is an absence of a management plan for noise, waste and maintenance.
Overcrowding	The lack of communal space and number of bedrooms can be seen as over-intensification.
Concentration of HMOs	Residents have raised that the street has several HMOs and adding another one would harm local character.

Key Issues

6. The key issue(s) involved with this proposal are:

- The impacts on the character and appearance of the area
- The impacts on neighbouring residential amenity
- The impacts on future occupants
- The impacts on parking provision and highways
- The impacts on waste
- The impacts on BNG
- The impacts on Dorset Heathlands
- The impacts on New Forest

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

Policy context

8. 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 the Bournemouth Core Strategy (2012) and other additional planning documents.

Bournemouth Core Strategy (2012)

- CS24: Houses of Multiple Occupation
- CS30: Promoting Green Infrastructure
- CS41: Design Quality

Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002)

- 6.17: HMOs

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Parking Standards SPD (2021)
- Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008)
- Technical Housing Standards- Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

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

Including in particular the following:

Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Paragraph 11 –

“Plans and decisions 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 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.”

Planning Assessment

Character & Appearance of the Area

10 The dormer would be considered Permitted Development and would need to be built prior to the change of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a Sui Generis HMO. This can be conditioned to ensure that the works are completed prior to the change of use being instigated. This was the method used for APP/24/00529/F and APP/25/00182/F, within which the assessments concluded:

“the works to the roof would need to be carried out prior to conversion to the larger HMO to be permitted development. This was secured by condition. It was concluded that the application was purely for conversion to a large-scale HMO and that the conversion to a HMO is in principle acceptable in this area.”

11. For the wrap around dormer to be considered permitted development, they need to comply with the conditions and limitations of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the General Permitted Development Order (as amended):

- permission to use the dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse has been granted only by virtue of Class G, M, 2MA, N, P, PA or Q of Part 3 of this Schedule (changes of use); **COMPLIES.**
- any part of the dwellinghouse would, as a result of the works, exceed the height of the highest part of the existing roof; **COMPLIES.**
- any part of the dwellinghouse would, as a result of the works, extend beyond the plane of any existing roof slope which forms the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse and fronts a highway; **COMPLIES.**
- the cubic content of the resulting roof space would exceed the cubic content of the original roof space by more than 50 cubic metres; **COMPLIES.**
- it would consist of or include:
 - i. the construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform; **COMPLIES**, or
 - ii. the installation, alteration or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe; **COMPLIES**
- the dwellinghouse is on article 2(3) land; **COMPLIES**

12. The change of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a Sui Generis HMO would cause an intensification of the existing use of the dwelling. Dwellings in the surrounding area are typically semi-detached or detached with typically 3-4 bedrooms, like the existing floor plan of 65A Richmond Wood Road (which has 3 bedrooms). Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume an occupancy for the typical dwelling in the area to be between 3 and 6 people. Assuming a maximum occupancy, the additional 2 people for which the application proposes as part of a Sui Generis HMO would not be considered an unreasonable intensification for the area or type of property. It would not cause harm to the character of the area.

13. The position that the rear extension and roof works can be built without requiring planning permission is deemed to be considered a material planning consideration in this case, as with the previously approved APP/24/00529/F and APP/25/00182/F.

14. Whilst the works required for the HMO are required prior to its conversion, they are nevertheless permitted development as the property currently stands. It is therefore considered that a condition requiring those works to be carried out prior to conversion is reasonable in this instance.

15. Therefore, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Outside of the outlined permitted development works, the proposed changes will not be of detriment to the character of the area. The proposed intensification of the dwelling would be considered reasonable for the size dwelling and surrounding properties and not harmful. The development is therefore compliant with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012).

