



Planning Committee

Application Address	426-432 Holdenhurst Road Bournemouth BH8 9AA
Proposal	Redevelopment of the site to provide residential accommodation of 20 flats (use class C3): including landscaping, refuse storage, cycle storage and other associated infrastructure.
Application Number	7-2024-29061-A
Applicant	Clifton Developments Ltd
Agent	Ken Parke Planning Consultants Ltd
Ward and Ward Member(s)	East Cliff & Springbourne Ward - Councillor Sara Armstrong - Councillor Anne Filler - Councillor Anne-Marie Moriarty
Report Status	Public
Meeting Date	28 th May 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	At the request of Councillor Sara Armstrong, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bins and waste management issue• Loss of the existing parking spaces.• Parking - impact on already overcrowded surrounding roads.• Heritage - look and feel of the area and dominance of the building on the landscape.• Deliveries – a modern part of life nowadays. There is nowhere for delivery vans to safely stop. This could cause traffic blockages and reduce access as delivery vans park on the pavements/bus stop.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built up area - demolition and environmental impacts of that. • Height of the building- privacy, light impact around surrounding properties. • Size of the flats - tiny - quality of life for the residents. • Lack of green space for residents. • Lack of space to dry clothing. • The need for family housing not more 1 bed flats. • Against Local Plan
Case Officer	Adam Davies
Is the proposal EIA Development?	No

Description of Proposal

1. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of two no. two-storey buildings comprised of office spaces on the ground floor and residential on the first floor (5 flats), to be replaced with a 3.5 storey building comprising 20 residential units including landscaping, refuse storage, cycle storage and other associated infrastructure. The ground floor will provide 6 flats, bin store and a small cycle store; the first and second floors will have 6 flats each, and the third floor will have 2 flats that will be set within the roof-scape. All flats will be accessed from a central core staircase and lift. The flats are comprised of fourteen 1-bedroom flats, and six 2-bedroom flats. For further details on the internal spaces of these flats, see the Planning Assessment section below.
2. Pedestrian access to the building is proposed from the footway along Holdenhurst Road with a separate access to a larger cycle store to the rear. No vehicular access is proposed as the development would be a car free scheme.
3. The proposal has been revised from the original scheme of 26 flats to the current layout of 20 flats to address concerns raised by the consultees.

Description of Site and Surroundings

4. The site is located to the southern side of Holdenhurst Road near its junction with Jefferson Avenue. It currently comprises of two detached properties that were originally constructed as pairs of semi-detached villas (426 – 428 and 430 – 432 Holdenhurst Road); both with office spaces on the ground floor and residential uses on the first floor and forming part of a row of matching two storey properties, lining one side of the street. The existing buildings include brick finishes of red and buff colours and bay features set within forward projecting twin gables at the first-floor level. All properties along this row include single storey front extensions, built out to the line of the former front gardens’ boundary walls, to facilitate the conversion of ground floor into commercial use. There is also a regular gap between properties along this row that help in maintaining rhythm for the street and contribute to the local context.

5. The buildings along this section of Holdenhurst Road are a mix of commercial and residential uses, although predominantly it is residential with varying plot sizes, building scales and designs. The properties in the vicinity consist of a mix of earlier two storey Edwardian buildings to the southern side and later 20th century/early 21st century developments of two storeys with attics on the northern side of the street. The latter, despite their later date, have taken reference from traditional building form, including hipped and pitched roofs, bay windows, stone lintels and sills, sash windows, brickwork etc.
6. The Church of St Mary, a Grade II listed building is located to the southern side of the street close to the application site and although of a larger scale, maintains the architectural hierarchy and primacy within the overall street scene.

Relevant Planning History

7. **7-2023-29061** - Demolish existing buildings and erect block of 26 flats with bin and cycle stores – Refused July 2024, for the following reasons:-

The proposed development, by reason of unjustified loss of employment floorspaces would have a significant impact on the health of the local economy and reduce the range of local sustainable employment opportunities contrary to policy CS27 of the Core Strategy 2012. Additionally, by reason of a proposed housing mix that will not reflect the housing size demands of the Borough, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS21 as well as the NPPF which require schemes to provide range of housing types and tenures based on local housing needs. As such, the proposals are unacceptable in principle and by definition, will not result in a sustainable development.

Moreover, by reason of its excessive scale, mass, bulk, footprint, height and bulky crown roof, the proposed development would not reflect the scale and mass of built form along this section of Holdenhurst Road; will dominate the street scene and be an intrusive feature that will have detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the Grade II Listed Building. The public benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. The development is therefore deemed contrary to paras 203, 205, 206, 208 & 212 of the NPPF and Policies CS21, CS39 and CS41 of the Core Strategy as well as policy 6.10 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan. Taken together, these policies seek to protect designated heritage assets and ensure that development is of a high-quality design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

Furthermore, by reason of introducing an array of higher level habitable windows in the rear elevation, the proposal will have a direct overlooking into the private rear amenity areas of No. 9 and No. 11 Curzon Road resulting in loss of residential privacy. Additionally, a large number of higher level habitable windows will be visible from the amenity spaces of N9 Curzon Road, N1 Jefferson Road and N1A Jefferson Road that will result in perceived loss of privacy. The additional bulk and mass of the new building will be conspicuous from habitable windows of N3 – 7 Curzon Road as well as from the private amenity areas of N434 Holdenhurst Road and N9 Curzon Road and due to limited separation from the boundaries, will appear overbearing to the neighbouring residential amenity. Due to their relative siting and introduction of additional mass, bulk and height closer to the shared boundary, the proposal will have an overshadowing impact on the side windows and private patio areas of N434 Holdenhurst Road. No BRE recommended daylight assessment is provided to

demonstrate the proposal will have acceptable impact on neighbouring properties. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policies CS21 and CS41 of the Core Strategy, Policy 6.10 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan, the Residential Design Guide and the key principles of the NPPF. Together these require new development to respect the amenity and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Additionally, the proposal has failed to demonstrate adequate internal and external amenities will be provided for the future occupiers, contrary to Policies CS41 of the Core Strategy, section 3.7 of the Residential Design Guide and the aims the NPPF. The proposal would not provide adequate waste collection facilities for the future residents contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS41, and recommendations contained in the residential design guide.

In addition, it is considered that the proposal will result in a significant increase in non-car trips. The failure to make an appropriate contribution towards mitigation measures would have negative impact on the existing sustainable travel infrastructure. For this reason, the proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS14, CS18 and CS41.

