

Planning and Rights of Way Panel 01st August 2017
Planning Application Report of the Service Lead; Infrastructure, Planning and Development

Application address: Rear of 65/67 Radstock Road			
Proposed development: Erection of a 2 storey, 3 bed detached house with associated car parking and refuse storage following demolition of existing garage.			
Application number:	17/00583/FUL	Application type:	Minor
Case officer:	Andrew Gregory	Public speaking time:	5 minutes
Last date for determination:	05.07.2017 (Over)	Ward	Peartree
Reason for Panel Referral:	More than 5 objections received (including objection from Cllr Keogh)	Ward Councillors:	Councillor Lewzey Councillor Houghton Councillor Keogh
Applicant: Swift House LTD		Agent: Austin Design Partnership Ltd	
Recommendation Summary		Delegate conditional approval to the Service Lead – Infrastructure, Planning and Development.	

Community Infrastructure Levy Liable	Yes
---	------------

Reason for granting Permission

The development is acceptable taking into account the policies and proposals of the Development Plan as set out below. The development will not adversely harm the character and appearance of the area or the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

The development is materially different to the previous refusal of planning permission for a 3-bed dwelling house on land to the rear of 65 Radstock Road (LPA Ref 14/01598/FUL) which was subsequently dismissed on appeal. The development now incorporates land to the rear of both 65 and 67 Radstock road to provide a larger development plot which satisfies the Council's Residential Design Guidance in relation to site building coverage, garden sizes and building separation distances. Other material considerations have been considered and are not judged to have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application, and where applicable conditions have been applied in order to satisfy these matters. The scheme is therefore judged to be in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and thus

planning permission should therefore be granted. In reaching this decision the Local Planning Authority offered a pre-application planning service and has sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner as required by paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Policies - SDP1, SDP4, SDP5, SDP7, SDP9, SDP12 and H1 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015) and CS4, CS5, CS13, CS16, CS19 and CS20 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015)

Appendix attached			
1	Development Plan Policies	2	Appeal Decision
3	Planning History and Plans		

Recommendation in Full

1. Delegate to the Service Lead to grant planning permission subject to the planning conditions recommended at the end of this report and to secure a financial contribution (or alternative) towards Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project to mitigate against the pressure on European designated nature conservation sites in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.
2. That the Planning and Development Manager be given delegated powers to add, vary and /or delete conditions as necessary and to refuse permission should the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project payment not be made.

1. The site and its context

1.1 This application site forms part of the rear gardens 65 and 67 Radstock Road which comprise semi-detached dwelling houses with long elongated plots. The site is located at the corner of Radstock Road and Bishops Road with an existing bus stop and shelter located adjacent to the western site boundary. A garage is located at the rear of 65 Radstock Road with gated dropped kerb access onto Bishops Road. The western site boundary comprises a 1.8m height brick wall and boarded fencing has been erected to sub-divide the rear garden of 65 Radstock Road.

1.2 The local area is mainly characterised by 2 storey dwellings with a varied style. A residential garage block is located on the opposite side of Bishops Road. There is a recent infill development fronting Millais Road to the rear of 85 Radstock Road.

2. Proposal

2.1 The application proposes to sub-divide the rear gardens of 65 and 67 Radstock Road to provide a new residential plot accommodating a detached 3-bed two-storey dwelling house. Two car parking spaces would be provided to the front of the property with access taken from Bishops Road via the existing drop kerb access which is proposed to be extended.

2.2 The property would be provided with a side and rear garden with a combined area of 130 sqm. The side garden would be enclosed to the street by the existing 1.8m height boundary wall, the wall would be lowered to a height of 1m to the front of the dwelling. The property has a pitched roof form which incorporates a chimney. The elevations are shown to be finished in a mix of face brickwork and render.

3 Relevant Planning Policy

- 3.1 The Development Plan for Southampton currently comprises the “saved” policies of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (as amended 2015) and the City of Southampton Core Strategy (as amended 2015). The most relevant policies to these proposals are set out at **Appendix 1**.
- 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force on 27th March 2012 and replaces the previous set of national planning policy guidance notes and statements. The Council has reviewed the Core Strategy to ensure that it is in compliance with the NPPF and are satisfied that the vast majority of policies accord with the aims of the NPPF and therefore retain their full material weight for decision making purposes, unless otherwise indicated.

