

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**  
Southampton City Council  
**Planning & Sustainability Division**  
Ground Floor, Civic Centre  
Southampton SO14 7LS

Please ask for: **Stuart Brooks**  
Email: [stuart.brooks@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.brooks@southampton.gov.uk)  
Our Ref: 13/00756/PREAP2

Direct dial: **023 8083 4331**  
Your Ref:

Mr M Holmes  
Concept Design and Planning  
Office 21/22  
Roxan Business Centre  
142 Lodge Road  
Southampton  
SO14 6QR

19th August 2013

Dear Mr Holmes

**RE: 3 Abbotts Way, Southampton**

I write in connection your pre-application enquiry in connection with refused application 13/00693/MMA.

Following your site meeting with Andy Amery you provided an amended plan, namely drawing no. C13 038 which responded to the issues of privacy and visual intrusion discussed at that meeting.

The matter has been discussed further with Heritage officers to provide you with a response on behalf of both the likely case officer and the key consultee.

**Option 1**

From a Heritage perspective the best option, given that it is accepted by officers that high level, obscure glazed windows with limited opening would address the privacy issue, would be to remove the currently unauthorised frame and replace it with a smaller, high level frame with just the three high level lights within it and a properly designed cill beneath. The roof structure could then be rebuilt up to the level of the new frame in matching materials. In terms of design, proportions and quality of finish this would achieve the best solution having regard to the Heritage policies of the Local Plan Review and the guidance in the Conservation Area Management Plan.

**Option 2**

The option of retaining the unauthorised frame and modifying it to maintain the three top lights, obscure glazing them, and only having the central light with top hung opening would not achieve the same level of quality as it involves a 'fudge' of currently unauthorised works.

However, subject to the modifications including a proper cill being provided beneath the high level lights and an appropriately designed infill panel being formed within the remainder of the opening it is accepted that the main element of the reason for refusal - privacy - will have been addressed.

The detailing and materials used on any infill panel must be appropriate to the building and the character of the area. Wooden infill panels as suggested are not considered to be appropriate. On review, infilling with brickwork may also not provide a visually pleasing finish given that it would sit uncomfortably within the retained frame of the unauthorised dormer. Tile hanging is not really characteristic of the area and a trepsa or metallic cladding would appear incongruous with the traditional form and materials on the existing and surrounding buildings.

A rendered panel may possibly work subject to detailing of how it is recessed within the unauthorised frame and that a properly constructed lower cill is provided beneath the windows. Colour finish and texture of the render would need to be agreed prior to the works being undertaken.

The Local Planning Authority strongly favour option 1 to address the concerns of the currently unauthorised works.

Option 2 is considered to overcome the concern with regards to loss of privacy providing that the cill levels are 1.7m above floor level.

The currently unauthorised works are not acceptable as identified in the councils recent decision to refuse the retrospective application seeking to amend the original consent. However, officer support will be given if the advice above in Option 1 is followed prior to submitting a formal application.

Option 2 may be supported if it is demonstrated that the quality and detailing of the scheme is appropriate for the Conservation Area.

I am of the opinion that the application must be dealt with as a full planning application, as the changes do not constitute a minor material amendment given condition 4 imposed by the Inspector to avoid overlooking of the neighbouring properties.

Please note that this is an informal opinion of an Officer without prejudice to the final decision based on the Council's current planning policy and guidance, and without consultation of the neighbours. Given the recent planning history for this site it is likely that any officer recommendation for approval would need to be referred to the Planning and Rights of Way Panel for final decision.

I trust this information is of assistance, but should you require any further clarification then please do hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Stuart Brooks  
Planning Officer

***Register your planning application online by going to [www.planningportal.gov.uk](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk) - quick, direct and economical***