In addition, it is considered that the proposed development would place additional demand on the Dorset Heathlands SPA (Special Protection Area), Ramsar Site and Dorset Heaths SAC (Special Area of Conservation). The failure to make an appropriate contribution towards mitigation measures (SAMM) would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the sites and is considered contrary to Policy CS33 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and the provisions of the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD.

Constraints

8. Following constraints apply to the site:
- Within the setting of Grade II Listed Building
 - BCP Council Parking Zone B
 - Flood Zone 1
 - Dorset Heathlands – 5km Zone

Public Sector Equalities Duty

9. 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

10. In accordance with regulation 9(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) ("the Habitat Regulations), for the purposes of this application, appropriate regard has been had to the relevant Directives (as defined in the Habitats Regulations) in so far as they may be affected by the determination.
11. For the purposes of section 40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, in assessing this application, consideration has been given as to any appropriate action to further the "general biodiversity objective".
12. 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.
13. For the purposes of this application, in accordance with section 17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998, due regard has been had to, including the need to do all that can reasonably be done to prevent, (a) crime and disorder in its area (including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment); (b) the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in its area; and (c) re-offending in its area.
14. For the purposes of this report regard has been had to the Human Rights Act 1998, the Human Rights Convention and relevant related issues of proportionality.

Consultations

15. Urban Design Officer – No Objection, Subject to conditions
16. Heritage Officer – Objection (due to impact on the setting of a listed church, see relevant section of the report below)
17. Highways Officer - No Objection, Subject to conditions
18. Waste Management - No Objection
19. Flood Management - No Objection, Subject to conditions
20. Environmental Health - No Objection, Subject to conditions

Representations

21. Site notices were posted near the application site on 09/01/2025 with an expiry date for consultation of the 31/01/2025. Additionally, a press notice was also posted. Thirteen representations have been received, 6 representations were received objecting to the proposal, 3 comments were made by the Chair of East Cliff and Springbourne Neighbourhood Forum, objecting to the proposal, plus one local councillor objecting to the proposals. The following concerns have been raised:
 - The proposal does not include any on-site parking provision.
 - The local need is for family type homes and not flats
 - No parking will cause a major issue for parking in surrounding area
 - Unbalanced mix of housing with a very high proportion of flats.
 - The size of the proposed development is not proportionate to its surroundings.
 - The proposal would result in the loss of commercial property that could be used to supply local jobs within walking distance of residential properties.
 - Little or no green space is available.

Key Issue(s)

22. The key issue(s) involved with this proposal are:
- Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
 - Principle of development;
 - Impact on the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the designated heritage asset;
 - Residential amenity of neighbouring properties;
 - Amenity of future occupants;
 - Highways considerations;
 - Waste and recycling;
 - Drainage;
 - Heathlands;
 - New Forest SAMM
 - Affordable housing
23. These issues will be considered along with other matters relevant to this proposal below.

Policy context

24. Local documents:

Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (2012):

Policy CS1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy CS4 – Surface Water Flooding

Policy CS6 – Delivering Sustainable Communities

Policy CS14 – Delivering Transport Infrastructure

Policy CS16 – Parking Standards

Policy CS18 – Increasing Opportunities for Cycling and Walking

Policy CS21 – Housing Distribution Across Bournemouth

Policy CS27 – Protecting Unallocated Employment Sites

Policy CS33 – Heathlands

Policy CS38 – Minimising Pollution

Policy CS39 – Designated Heritage Assets

Policy CS41 – Quality Design

District Wide Local Plan (2002):

Policy 3.20 – Contamination

Policy 3.28 – Flooding

Policy 4.25 – Landscaping

Policy 6.10 – Flatted Developments

Other

BCP Parking Standards SPD (January 2021)

Residential Development: A Design Guide (2008)

Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020 – 2025 SPD

Affordable Housing DPD and SPD

25. National Planning Policy Framework(2024) (“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 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, 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

Presumption in favour of sustainable development

26. At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. NPPF paragraph 11 states that in the case of decision making, the presumption in favour of sustainable development means that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless policies in the Framework that protect areas of assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposals or any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
27. Footnote 8 of paragraph 11 provides that in the case of applications involving the provision of housing, relevant policies are out of date if the local planning authority is (i) unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites or (ii) where the Housing

Delivery Test (HDT) result is less than 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

28. The NPPF (2024) paragraph 78 requires local planning authorities to identify and update a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing. Paragraph 78 goes on to state that the supply should be demonstrated against either the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against the local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. Where the Housing Delivery Test indicates delivery has fallen below the local planning authority's housing requirement over the previous three years, a buffer should be included as set out in paragraph 79 of the NPPF.
29. At 9 February 2026 BCP Council had a housing land supply of **2.55** years against a 5-year housing requirement that includes a 20% buffer. For the purposes of paragraph 11 of the NPPF, it is therefore appropriate to regard relevant housing policies as out of date as the local planning authority is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of homes.
30. In this instance, the scheme would provide a net 15 additional dwellings that would contribute towards the Council's housing delivery target. Overall, there is no objection to the principle of the proposed development, subject to its compliance with the adopted local policies. This is assessed below.
31. For this planning application the benefits provided from the supply of new homes are considered to carry significant weight in the planning balance

Principle of Development:

32. The starting point of decision making is the development plan. Section 70[2] of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 state that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, Development Plan consists of Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and saved policies of Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan 2002 which are read alongside relevant SPDs and the National Planning Policy Framework.
33. The existing buildings currently benefit from mixed use of offices (Use Class E(g)(i)) on the ground floor and residential flats on the upper floors. The proposal is to replace the mixed use with residential flats that will result in loss of employment floor space. The application site has not been allocated as an employment land. Consequently, Core Strategy policy CS27 relating to Protecting Unallocated Employment Sites applies. Policy CS27 states that:

“Development resulting in the loss of sites or premises used, or last used, within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8 outside the allocated employment sites will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that either:

 - The current use causes environmental problems; or
 - The location of the premises is no longer suitable for employment use.

Replacement uses will favour other employment generating uses prior to sites being considered for residential development. Prior to other non-employment uses being considered it must be demonstrated that an employment use is not forthcoming and the land and/or premises has been sufficiently and realistically marketed for a minimum of 12 months”.
34. The applicant has provided the statement below to the loss of the commercial space:-

“The loss of the redundant commercial units is not detrimental to the area, given that the ground floor commercial units have slowly been abandoned over the last decade. The last

business, which was an accountancy firm vacated the premises in July 2024 following a period of not being able to pay the rent for the office anymore. The business is still in operation but operates from the home of the accountant”.