4 Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 In 2014 planning permission was refused for the erection of a detached 3-bed dwelling house to the rear of 65 Radstock Road (planning application reference 14/01598/FUL). The application was refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and poor design, insufficient garden size and because of insufficient separation was provided from neighbouring windows and gardens.
- 4.2 A subsequent appeal decision upheld the Council’s decision to refuse planning permission (Appeal Decision Ref APP/D1780/W/15/3039086). The appeal Inspector agreed the proposal would be out of keeping, giving the appearance of being shoe-horned into an area of existing garden land that is too small to satisfactorily accommodate it, at odds with the suburban grain and character of the area. The Inspector considered the plot size and spatial separation to be less than that approved at the nearby development at the corner of Radstock Road / Millais Road. Furthermore the Inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the amenities of future occupiers and the occupiers of 65 and 67 Radstock Road by providing insufficient garden size and building separation distances leading to sense of enclosure and shadowing to neighbouring properties.
- 4.3 A copy of the appeal decision is attached as **Appendix 2**, and the plans associated with the previously refused scheme and decision notice are included as **Appendix 3**.
- 4.4 The key changes to the scheme since these changes are:-
- The site area has increased to 243sqm by also incorporating part of the rear garden of 67 Radstock Road;
 - Private amenity area has increased to 130sqm;
 - Building separation with 65/67 Radstock Road has increased to 12.5m
 - The proposed house is set further back from the back edge of pavement to respect the building line of 2 Bishops Road;
 - The proposed house is set further away from neighbouring gardens (5.7m from 69 Radstock Road and 4.5m from 65 Radstock Road); and
 - The proposed house now has a traditional design with a hipped roof form.

5 Consultation Responses and Notification Representations

- 5.1 Following the receipt of the planning application a publicity exercise in line with department procedures was undertaken which included notifying adjoining and nearby landowners and posting a site notice on 05/05/17. At the time of writing the report **25** representations have been received and objection from Cllr Keogh. The following is a summary of the relevant points raised:
- 5.2 ***The development is out of character with the properties in this area and***

therefore not in keeping with the existing housing stock.

Officer Response – The surrounding area includes housing of varying styles and is not homogenous in design terms. The proposed two-storey dwelling has a traditional design which is considered in keeping in terms of scale and appearance. The proposed site area is 243sqm and is comparable to neighbouring plot sizes (2 Bishops Road is 273sqm and 4 Bishops Road is 209 sqm).

- 5.3 The proposal incorporates private garden area of 130sqm which exceeds the minimum standard of 90sqm as required under policy CS16 and Section 02 of the Residential Design Guide. Furthermore the level of site coverage with buildings and hard surfacing amounts to less than 50% of the site area. It is acknowledged that the proposed plot does not have a long elongated shape, however the plot configuration is comparable to existing housing at the corner of Radstock Road and Millais Road. As such the amended proposal is not considered at odds with the spatial character of the area.

- 5.4 ***The development will overshadow number 2 Bishops Road and 65 Radstock Road. It will have a major impact on 65 and 67 Radstock Road through its size and bulk. It will have a significant impact on the light into the area***

Officer Response – The proposed dwelling is due south of the blank side gable of 2 Bishops Road and does not project beyond the rear building line of that property, as such the proposal will not lead to any harmful shadowing of 2 Bishops Road. There may be some limited shadowing of the lower part of the garden of no.69 during late afternoon but this limited shadowing will not have such a harmful impact on the amenities of no. 69 Radstock Road to substantiate a refusal, having regard to the large size of the neighbouring garden. Paragraph 3.3.17 of the BRE Daylight and Sunlight Guide recommends that for a neighbouring garden to receive adequate sun lighting throughout the year, at least half of the amenity area should receive at least 2 hours of sun on 21st March