Neighbouring Residential Amenity

16. The dwellinghouse is a semi-detached property adjoined to 65B to the east. To the west and detached is number 63. The works to the property are not being considered as part of this application due to their completion under permitted development. Therefore, the impacts of the dormers on neighbouring amenity cannot be considered. However, if they were considered, there would not be a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.
17. New windows to the rear elevation of the dormer would offer some views of the garden space of 65A and B but this would not be to the detriment of 65B's amenity. The front facing window on the side dormer would only offer views towards the front of the dwellinghouses and again is acceptable.
18. One new window is proposed on the side elevation facing number 63 to accommodate a new bedroom. This is acceptable as it would overlook an area of curtilage used as a side access to the garden. A substantial boundary treatment along the boundary and lack of windows on the facing elevation of number 63 mean there is no overlooking from this new window.
19. The existing dwellinghouse is a three-bedroom property. Regarding the increase in occupancy to the site, it is deemed acceptable. It is already a residential property within an area where larger dwellings in the road have a higher occupancy rate. There may be additional comings and goings but within the context of the road and surrounding dwellings this would not be harmful to surrounding residential amenity.
20. The proposal is compliant with policy regarding the concentration of HMOs within an area. There is no more than 10% of dwellings in the area adjacent to the application property that are within a Use Class C4 or Sui Generis HMO use. 66 properties are within the Policy CS24 catchment area, with 3 of these constituting HMOs. This means only 4.54% of dwellings within the outlined assessment area (as per Policy CS24) are these HMO use classes.
21. Therefore, the impacts on neighbouring amenity are deemed minimal and the proposal is acceptable with Policies CS24 and CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012).

Future Occupants

22. Policy 6.17 of the District Wide Local Plan (2002) has certain criteria regarding the change of use from a C3 to HMO use. This includes the provision of sufficient outdoor garden and amenity space for the use of future occupants. Post construction of the rear extension (of which prior approval has been granted) and bike store to the rear, there would still be sufficient garden space for the activities outlined within Policy 6.17. Furthermore, the proposal includes the provision for every bedroom to have an en-suite bathroom (including toilet and shower) and an additional downstairs WC.
23. The rooms within the property are compliant with the Nationally Described Space Standards (2015). Each bedroom has at least one reasonably sized window and is at least the area required as per the guidance. This is also true of the communal areas such as the joint living and kitchen spaces which is 22.35 metres squared.

24. Therefore, the provision of amenities retained or provided for future occupants of the HMO mean the proposal is compliant with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012), Policy 6.17 of the District Wide Local Plan (2002) and the Nationally Described Space Standards (2015).

Parking Provision & Highways

25. As part of the application process, the Highways Officer was consulted. The application provides no additional parking and includes the provision of a cycle store in the rear garden. The dwellinghouse is within Parking Zone D. Sui Generis HMOs are required to have 1 parking space regardless of Parking Zone, according to the Parking Standards SPD (2021).
26. The Highways Officer found that despite a lack of parking spaces proposed, the change of use is deemed acceptable, and no objection is raised subject to the inclusion of a condition for the cycle facilities to be constructed prior to occupation. As the Highways Officer is the advisory authority on highways and parking, this conclusion is agreed upon, and the proposal will not cause harm to parking provision or highways. This is despite the one parking space not being provided as per the Parking Standards SPD (2021).
27. Therefore, the impacts on the highway and parking provision are deemed acceptable and the scheme is compliant with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012) and Policy 6.17 of the District Wide Local Plan (2002).

Waste

28. As part of the application process, the Strategic Waste Officer was consulted. They raised no objection and stated that the submitted plans were suitable. An occupant of the dwelling will need to ensure the bins are presented for collection at the kerbside and returned to the property boundary following emptying.
29. There are therefore no impacts on waste collection as result of the proposal and it is compliant with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012).

BNG

30. 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.
31. 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 de minimis exemption.

Heathland Mitigation

32. 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) which covers the whole of Bournemouth. As such, the determination of any application for an additional dwelling(s) resulting in increased population and domestic animals should be undertaken with regard to the requirements of the Habitat Regulations 1994. It is considered that an appropriate assessment could not clearly demonstrate that there would not be an adverse effect on the integrity of the sites, particularly its effect upon bird and reptile habitats within the SSSI.