The applicant continues:

“In principle the loss of the redundant commercial ground floor units is acceptable. It should not be required that marketing evidence be obligatory in this application as it is obvious these units are not suitable for continued use as offices”.

35. As per the above point, no evidence (other than the statements above) has been submitted to demonstrate why an employment use is not considered suitable prior to a residential development coming forward. The viability assessment report submitted to support the application states that the offices are in 3 star condition with an average market value of £2,903 per sqm and average rent potential of £198.31 per sqm per annum. Based on this information it is considered that the existing employment floor space has the potential for continuing as an alternative employment generating use. Similarly, it has not been demonstrated that the commercial use caused environmental problems. The proposals are therefore considered contrary to Policy CS27.
36. The site is within 400m of a key transport route and Policy CS21 applies. Policy CS21 states that proposals for residential development within these areas will be expected to reflect the housing size demands of the area as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). As part of the emerging local plan preparation, a Local Housing Needs Assessment report has been produced in 2021 that identifies the appropriate mix of units based on the demand within BCP Council’s area. The proposals are for the erection of 14 x 1-bedroom flats (70%) and 6 x 2-bedroom flats (30%). This does not correspond with the recommended housing mix identified in the LHNA, which identifies a need for more family friendly housing (5% 1 bed, 35% 2 bed, 40% 3 bed and 20% 4 bed+).
37. In Chapter 9 (Family Households and the Appropriate Mix of Housing) of the Dorset and BCP Housing Needs Assessment (November 2021), the assessment identifies a recommended mix across the entire Borough, with the broad focus of the size of homes required for different tenure groups. Paragraph 9.39 “...there may be a case on a site-by-site basis, or at a specific point in time for some minor adjustments.” The suggested mix is broken down by tenure and in essence, requires a higher percentage figure of 1-bedroom units.

BCP	1- bedroom	2-bedrooms	3-bedrooms	4+- bedrooms
Market	5%	35%	40%	20%
Affordable Home Ownership	25%	40%	25%	10%
Affordable Housing (rented)	35%	35%	25%	5%

Table 1.2 Dorset and BCP Housing Needs Assessment

38. The applicant has acknowledged that the proposed development has a higher number of one bedroom units than the 2021 Housing Needs Assessment figures call for; however they state:
- “As paragraph 9.32 notes, the site location and character of an area are relevant considerations in determining housing mix. In this case, the application site is located on a busy distributor road and does not have the appropriate space to the rear to easily provide multiple private gardens or the parking required for larger units within Zone B”.
39. The applicant further states:
- “The site location within close proximity to services, facilities and options for sustainable travel especially with direct bus routes to the university means the location will therefore be attractive young people generally without children, who are seeking access to the housing market. As a result, one-bedroom units in this location will not only offer attractive forms of accommodation to potential future occupiers, but wholly appropriate forms of accommodation too”.
40. Following a site visit, and a review of the surrounding environment, the officer is in agreement with the applicant that this location is more suited to apartments.
41. Overall, the proposed development, by reason of unjustified loss of employment floorspaces would have a detrimental impact on the health of the local economy and reduce the range of local sustainable employment opportunities contrary to Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy 2012.
42. Following a review of the proposed housing mix, as per the comments above, the proposal would comply with the requirements of Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS21. On balance, the proposal is acceptable on that issue.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

43. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that “good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities”. Additionally, paragraph 139 states that “Development that is not well designed should be refused”. Similarly, Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy states that a development must respect and reflect the site and its surroundings in terms of scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance and must be of high-quality design. This is reinforced by section 2.0 of the Residential Design Guide which requires developments to have a sense of place and respond positively to their surroundings by paying special attention to the local distinctiveness.
44. The existing buildings on the site are modest 2 storey mixed-use units of an average 8.5m height with simple hipped roofs and two subservient gables on top. There are single storey flat roof elements to the front containing the commercial offices. The ground floor has limited windows and does not provide a strongly active frontage or high-quality appearance at present. There is a car parking area to the rear.
45. The proposal will replace these buildings with a block of 20 flats and associated paraphernalia that will be 10m (3 storey) and 12.9m (3.5 storey) high with accommodation in the roof space. An earlier application was refused due to the size and mass of the building. The proposed building remains three storeys in height with accommodation in the roof, but has been amended to step down on each side to form a softer character in order to remove the outlook of a large and bulky building. There are other buildings within a short distance which are of similar height, despite this immediate section on the Southern side of Holdenhurst Road being predominantly two storeys in scale. There would be a change in the type of building on site, however, this proposal is seen as a positive change following

amendments to the building (removal of 6 flats), reducing the roof line to a stepped approach and improved materials.

Parameters	Existing	Proposed	% Increase
Building footprint (sqm)	376 (combined footprint of two buildings)	381.2sqm	1.38
Width (m)	10.8 (426 – 428 Holdenhurst Road) 12.7 (430 – 432 Holdenhurst Road) 3.85m gap between the properties	26.6m	14
Ridge height (m)	8.5 average	10m (3 storey) 12.9m (3.5 storey)	17.65 (for 2m) 51.76 (for 14.4m)

Table 1: Existing and proposed building parameters

46. As can be seen from the above table, the proposal would result in an increase in bulk, mass, width and height compared to the existing buildings. However, as described previously, in order to reduce the bulk and mass, a stepped approach has been incorporated into the design to reduce the flat crown roof. The urban design officer comments:
- “While the scale would result in a change of character, I consider the appearance of the building and frontage planting in the street scene to be positive when compared to the existing buildings with flat roof front extensions and dead frontage at street level”.
47. Both the proposed footprint and height of the building would be greater than the houses in the immediate neighbouring area, however, not too dissimilar to buildings nearby on Holdenhurst Road, particularly on the northern side, and further to the west adjacent to the junction with the A338. The front of the proposed building has incorporated 3 storey bay windows on 2 elevation fronts, similar to other buildings also on Holdenhurst Road, for example, 385 Holdenhurst Road.
48. The introduction of Juliet balconies and patios to the front of the proposal provides a more active frontage to Holdenhurst Road.
49. It is to be noted that the current proposal has been revised during the determination process to address concerns raised by the Heritage and Urban Design officers in regard to the impact of the proposed development on the character of the area. To conclude, following amendments to the proposal to reduce the scale, mass, bulk, footprint and height, the proposed development would reflect the scale and mass of built form along this section of Holdenhurst Road. The proposal represents a more sympathetic development than the earlier refused 26 flat scheme, which had a greater mass and bulk. The development therefore complies with Policies CS21 and CS41 of the Core Strategy as well as Policy 6.10 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan.