- 5.5 The development achieves a 12.5m separation distance from the rear elevation of 65 and 67 Radstock Road and therefore compliant with design separation standards as set out within section 2 of the Residential Design Guide SPD. It is noted that the previously refused scheme achieved a lesser separation distance of 9.8m. The proposed building is located due north and set 4.5m from the rear gardens of 65-67 Radstock and therefore will not lead to harmful shadowing or sense of enclosure to those properties. Furthermore the proposal is located 5.7m from the garden of 69 Radstock Road and therefore the proposal will not appear unduly dominant or overbearing when viewed from the garden of no. 69

- 5.6 ***The development is too close to the bus stop and is most likely to worsen road safety in that area. The development is close to a local school and will increase the risk to children and parents walking to and from school.***

Officer Response – The extended access will not harmfully conflict with the adjacent bus stop and no objection has been raised by the Council's Highways Team. A condition is recommended to ensure 2m x 2m sightlines to ensure good visibility of pedestrians when vehicles egress the site.

- 5.7 ***The development is an example of garden grabbing in this area and this infilling is occurring on a scale that is undermining the quality of life for other residents.***

Officer Response – Development plan policies do not presume against delivery of windfall housing development on private residential gardens providing they do not harm the character and appearance of the area or the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. Residential gardens are no longer defined as previously

developed land giving greater weight to a character based assessment

5.8 The scale of the development is out of proportion to the site in which it will reside.

Officer Response – The dwelling to plot size ratio is comparable to the neighbouring sites and the proposed garden size exceeds the minimum requirements of the Residential Design Guide SPD.

5.9 The proposed development is positioned very close in proximity to 2 Bishops and would be out of proportion to the rest of the properties in Bishops Road. The site is very small and the large scale and mass of development gives the appearance of being “shoe horned onto the site

Officer Response – The proposal achieves 2.5m separation from 2 Bishops Road and 12.5m from the rear of 65/67 Bishops Road and, therefore, the proposal will not be out of keeping with the spatial character of the area. The dwelling to plot size ratio is comparable to the neighbouring sites already mentioned and is materially different to the previously refused scheme.

5.10 The amenity space for the proposed development is small and constrained and not suitable for family use. The leftover amenity space of 65 and 67 Radstock road will be unduly enclosed by the proximity of the new. Section 4.4.4 of the Residential Design Guide SPD suggests that all neighbouring dwellings should not be overlooked

Officer Response – The proposed garden has a side and rear part with a combined area of 130sqm. The rear part is 5.75m deep and 11.75m wide and is considered suitable for family use. The side garden will also be private because it is enclosed to Bishops Road by the existing tall boundary wall. The garden will received adequate sunlight throughout the course of the day.

5.11 The proposal has been amended to ensure that first-floor windows serving non-habitable rooms are obscure glazed to prevent overlooking of neighbouring gardens and this can be secured by condition

5.12 Polices in the Local Plan Review support the maximum use of derelict, vacant and underused land for residential development. Both 65 and 67 Radstock Road until recently were utilised gardens, this is a prime example of land grabbing for personal financial gain.

Officer Response – Development plan policies do not presume against delivery of windfall housing development on private residential gardens providing the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area or the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers

5.13 The proposed development would not be classed as affordable and therefore does not meet the needs for the local population

Officer Response – Housing needs evidence as set out within the PUSH Objectively-Assessed Housing Need Update, Final Report, April 2016, indicates a need for 1,066 dwellings per annum with affordable need of 408-669 homes per annum. Therefore there is both market and affordable housing need in Southampton. Affordable housing is not required on developments of less than 11 residential units, as set out within National Planning Policy Guidance.

5.14 The new development is close to a current public footpath, thus creating a closed in dark alleyway and creating safety, security and anti-social behaviour concerns.

Officer Response – The footpath to the side of the property is enclosed by the

existing boundary wall. Surveillance at the entrance of the footpath will be improved because the boundary wall will need to be lowered to achieve 2m x 2m driver sight lines.

5.15 The position of refuse storage is unclear and not identified on the site plan

Officer Response – There is adequate space on the plot to incorporate 3 no. wheeled bins and a glass collection box.

5.16 It will be impossible to get two family sized cars side by side on the driveway which creates potential for overspill parking

Officer Response – The proposed car parking spaces with a size of 5m x 2.4m accord with the Council's Parking Standards SPD.