33. Therefore, as of 17th January 2007 all applications received for additional residential accommodation within the borough is subject to a financial contribution towards mitigation measures towards the designated sites. In this case, contribution is required for the two additional rooms over a C4 HMO. A contribution of £720 along with £75 admin fee would need to be secured.

New Forest SAMMS

34. The site lies within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, New Forest SPA and New Forest Ramsar, which are protected under European legislation for their wildlife importance.
35. It has been demonstrated in the recent report by Footprint Ecology to the New Forest Steering Group (New Forest Strategic Access Management & Monitoring (SAMM) Strategy October 2024) and in agreement with Natural England that additional recreational pressure from additional dwelling(s) have the potential to harm the integrity of these designated sites.
36. The proposed development must secure the appropriate level of mitigation to safeguard the New Forest designated sites from recreational related impacts. This will be secured through a Section 106 Agreement. A contribution of £600 along with £60 admin fee would need to be secured, HMOs exceeding six bedrooms must pay a fee of £300 per additional bedroom. As the proposal is for eight bedrooms the site has been charged fees for two additional dwellings to mitigate harm as a result of the larger dwelling.
37. Once paid, the appropriate assessment can conclude that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site and would accord with the requirements set out in Section 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Planning Balance / Conclusion

38. Overall, it is considered that the proposed change of use would be acceptable. The scheme accords with the most important aspects of the Development Plan and there is no identified harm to the issues discussed that could be considered demonstrable to a level which would be considered a reasonable reason for refusal. Therefore, it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Recommendation to Grant

Conditional GRANT

RECOMMENDATION I - That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning Operations to Grant Conditional Permission subject to the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement necessary to secure the mitigation of the impact of the proposed residential development on Dorset Heathlands and the New Forest SAMMS by securing the payment of a financial contribution and conditions (below)

RECOMMENDATION II - That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning Operations to add/amend conditions where necessary.

RECOMMENDATION III - That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning Operations to refuse planning permission if a Legal Agreement has not been satisfactorily completed within three months of the date of this resolution.

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date this permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Block Plan (Received 15/09/2025)
Location Plan (Received 29/10/2025)
PG.1064.25.01 Existing Plans and Elevations
PG.1064.25.02 Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations
0-0-01 Cycle Store - Sheffield Stand

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

3. Prior to the occupation of the property known as 65A Richmond Wood Road as a HMO for 8 persons, the external alterations including the rear extension and alterations to the roof form, to be constructed under permitted development allowances, shall be completed in their entirety.

Reason: In order to ensure that the property meets the required space standards and therefore provides a good standard of living in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy (2012) and Policy 6.17 of the District Wide Local Plan (2002).

4. Before the development is occupied or utilised the cycle parking facilities shown on the hereby approved plans must have been constructed. Thereafter, these must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper construction of the parking facilities and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

5. A Management Plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing no later than 4 weeks from the date of this permission. This should include the contact details for the landlord or any managing agency for the property that can be contacted regarding anti-social behaviour issues 24 hours per day.

Once approved, the approved use shall be implemented in strict accordance with the Management Plan at all times.

Reason: To ensure the facility is well managed.

6. No more than eight persons, excluding staff, shall occupy the premises at 65A Richmond Wood Road at any one time.

Reason: To ensure the intensity of use remains appropriate to the character of the area, to maintain a suitable staff/resident ratio and to minimise potential impacts on residential amenity including noise and disturbance.

Informatives

1. The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (“the biodiversity gain condition”) that development may not begin unless: (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and (b) the planning authority has approved the plan. The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council. There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed in paragraph 17 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

Based on the information provided it is considered that the approval of a biodiversity gain plan would not be required before development can be begun and the statutory biodiversity gain planning condition would not apply. This is because the development is considered to meet the conditions of the ‘de minimis’ exemption, as set out in the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024. The conditions are that the development does not impact on a priority habitat as specified under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006; that the development impacts on less than 25sqm of onsite habitat that has a biodiversity value greater than zero; and that the development impacts on less than 5m of onsite linear habitat.

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.

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.