Impact on Heritage Assets

50. The site lies close to the Grade II listed Church of St Mary, which lies approximately 30 metres to the West on the other side of Curzon Road. Despite the physical separation of the church from the site, the wide street with its open character provides clear street views that allow the Grade II listed church to be experienced in conjunction with the existing villas including the application site.
51. Historic England's guidance advises that setting should be considered to extend to all of the land, whether public or private, from which a heritage asset can be experienced, which in this case includes the street. It is acknowledged that the existing buildings within the application site with single storey flat roof front extensions have a poor appearance, and that the amended scheme with more traditional design elements relate better to the character of Springbourne. The previous refusal included a 4 storey proposal. The revised application has seen a 3.5 storey element reduced to 2.5 storey on either side of the building. Although the 3.5 storey element would be visible in the street scene, the current proposal is of similar ilk to other buildings within the vicinity.
52. Whilst the roof of the proposed building now sits just below the height of the St Mary's Church and the eaves align to those of the church, the overly large building in terms of its size, scale, width, bulk and massing would cause slight harm to the setting and primacy of the designated heritage asset. A heritage statement has been submitted, which states:-

"Significant material changes to the development have now been made since the previous refused application which we consider now make the development more diminishing on the site and within the street scene and setting of the listed building. The proposed building better reflects the local vernacular in terms of the design and materiality. In this regard, we consider the development will preserve the setting of the Listed Building and incorporate a building of good quality design and proportions which will contribute towards the street scene. Moreover, the building will not in its design layout and scale give rise to any harm to the significance of the Listed Building including its setting.

The Applicant recognises that 'great weight' must be attributed to any harm identified irrespective of whether this is substantial or less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, as Paragraph 205 states. It is considered however that, having regard for the revised design of the proposed building, its carefully designed front façade and stepped roof form, the development will sit comfortably and appropriately within the surrounding environment and historical context of the Listed Building St Mary Church.

In summary, there is no harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed Building or its setting, and with reference to Paragraph 208* of the NPPF the heritage balance is not therefore engaged as there is no harm in heritage terms. If the Council disagreed with this view, the significant public benefit of the provision of much needed housing would clearly outweigh any perceived harm to the significance of the listed building".

**(Now paragraph 215 NPPF 2024)*

53. The applicant has also submitted indicative street scene and images from different viewpoints of the proposal and church setting, as requested by the heritage team. From these images, it is clear that the proposed block of flats would be wider than the church within the Holdenhurst Road street scene, so failing to preserve the primacy of this key designated heritage asset and impacting detrimentally on its wider setting. The harm to the designated heritage asset is considered to be 'less than substantial'.
54. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that where 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. Great weight must be given to a designated heritage asset's conservation and any harm to its significance requires clear and convincing justification. On balance, this site, due to its setting on a busy main road, and reviewing the wider character, is suited to an intensified scheme. There are similar scale buildings to the east of the church. Whilst the proposal would deliver 20 market houses and no affordable housing, the applicant has amended the original proposal to reduce the harm to the grade II listed building and has provided some justification within the heritage statement that there would ultimately be a public benefit to this scheme from the housing provision given the Council's lack of 5 year housing supply.

55. To conclude, there would be less than substantial harm to the character and appearance to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building, however, the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. The development therefore complies to paras 207 – 215 of the NPPF and Policies CS21, CS39 and CS41 of the Core Strategy as well as policy 6.10 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

56. The application site shares its boundary with a flatted terraced property at 424 Holdenhurst Road/ 1 – 7 Curzon Road to the west side; a two storey semi-detached property at 9 Curzon Road and a mixed-use property at 1a Jefferson Road to the rear; and two-storey dwellings at 1 Jefferson Road and 434 Holdenhurst Road to the east. The proposal will introduce a 3.5 building within approximately 10m of the rear boundary with 9 Curzon Road; 3.3m of the side boundary with the terrace at 424 Holdenhurst Road / 1 – 7 Curzon Road and within 3.2m of the side boundary with 434 Holdenhurst Road.

Overshadowing/ Loss of Light Impact

57. The proposal will introduce a larger and taller building within the application site that will be closer to the neighbouring properties. However, the new footprint would only sit 0.1m further beyond the current rear building line and 0.5m to the front building line. The proposal reduces by 0.3 metres from the current western build line. Due to their relative orientations, the proposed development is not anticipated to have any loss of light impact on neighbouring properties adjoining the rear boundary.
58. Similarly, with the step down to the side no significant loss of light impact will occur on the numerous side and rear habitable windows of the terraced development at No.424/ No.1 Curzon Road. This building already has a relatively close relationship with number 426 Holdenhurst Road. The proposed development would be taller and have a greater mass so there would be a modest impact here to this property to the west, but on balance this is not considered harmful.
59. With the stepped side approach of the proposal, the loss of light impact on the side window and amenity area of No.434 Holdenhurst Road would be minimal.

Overlooking Impact

60. The proposal would have one small habitable room window on the ground floor, two high level habitable windows at first floor and sky light windows on the western side elevation, thus having minimal impact on overlooking to No.424/ No.1 Curzon Road. The proposal would have two small habitable windows on the ground floor, two high level habitable windows at first floor, one sky light window on the second floor and two sky light windows on the third floors on the eastern side elevation, thus having minimal impact on overlooking to No.434. As such, no overlooking impact is anticipated on neighbouring properties on both sides.