The provision of 2 spaces for a 3-bed dwelling accord with the Council's maximum car parking standards.

5.17 No provision has been made for secure cycle parking

Officer Response – Secure enclosed space is required for a minimum of 1 bicycle and there is adequate space within the rear garden to accommodate this. A planning condition is recommended to secure the delivery of cycle parking facilities in order to promote sustainable travel.

5.18 The property is out of keeping with the street with a ridge running north-south and 3 first-floor windows facing the street.

Officer Response – The shape and configuration of the plot has meant that the building is orientated north-south rather than east-west. This has meant the building has a wider front elevation than housing to the north. The massing of the front elevation has been broken up with the incorporation of a forward projection on the right side of the building. The street scene can accommodate a building without harming the wider character.

5.19 To the right of the development they have designed a small forward projection which will be forward of the existing building line and out of keeping

Officer Response – The proposed building provides a transition between the staggered building lines of 2 Bishops Road and the side wing of 65 Radstock Road. When walking the street the subtle change will be negligible.

5.20 The proposal falls short of the 12.5m separation distance between its gable end and the rear wall of the neighbouring property and therefore the scheme is contrary to paragraph 2.2.7 of the Residential Design Guide SPD

Officer Response – 12.5m separation is achieved. The separation distance should be measured from the side gable and not the eaves overhang as shown on the site plan

5.21 Trees and shrubs should be included in all new residential developments in order to improve visual amenity and to green the city.

Officer Response – Landscaping can be reserved by condition and there is potential for a tree to be located within the side garden.

5.22 Planning permission was refused for infill development at 167 Radstock Road (Ref 15/02400/FUL)

Officer Response – The proposal is scheme is materially different because dwelling has a different design and the plot is larger.

Consultation Responses

5.23 **SCC Highways – No objection**

The principle of development is acceptable, however adequate forward visibility lines should be secured to enable pedestrians on the footway being seen by drivers using the access. The drive way will need to be constructed of permeable paving but it must be non-migratory. The dropped kerb access will need to be widened to accommodate the additional parking width, whilst not interfering with the bus stop or street light. Details of cycle storage and bin storage are required and can be secured by condition.

5.24 **SCC Environmental Health – No objection** subject to a condition to control the hours of work

5.25 **SCC Ecologist – No objection**

The application site consists of a garage building, hard standing, overgrown amenity grassland and shrubs. The garage and hard-standing have negligible intrinsic biodiversity. The grassland has the potential to support slow worms however, it has been regularly managed until recently so there are unlikely to be high numbers of reptiles present. To encourage individual animals to disperse into surrounding gardens the grass should be cut to 10cm height and then left for a day after which it can be cut to ground level.

As a simple biodiversity enhancement the Council's Ecologist would like a bat box to be incorporated into the fabric of the building. This box should be located on the eastern elevation of the proposed house away from the street light.

5.26 **SCC Sustainability – No objection** subject to conditions to secure at minimum 19% improvement over 2013 Dwelling Emission Rate (DER)/ Target Emission Rate (TER) (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for Energy) and 105 Litres/Person/Day internal water use. Conditions are recommended.

5.27 **SCC Archaeology – No objection**

The site is in a Local Area of Archaeological Potential, as defined in the Southampton Local Plan and Core Strategy. It lies in the suburb of Woolston. The site itself was part of a large field until developed for housing between 1897 and 1910. Prehistoric, Romano-British and medieval evidence has been found in the vicinity, and other prehistoric finds are known from the wider area. Such remains, if present on the site, are undesignated heritage assets under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). (Further information about the archaeological potential of the area is available on the Southampton Historic Environment Record.)

The proposed development involves the construction of a new detached house with associated parking, etc. Groundworks for the foundations, services and landscaping threaten to damage archaeological deposits, and an archaeological investigation will be needed to mitigate this. The archaeological investigation will take the form of a watching brief on the groundworks.