61. The proposal will introduce 25 habitable windows (11 of which are Juliette/patio balcony/windows) in the rear elevation that will be approximately 10m away from the shared boundary with no. 9 Curzon Road that has a transverse relationship with the application site. The current scheme will have two habitable dormer windows at third storey level that will be approximately 10.5m from the rear garden. There is a commercial building to most of the remainder of the rear boundary of the site, with 1 Jefferson Avenue having a very modest rear garden space to the eastern corner of the site.
62. As per the refused scheme (7-2023-29061), there would be direct outlook over the neighbour's rear garden in Curzon Road, resulting in some loss of privacy. The Residential Design Guide recommends a minimum of 12.5 metres for a back to side built relationship. From a review of the site plan, elevations and floor plans, only 10 (2 dormer) of the windows would directly overlook No. 9 Curzon Rd's rear garden, whilst the other 15 would have more oblique views and are not considered to be harmful. As previously mentioned, the current scheme will have habitable dormer windows at 3.5 storey level that will be approximately 10.5m from the neighbour's private patio area. Additionally, due to their elevated location, the dormers will also have outlook over the garden area of No.11, which will be 17.7m from these windows, resulting in loss of privacy for this property as well.
63. It must be acknowledged that there is an existing degree of overlooking between the neighbouring properties, currently the property at No.426 – 428 at first floor level which is located approximately 10.5m from No.9's boundary. This rear to side relationship is not dissimilar to other properties within high-density urban settings and the separation distance has been increased since the earlier refused application. Positive steps have been taken from the refused scheme to overcome these issues – an increase of 2m from 8m to 10m with the shared boundary to No.9, a reduction of four flats to two in the third storey – decreasing the dormer windows from 8 to 2 and increase from 16m to 17.7m in the third-floor dormer windows distances overlooking towards No.11 Curzon Rd.
64. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is an existing degree of overlooking between the neighbouring properties, currently the property at No.426 – 428 has only one window at first floor level which is located approximately 10.5m from No.9's boundary. There will be an introduction of 25 habitable windows to the rear of the property, however, only 10 of these would directly overlook No.9 Curzon Road, and with a condition to introduce obscure glazing to the bottom half of all windows in the rear elevation, it is considered this would reduce the loss of privacy impact that would arise from the proposal.
65. The existing outlook of No.430 – 432 is over No.1A Jefferson Road that does not have any habitable windows. Whilst it is acknowledged that outlook from some of the new windows will be over No.1A this property does not have any private amenity space. No.9 Curzon Rd and No. 1 Jefferson Rd would be impacted by loss of privacy to a degree, however, with the amendments made and condition on obscure windows, this impact can be mitigated.

Overbearing Impact

66. The proposed development is stepped down on both flanks to reduce overbearing impacts on neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding, the height of the building nearest to the neighbouring terrace at 424 Holdenhurst Road/ 1 – 7 Curzon Road will be 10m high. This neighbouring property is set over 3 floors with 7 habitable windows facing the application site. The current building at No.426 is two storeys with rear section stepping in from the side boundary. As a result, first floor habitable windows of No.5-7 Curzon Road are 8m from No.426 and although the ridge of the existing building is higher than the second floor windows of the terrace, due to the hipped section of the existing roof, the windows have access to outlook and views of the sky. With the stepped approach, improved materials, and increase in distance from No.434, the overbearing impact is seen as less intrusive as previous designs.

Overall

67. To summarise, the proposal on balance complies with Policies CS21 and CS41 of the Core Strategy, Policy 6.10 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan, the Residential Design Guide and the key principles of the NPPF.

Amenity of the Future Occupiers

Locational sustainability

68. The site fronts Holdenhurst Road in proximity to the local shops and amenities within the district centre of Springbourne to the west. The site sits adjacent to a signalised pedestrian crossing, bus stop and three-lane carriageway. Holdenhurst Road (A3049) is a classified road and forms part of the Council's strategic road network, evidenced by its status as a District Distributor Road to the west of the site and a Local Distributor Road further to the east. Overall, the site is considered a sustainable location and suitable for additional residential density, as outlined in Policy CS21.

Internal space

69. The Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard provides minimum internal area required for various dwelling types. The current scheme proposes 6 x 2-bedroom flats and 14 x 1-bedroom flats. The proposal's compliance with the nationally described space standards is referred to below:

Flat	Bedrooms	Occupancy (based on bedroom size)	Proposed Area (sqm)	Required Area (sqm)	Complies*
1	1	1	43.9	39	Y (G)
2	1	1	41	39	Y (P)
3	1	1	37.2	39	N (P)
4	1	1	37.2	39	N(P)
5	1	1	40.4	39	Y (P)
6	1	1	41.3	39	Y (P)
7	2	3	63.5	61	Y (J)
8	1	1	40.4	39	Y (J)
9	1	1	41.5	39	Y (J)
10	1	1	41.5	39	Y (J)
11	1	1	40.4	39	Y (J)
12	2	3	66.1	61	Y (J)
13	2	3	63.5	61	Y (J)
14	1	1	40.4	39	Y (J)
15	1	1	41.5	39	Y (J)
16	1	1	41.5	39	Y (J)
17	1	1	40.4	39	Y (J)
18	1	3	66.1	61	Y (J)
19	1	3	66,4	61	Y (B)
20	1	3	63.6	61	Y (B)
70.P – Patio					

71.G – Garden

72.J – Juliette balcony

73.B - Balcony

74. As can be seen, two flats are 1.8m short of the minimum floor area required for a single person one bedroom flat. However, the standards state that the minimum can be reduced to 37 square metres where a shower room is used instead of a bathroom, which is the case here and means there is no conflict with the standards. Both these flats also have access to a private amenity space (including a patio area) which measures 21.4sqm at the front of the property. The other 18 flats exceed the national minimum space requirements.
75. In contrast to the previous proposal, 12 flats now have Juliet balconies, 2 have access to balconies, 5 have access to private patios and 1 has access to a private garden. Additionally, all apartments have access to the rear amenity space. To summarise, the proposal complies with the Core Strategy Policy CS41 and recommendations contained in the residential design guide.

Outlook

76. The proposal to ensure that privacy of no.9 Curzon Road is maintained as outlined in the relevant section of the report above is to require the lower panes of rear windows to be obscure glazed. It is important to ensure that some outlook is still possible to occupants of the rear flats while also reducing the direct downward overlooking. Section drawings of the floor levels have not been provided but there are a mix of full height opening doors and other windows which appear to have relatively low sill heights. The proposed flats will therefore retain adequate outlook while reducing the perception of overlooking to the neighbouring property.

External Amenity

77. Section 3.7.5 of the Residential Design Guide requires new residential developments to provide access to private outdoor spaces such as gardens, patios or balconies. As previously mentioned, 12 flats now have Juliet balconies, 2 have access to balconies, 5 have access to private patios and 1 has access to a private garden. Additionally, all apartments have access to an area of communal rear amenity space. The site is also close to King's Park public open space and facilities.
78. On balance, the proposal would provide adequate private outdoor amenity space for the proposed units, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS41 and recommendations contained in the Residential Design Guide.