5.28 **Southern Water – No objection** and request informative regarding connection to the public sewer

5.29 **CIL** - The development is CIL liable as there is a net gain of residential units. The charge will be levied at £70 per sq. m (to be indexed) on the Gross Internal Area of the new development. If any existing floorspace is to be used as deductible floorspace the applicant will need to demonstrate that lawful use of the building has occurred for a continuous period of at least 6 months within the period of 3 years ending on the day that planning permission first permits the chargeable development

6 Planning Consideration Key Issues

- 6.1 The key issues for consideration in the determination of this planning application are:
- Principle of Development and other planning matters considered in the previous appeal decision;
 - Design and amenity;
 - Highway Matters
 - Mitigation / Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project

Principle of development and other planning matters considered in the previous appeal

- 6.2 The site is not allocated for additional housing and the proposed dwelling would represent windfall housing development. The previous refusal of planning permission for a 3-bed dwelling at 65 Radstock Road and subsequent appeal decision raised no objection in principle to windfall housing development but dismissed the proposal because the cramped form of development was considered harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring and future occupiers. These are again the key issues
- 6.2.1 The current proposal is materially different to the previously refused scheme in terms of enlarged plot size, building design and building separation distances. The scheme now incorporates part of the rear garden of 67 Radstock Road and has a site area of 243sqm which is comparable to neighbouring plots in the area. The proposed building footprint has an area of 65sqm and would occupy less than half the site area, with a private rear and side garden totalling 130sqm in area which is compliant with plot coverage and garden size requirements as set out within sections 2 and 3 of the Council's Residential Design SPD. The proposed building footprint, building to plot ratio and garden size would be in keeping with the surrounding density and spatial character. The shape and configuration of the plot has meant that the building is orientated north-south and has a wider frontage than 2 Bishops Road but this in itself is not harmful having regard to the varied design and massing of housing within the area which incorporates detached housing, semi-detached pairs, terraced housing and flatted blocks.
- 6.2.2 The larger plot size has meant that the current proposal has improved regard to existing building lines within Bishops Road, the dwelling is now set back in line with the front elevation of 2 Bishops Road (6m from the back edge of footway) and incorporates a forward projection on the right hand side which acts as a transition with the building line of 65 Bishops Road which provides a pinch point at the junction of Bishops Road and Radstock Road. The development addresses previous concerns in relation to building separation distances and garden sizes and accords with Residential Design Standards as set out within section 05 of this report
- 6.2.3 The LDF Core Strategy identifies the Council's current housing need and this scheme would assist the Council in meeting its targets. The City has a housing need. As detailed in Policy CS4 an additional 16,300 homes need to be provided within the City between 2006 and 2026.
- 6.2.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable housing development, the proposal involves development on private rear gardens which include usable garden space, a detached garage and hard surfacing. The development plan does not contain any policies which presume against development on rear gardens providing the character and appearance of the area and residential amenities are not compromised.
- 6.2.5 Policy CS5 of the Council's Core Strategy (2015) indicates that development will only be permitted which is of an appropriate density for its context. The site is located

within an area of lower accessibility where net density levels of 35-50 dwellings per hectare will be sought, providing the character and appearance of the area is not compromised. The development achieves 41 dwellings per hectare which accords with policy CS5. The provision of a genuine family dwelling house would be in keeping with the character of the area and accords with policy CS16 of the Council's Core Strategy (2015).

Design and amenity

- 6.3 The proposed dwelling house has a traditional design which reflects the scale and form of existing housing within the area. The property has a comparable eaves and ridge height to adjacent dwellings and includes a pitched roof hipped four ways and a chimney on the left side. Details of finishing materials can be reserved by condition however the proposed mix of face brick, render and plain roof tiles would be in keeping with the surrounding area.
- 6.3.1 The gardens for the proposed house and those retained for 65 and 67 Radstock Road accords with policy CS16 and Section 02 of the Residential Design Guide by achieving the minimum size of 10m length and/or 90sqm area.
- 6.3.2 The development does not incorporate any first-floor side windows and the rear first-floor windows serving non-habitable rooms are obscure glazed to ensure there will be no loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. Details of means of enclosure will be reserved by condition to ensure a minimum enclosure height of 1.8m is achieved to ensure no overlooking from ground floor windows.