Waste Management

79. For a development of 20 x flats provision should be made for 4 x 1100L and 1 x 660L recycling bins and 3 x 1100L and 1 x 660L refuse bins. The development should also include a provision for 3 x 140L food waste bins. The waste storage has been amended to allow space for the required bins within the building, and the store has been placed within 10m of the highway for BCP council collection.
80. It is considered that the proposal would provide adequate waste collection facilities for the future residents and comply to Core Strategy Policy CS41, and recommendations contained in the residential design guide.

Highway safety and parking provision

Site Context

81. The site sits adjacent to a signalised pedestrian crossing, bus stop and three-lane carriageway. Holdenhurst Road (A3049) is a classified road and forms part of the Council's strategic road network, evidenced by its status as a District Distributor Road to the west of the site and a Local Distributor Road further to the east. To preserve the integrity of such routes, new development must not result in material harm to the operation of the network nor the safety of its users, as supported by Saved Policy 8.2 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002).
82. The removal of the vehicular access renders existing sections of dropped kerb (fronting the site) redundant and therefore these are required to be reinstated with full height kerbs at the cost of the applicant.
83. Owing to the sustainability of the site in relation to accessibility and in accordance with the BCP Parking Standards SPD (2021), the site is located within parking zone B. In this location, residential developments flats comprising two and three habitable rooms do not generate a car parking requirement, Table 9 – C3: Flats of the Parking SPD refers. Consequently, a car-free development is acceptable in principle.

Cycle storage

84. The cycle storage will be located at the south western corner of the site, adjacent to the boundary of No.9 Curzon Rd. The height of this storage facility is approximately 2.3m in height and single storey, The external cycle store for resident parking meets SPD requirements for 24 cycles. Its amended position, adjacent to the visitor cycle parking and nearer the side access path linking to the public highway, improves accessibility. There is also an integral store for 4 cycles - 4 visitor spaces, are located to the western elevation.

Highways Contribution

85. A car-free development of this scale is expected to result in a significant increase in non-car trips, namely those undertaken on foot, by cycle and via public transport. Consequently, the applicant is required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development upon existing sustainable travel infrastructure. The applicant has agreed to provide a financial contribution of £25,000.00 for the provision of a replacement bus shelter with RTI capabilities at the eastbound bus stop on Holdenhurst Road, fronting the site. A S106 agreement would have been sought to secure the obligations, should the application be recommended for approval. This application therefore complies with Core Strategy Policies CS14, CS18 and CS41.

Trees and Landscaping

86. Currently, there is no landscaping on site. The proposal offers a betterment by introducing 4 new trees, a large lawn area to the rear, hedgerow planting on part of the southern boundary and northern boundary fronting Holdenhurst Road.
87. There is a tree on the neighbouring boundary, in which the Root Protection Area falls within this red line boundary. The tree and landscape officer has submitted the following: -
"The submitted arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan provides an effective scheme for the protection of the T1 Sycamore. The other tree present on neighbouring land will not be affected and will not require protection measures. I raise no

objections to this proposal subject to a condition requiring compliance with the submitted arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan”.

88. As such, the proposal would make a positive contribution in terms of landscaping and would satisfy Policy 4.25 of the BWDLP and Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy.

Land Contamination

89. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has an objective of preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air or water pollution. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that potential contaminated land should be subject to adequate site investigation undertaken by a competent person and that where appropriate sites should be subject to remediation to make suitable for the proposed use. The Council's records show that the application site is near to disused fuel tanks at 1 Jefferson Avenue. However, there is no record of previous contaminative uses of the application site.
90. For this reason, there is no objection to the proposal on land contamination grounds subject to a condition requiring reporting of any unexpected contamination found during construction.

Flooding and Drainage

91. The site falls entirely within Flood Zone 1 indicating low risk of fluvial flooding. BGS data indicates that the site sits above up to 3m of superficial deposits, consisting of river terrace deposits (sand and gravel), underlain by Boscombe Sand formation.
92. A detailed drainage scheme has been provided. The Lead Local Flood Authority have raised no objection and have submitted the following comments:-
- “Following review of the latest drainage document revisions (listed below), we are satisfied that all issues raised in our previous correspondence have now been addressed.
Documents Reviewed Surface Water Drainage Report – C3100 Rev. P1 – 19/12/2025
Proposed SW Drainage Strategy – CGS Civils – C3100 P 101 Rev. P3 – 19/12/2015
Surface Water Calculations – CGS Civils – 19/12/2025”
93. The proposal therefore complies with Policy CS4 of the Bournemouth Core Strategy (2012) and Policy 3.24 of the BWDLP (2002).

Biodiversity and Ecology

94. The existing site comprises buildings and ‘hardstanding sealed surface’ only. An Ecological Impact Assessment has been submitted, in which the biodiversity officer has stated no objection, subject to the following enhancements: -
- The provision of nest boxes for bird species such as swift and house sparrow on the walls of the new building - minimum of three within proximity to each other. Swift bricks will be fixed no less than two storeys (4.5-5m) above ground level and nest boxes can be sited on any aspect of a building except the southern side. The design will include a group of four swift integrated boxes which can be rendered or brick faced.
 - Provision of two bat integrated boxes/bricks. The box/brick will be fitted on south or west facing walls, as close to the eaves as possible.
 - Installation of four bee bricks within the walls of the new building. These bricks will be erected at least 1 metre above ground level within the brick/stonework.

95. Subject to these conditions, the proposal is considered compliant with CS30 on biodiversity and wildlife enhancements and with paragraph 187 of the NPPF (2024, as amended.)

Biodiversity Net Gain

Exemptions

96. Paragraph 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, under the heading of 'duty to conserve biodiversity' states "every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity."
97. 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 which promotes biodiversity and habitat enhancement.
98. A 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) is required as per the Environment Act 2021 though exemptions apply. This proposal is exempt as the site is entirely laid to hardstanding and therefore contains no priority habitat or non-priority habitat so is exempt.