Highway Matters

- 6.4 No objection has been raised by Highways Development Management. The provision of 2 car parking spaces would accord with the Council's maximum car parking standards (the maximum permissible is 2 spaces). The proposed parking spaces also accord with the size requirements of the Parking Standards SPD.
- The proposal has demonstrated that 2m x 2m sightlines can be achieved in the interests of pedestrian and driver safety.
- 6.4.1 Unrestricted on-street parking is available within Bishops road adjacent to 65 Radstock Road which could accommodate any parking displaced by the removal of the existing garage and hard surfacing at the rear of 65 Radstock Road.

Mitigation / Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project

- 6.5 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) provides statutory protection for designated sites, known collectively as Natura 2000, including Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPA). This legislation requires competent authorities, in this case the Local Planning Authority, to ensure that plans or projects, either on their own or in combination with other plans or projects, do not result in adverse effects on these designated sites. The Solent coastline supports a number of Natura 2000 sites including the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, designated principally for birds, and the Solent Maritime SAC, designated principally for habitats. Research undertaken across south Hampshire has indicated that current levels of recreational activity are having significant adverse effects on certain bird species for which the sites are designated. A mitigation scheme, known as the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project (SDMP), requiring a financial contribution of £181 per unit has been adopted. The money collected from this project will be used to fund measures designed to reduce the impacts of recreational activity. This will be secured through a S111 form or S106 agreement.

7 **Summary**

The development is materially different to the previously refused scheme that was dismissed at appeal and now incorporates land to the rear of both 65 and 67 Radstock road to provide a larger development plot which satisfies the Council's Residential Design Guidance in relation to site building coverage, garden sizes and building separation distances. Overall the scheme is acceptable and the level of development proposed will not result in an adverse impact on the amenities enjoyed by surrounding occupiers or to the character and appearance of the area. A suitable balance has been achieved between securing additional family housing, on-site amenity space and landscaping, whilst ensuring that existing residential amenity is protected. It is considered this scheme has addressed the previous reasons for refusal and Planning Inspectorate concerns.

8 **Conclusion**

Taking a balanced assessment of the details discussed above, this application is recommended for approval, following SDMP resolution, for the reasons set out above.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Documents used in the preparation of this report Background Papers

1a, b, c, d, 2b, d, g, 4f, 6a,

AG for 01.08.17 PROW Panel

PLANNING CONDITIONS

01. Full Permission Timing Condition (Performance)

The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

02. Details of building materials to be used (Pre-Commencement Condition)

Notwithstanding the information shown on the approved drawings and application form, with the exception of site clearance, demolition and preparation works, no development works shall be carried out until a written schedule of external materials and finishes, including samples and sample panels where necessary, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include full details of the manufacturer's composition, types and colours of the external materials to be used for external walls, windows, doors, rainwater goods, and the roof of the proposed buildings. It is the Local Planning Authority's practice to review all such materials on site. The developer should have regard to the context of the site in terms of surrounding building materials and should be able to demonstrate why such materials have been chosen and why alternatives were discounted. If necessary this should include presenting alternatives on site. Development shall be implemented only in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity by endeavouring to achieve a building of visual quality.

03. Residential - Permitted Development Restriction (Performance Condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any Order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order, no building or structures within Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes as listed below shall be erected or carried out to any dwelling house hereby permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority:

Class A (enlargement of a dwelling house), including a garage or extensions,

Class B (roof alteration),

Class C (other roof alterations),

Class E (curtilage structures), including a garage, shed, greenhouse, etc.,

Class F (hard surface area)

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may exercise further control in this locality given the specific circumstances of the application site and in the interests of the comprehensive development and visual amenities of the area.

04. No other windows or doors other than approved (Performance Condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), no windows, doors or other openings, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be inserted above ground floor level in the side elevations of development hereby permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the adjoining residential properties.

05. Obscure Glazing (Performance Condition)

All first-floor windows in the rear elevation of the hereby approved development, shall be obscurely glazed and fixed shut up to a height of 1.7 metres from the internal floor level before the development is first occupied. The windows shall be thereafter retained in this manner.

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining property.

06. Hours of work for Demolition / Clearance / Construction (Performance)

All works relating to the demolition, clearance and construction of the development hereby granted shall only take place between the hours of:

Monday to Friday 08:00 to 18:00 hours

Saturdays 09:00 to 13:00 hours

And at no time on Sundays and recognised public holidays.