Affordable Housing

99. All applications proposing residential development in excess of 10 units net will be subject to the Council's adopted affordable housing policy. The affordable housing DPD sets out an approach to achieving contributions towards the delivery of affordable housing in Bournemouth. Policy AH1 contained within DPD requires all residential development to contribute towards meeting the target of 40% affordable housing. When considering residential development, the Council will seek a 40% contribution except where it is proven to not be financially viable. The DPD was revised in November 2011 and sets out in greater detail how the DPD will be implemented as well as including an indicative contribution table which applicants can agree to rather than submit viability information.
100. In this case the applicant has submitted an Economic Viability Assessment, which has been assessed by the District Valuer Service (DVS). The assessment concludes the following:-
- "Following the above testing work It is my considered conclusion that the proposed development is not viable and unable to support a financial contribution towards affordable housing".
101. This means that the developer is unable to provide any affordable housing either on site or as an off-site contribution. With regard to the provisions of AH1 and the Affordable Housing DPD, the proposal fails to provide the benefits associated with an affordable housing contribution but has provided sufficient information to establish its 'unviability'.

Protected sites

Heathlands

102. 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 is therefore required and in this instance is £360 per apartment with a 5% admin fee (or minimum £75), a total of £5,670. This will be secured through a legal agreement.

New Forest Recreation Zone

103. The site lies also within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, New Forest SPA and New Forest Ramsar, which are protected under European legislation for their wildlife importance, where it has been demonstrated in conjunction with New Forest Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy 2023, prepared by Footprint Ecology and in agreement with Natural England that additional recreational pressure from additional bedroom numbers have the potential to harm their integrity. It cannot be ruled out beyond all reasonable scientific doubt that the proposal would not have a likely significant effect on the sensitive interest features of the habitat sites, from human pressures, either alone or in combination with other proposals. Accordingly, a SAMMS payment is also required in relation to protected new Forest sites of £300 per dwelling with a £60 minimum admin fee or 5% administration fee. £4,725 will be secured through a legal agreement.
104. Following the securing of SAMMS payments for protected sites, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on these sites and is compliant with Policies CS32 and CS33.

Planning Balance / Conclusion

105. Overall, it has been identified that there is a conflict with Policy CS27 due to the lack of justification for the loss of the employment floor space on the ground floor of the existing buildings. Harm has also been identified in relation to the impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Church of St Mary at the level of 'less than substantial'. This heritage harm has been minimised through amendments to the scheme since the earlier refused application and subsequent amendments to the current application. There will be some overlooking impact to neighbouring residents, but again this has been reduced through the amendments and proposed conditions for some obscure glazing elements and is not considered to result in a policy conflict now.
106. The proposal would provide a net increase of 15 flats on the site which would provide a valuable contribution towards local housing needs. The proposal would also provide some regeneration benefits to the area and a degree of street scene enhancement. The application is acceptable in terms of highway safety and would provide improvements to public transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the site.
107. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF requires that in case of less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, this harm must be weighed up against the public benefits to the scheme. In this case, it is considered that the demolition of two no. two-storey buildings and replacement with a 3.5 storey building comprising 20 residential units including landscaping, refuse storage, cycle storage and other associated infrastructure would create less than substantial harm to the character and appearance to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building, however, the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.
108. The LPA is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. The provision of 20 new homes (a net increase in 15 units) is consequently given significant weight. The proposal comprises of 1 and 2 bed apartments, which offer a good standard of residential amenity. This is considered to outweigh the small impact on the designated heritage asset.

It is considered that the impact on the designated heritage asset does not provide a strong reason for refusal, and accordingly the tilted balance, as detailed in paragraph 11, remains at play.

109. It is considered that the scheme accords with most important aspects of the Development Plan (Policies CS1, CS4, CS6, CS14, CS16, CS18, CS21, CS33, CS38, CS39 and CS41) – but as identified, there is a degree of conflict with criterion Protecting Unallocated Employment Sites of Policy CS27 (in respect of no evidence - other than statements provided - has been submitted to demonstrate why an employment use is not considered suitable prior to a residential development coming forward). It is considered that whilst the proposal may result in the loss of employment floor space, any harm that may be attributed to this is not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal as set out above when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. The loss of floor space is modest overall and the contribution towards the housing supply holds significant weight in the balance.
110. In this instance, having regard to the conclusions relating to these policies as explained above and notwithstanding the minor conflict identified, it is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan when considered as a whole. Furthermore and notwithstanding the conflict with the Development Plan policy identified, for the reasons given in this report, it is considered that the identified material considerations including the benefits of the scheme also clearly support a view in favour of granting the proposal.

Recommendation

111. **RECOMMENDATION I** - That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning Operations to GRANT Permission, for the reasons as set out in this report, subject to the following conditions, and a deed pursuant to section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) securing the terms below with power delegated to the Head of Planning Operations (including any officer exercising their powers if absent and/or the post is vacant and 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 officer) does not result in a reduction in the terms identified.

RECOMMENDATION II - That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning Operations to refuse planning permission if sufficient progress on concluding the Legal Agreement has not made within six months of the date of this resolution.

S106 heads of terms:

- **Heathlands Mitigation – £5,670**
- **New Forest mitigation – £4,725**

Highways bus shelter contribution - £25,000

Applicant to enter into a S278 agreement for alterations to the existing public highway fronting the site to accommodate a new bus shelter

Conditions:

1. Detailed permission

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. Decision notice - Grant

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

Site, Block & Location plan; dwg no. 9745/200. Rev F. 26/02/26

Existing Plans; dwg no. 9745/206. Sept 2024

Floor Plans 1 of 2; dwg no. 9745/201. Rev D. 26/02/26

Floor Plans 2 of 2; dwg no. 9745/202. Rev D. 26/02/26

Cycle Store; dwg no. 9745/208. Rev A. 26/02/26

Elevations; dwg no. 9745/203 .Rev F. 26/02/26

Indicative Street Scene; dwg no. 9745/204. Rev C. 17/09/25

Proposed SW Drainage Strategy; dwg no. 101 Rev P3. 19/12/2025

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

3. Materials to be submitted

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed that is visible above ground level/above damp proof course level/above the proposed finished ground level unless details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces including any roof have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall include samples of all such materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details and once provided the approved materials shall thereafter at all times be retained.

Reason: To ensure that the impact of the development on the visual amenities of the locality is acceptable.

4. Soft landscape

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed that is visible above damp proof course level unless a scheme of soft landscaping including all planting has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include indications of all existing trees and hedges and other planting on the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development. The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following substantial completion of the development or the first occupation of any part of it, whichever is the sooner. Any tree or plants found damaged, removed, dead or dying in the first 5 years following its planting shall be replaced with a tree/plant of the same

species and similar size or such other species and size as has otherwise been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of securing the amenity and the appearance of the development and the locality.

5. Biodiversity enhancements

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the biodiversity enhancements as given in section 7 and appendix 3 of 'Ecological Impact Assessment' by Cherry Tree Ecology Ltd dated 25th March 2026 must be implemented in full and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: To promote biodiversity in compliance with paragraph 187 of the NPPF and Policy CS30.

6. Implement arboricultural method statement/tree protection

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out other than in accordance with the details and timetable contained in the approved Arboricultural Impact and Method Statement and tree protection plan from Tree Call Consulting Limited dated 6th February 2026 and Appendix B Plan Dated 27th January 2026, ref: DS/52426/AC.

Reason: To ensure that trees and their rooting environments are afforded adequate physical protection during construction.

7. Footway Crossing - Reinstatement

Notwithstanding details shown on the submitted plans, within 3 months of the commencement of the development, details of the reinstatement of existing sections of dropped kerb fronting the site, made redundant by this proposal, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Full height kerbs shall be constructed in accordance with approved details prior to occupation of the proposed development.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site and to ensure that highway safety is not adversely impacted upon in accordance with Policies CS16, CS18 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

8. Cycle Parking

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, all cycle parking shall be installed as shown on the approved plans and thereafter retained, maintained and kept available for the occupants of the development at all times.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable development and active travel including the cycling mode of transport, in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (October 2012).

9. 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 and the type of refuse vehicles to be used; specified timings

of an 'off-peak' collection arrangement as standard, 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); 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 the safe collection of refuse from the site so as not to impact the efficiency of the local highway network nor the safety of its users.

10. Construction Management Plan

No development shall take place, including any demolition works, until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition/construction period. The plan/statement shall provide for:

- 24 hour emergency contact number;
- Hours of operation;
- Parking of vehicle of site operatives and visitors (including measures taken to ensure satisfactory access and movement for existing occupiers of neighbouring properties during construction);
- Routes for construction traffic;
- Locations for loading/unloading and storage of plant, waste and construction materials;
- Method of preventing mud being carried onto the highway;
- Measures to protect vulnerable road users (cyclists and pedestrians)
- Any necessary temporary traffic management measures;
- Arrangements for turning vehicles;
- Arrangements to receive abnormal loads or unusually large vehicles;
- Methods of communicating the Construction Management Plan to staff, visitors and neighbouring residents and businesses.

Reason: In the interests of safe operation of the adopted highway in the lead into development both during the demolition and construction phase of the development.

11. Acoustic measures

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until all noise mitigation measures set out in the Noise Impact Assessment prepared by Impact Acoustics Ltd (Ref: IMP7781-2, dated February 2025) have been fully implemented. These measures include, but are not limited to:

- Installation of glazing and ventilation systems as specified in the report.
- Provision of mechanical ventilation/heat recovery (MVHR) to road-facing habitable rooms.
- Construction of external walls and roofs to the acoustic performance detailed in the report.
- Installation of a 2.0 m high acoustic boundary fence with a minimum surface mass of 24 kg/m² to external amenity areas. The approved mitigation shall be retained and maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the development achieves acceptable internal and external noise levels in accordance with BS8233:2014, PRoPG: Planning & Noise, and BCP Local Plan Policy ENV12.

12.Surface water drainage

No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works shall have been implemented in accordance with Proposed SW Drainage Strategy – CGS Civils – C3100 P 101 Rev. P3 – 19/12/2025 and supporting plans.

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.

13.Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that unexpected contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and further development ceased. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the Environment Agency "Land contamination risk management (LCRM)" procedures and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in advance of the scheme recommencing. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority prior to development commencing other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To ensure that the risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecosystems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors

14.No external pipework

Unless shown on the approved elevational drawings any pipework (with the exception of rainwater and foul down pipes) shall be internal to the building.

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).

15.Obscure glazing of lower part of window

The lower half of the windows to the rear elevation of flats 7, 12, 13, 18 and 19 (as indicated on drawing number 9745/201. Rev D 26.02.26 and 9745/202. Rev D 26.02.26), shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Pilkington Level 3 or above (or the nearest equivalent standard) and shall be permanently retained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent undue overlooking of the adjoining residential property and in accordance with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).

Informative Notes:

No Storage of Materials on Footway/Highway: The applicant is advised that there should be no storage of any equipment, machinery or materials on the footway/highway including verges and/or shrub borders or beneath the crown spread of Council owned trees.

Kerb and Footway Re-instatement: As a consequence of vehicle access closure and the development of the site, the applicant is advised that it will be necessary for the kerb to be raised and the footway (and verge if appropriate) restored where required. Normally the Highway Authority will undertake this work at the expense of the applicant although on occasion there might be instances where the applicant under supervision can undertake this work. A Section 171 (Highways Act 1980) licence application form is available within the Roads and Transport section of the council's website (www.bcpccouncil.gov.uk).

Streetworks: Prior to construction commencing on site, the applicant/site developer is strongly advised to contact the Streetworks Team on 01202 128369 or streetworks@bcpcouncil.gov.uk to discuss how the highway network in the vicinity of the site is to be safely and lawfully managed during construction. This team is responsible for managing the highway network and must be consulted prior to you commencing any work that you are undertaking that may impact on the operation of the public highway. They will also be able to advise on any Permits, Licences, Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs), traffic signal or ITS changes and signing requirements, together with co-ordination of your work in relation to the planned work of other parties on the public highway. Some procedures, require significant lead in times and therefore early engagement is essential. Therefore, to avoid any delay in starting work it is strongly recommended that you make contact at least 3 months before you plan to commence work. Failure to do so may result in delay in starting work. If any permanent changes are required to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs), please note that these can take a minimum of 9 months to process and this period should be considered when planning your project.

Car Parking Permit Restriction: The applicant should note and inform future residents that they may be excluded from being able to purchase permits associated with parking permit schemes controlled by the Council in the area. This is to reduce the impacts from the development due to the lack of car parking provision being proposed and to encourage sustainable modes of travel amongst future residents.

BNG: "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 available this permission does not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements listed is relevant.

Bats: If bats are found during demolition, all work shall cease and if possible, part of structure that was removed and exposed bats put back into place. A bat ecologist shall be employed to address the situation and Natural England contacted.

Background Documents:

7-2024-29061-A

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