Any works outside the permitted hours shall be confined to the internal preparations of the buildings without audible noise from outside the building, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of existing nearby residential properties.

07. Sightlines specification (Pre-Commencement)

Sight lines shown on the approved drawing (Drawing number to be inserted) of 2m by 2m measured at the back of footway shall be provided before the use of any building hereby approved commences, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 no fences walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected above a height of 0.6m above ground level within the sight line splays.

Reason: To provide safe access to the development and to prevent congestion on the highway.

08. Archaeological evaluation/watching brief investigation (Pre-Commencement)

No development shall take place within the site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological investigation is initiated at an appropriate point in development procedure.

09. Energy & Water (Pre-Commencement)

Before the development commences, written documentary evidence demonstrating that the development will achieve at minimum 19% improvement over 2013 Dwelling Emission Rate (DER)/ Target Emission Rate (TER) (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for Energy) and 105 Litres/Person/Day internal water use (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3/4) in the form of a design stage SAP calculations and a water efficiency calculator shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval, unless an otherwise agreed timeframe is agreed in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To ensure the development minimises its overall demand for resources and to demonstrate compliance with policy CS20 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted Version (January 2010).

10. Energy & Water (performance condition)

Within 6 months of any part of the development first becoming occupied, written documentary evidence proving that the development has achieved at minimum 19% improvement over 2013 Dwelling Emission Rate (DER)/ Target Emission Rate (TER) (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for Energy) and 105 Litres/Person/Day internal water use (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3/4) in the form of final SAP calculations and water efficiency calculator and detailed documentary evidence confirming that the water appliances/fittings have been installed as specified shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval.

Reason: To ensure the development has minimised its overall demand for resources and to demonstrate compliance with policy CS20 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted Version (January 2010).

11. Refuse & Recycling (Performance)

Before the development hereby approved first comes into occupation, 2 x 240litre wheeled bins (one with green lid, one with blue lid) and a glass collection box for refuse storage shall be provided and thereafter retained on site. The bins shall only be moved to the footway on the day of collection and shall remain within the residential curtilage at all other times.

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

Note to applicant: In accordance with para 9.2.3 of the Residential Design Guide (September 2006): if this development involves new dwellings, the applicant is liable for the supply of refuse bins, and should contact SCC refuse team at Waste.management@southampton.gov.uk at least 8 weeks prior to occupation of the development to discuss requirements.

12. Cycle parking (Performance Condition)

Before the development hereby approved first comes into occupation, secure and enclosed storage for a minimum of 1 bicycle shall be provided within the side/rear garden and made available for use. The storage shall thereafter be retained as approved.

Reason: To encourage cycling as an alternative form of transport.

13. Landscaping & means of enclosure detailed plan (Pre-Commencement)

Notwithstanding the submitted details, before the commencement of any site works a detailed landscaping scheme and implementation timetable shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing, which includes:

- i. means of enclosure (including retention of existing 2m height wall for garden privacy); hard surfacing materials, structures and ancillary objects;
- ii. planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/planting densities where appropriate;
- iii. details of any proposed boundary treatment, including retaining walls and;
- iv. a landscape management scheme.

The approved hard and soft landscaping scheme (including parking) for the whole site shall be carried out prior to occupation of the building or during the first planting season following the full completion of building works, whichever is sooner. The approved scheme implemented shall be maintained for a minimum period of 5 years following its complete provision.

Any trees, shrubs, seeded or turfed areas which die, fail to establish, are removed or become damaged or diseased, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting shall be replaced by the Developer in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. The Developer shall be responsible for any replacements for a period of 5 years from the date of planting.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interests of visual amenity, to ensure that the development makes a positive contribution to the local environment and, in accordance with the duty required of the Local Planning Authority by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

14. Ecological Mitigation (Pre-commencement)

Prior to commencement of development details of a bat box to be incorporated into the fabric of the building shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. This box should be located on the eastern elevation of the proposed house away from the street light. The development shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To safeguard protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) in the interests of preserving and enhancing biodiversity.

15. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in the schedule attached below, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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