

Planning and Rights of Way Panel 24th May 2022
Planning Application Report of the Head of Planning & Economic Development

Application address: 3 Raymond Road, Southampton			
Proposed development: Erection of part two-storey, part single-storey front and rear extensions, a single storey side extension; and roof alterations including increased ridge height, roof lights and side facing dormer window.			
Application number:	21/01769/FUL	Application type:	Householder
Case officer:	Laura Treagus	Public speaking time:	5 minutes
Last date for determination:	25.01.2022	Ward:	Shirley
Reason for Panel Referral:	Five or more letters of objection have been received	Ward Councillors:	Cllr Hannah Coombes Cllr Satvir Kaur Cllr Alexander Winning
Applicant: Mr Amit Wagadia		Agent: JaGs ArchiTechs Ltd	

Recommendation Summary	Conditionally Approve
-------------------------------	------------------------------

Community Infrastructure Levy Liable	Not applicable
---	-----------------------

Reason for Granting Permission

The development is acceptable taking into account the policies and proposals of the Development Plan as set out below. 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 39-42 and 46 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Policies –CS13 of the of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Amended 2015). Policies – SDP1, SDP7 and, SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (Amended 2015).

Appendix attached			
1	Development Plan Policies		

Recommendation in Full
Conditionally approve

1. The site and its context

- 1.1 The application site comprises a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse on the northern side of Raymond Road, featuring buff-coloured brick with white rendering, white fenestration, and slate-tiled roof. The property comprises a long rear garden with an existing patio that spans the width of the rear elevation and an existing outbuilding.
- 1.2 The wider area is residential in character, predominantly comprised of detached dwellinghouses.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The application proposes the erection of a part two-storey, part single-storey front and rear extensions, a single storey side extension; and roof alterations including increased ridge height, roof lights and side facing dormer window.
- 2.2 The proposed two-storey extension would infill the current L-shaped footprint at the rear of the property. The extension would allow for a reconfiguration of the first-floor layout and the provision of an additional bedroom and two en-suites at first floor level. The proposed bedroom would be served by a window on the rear elevation and two bathrooms would feature windows on the western side elevation. It extends 9.62m along the common boundary (5.63m at two storey) and has a width of 7.79m.
- 2.3 In order to facilitate the conversion of the roofspace into habitable accommodation, the application proposes increasing the ridge height of the roof from 8.4m to 8.8m and the erection of a dormer on the east facing roof slope, which would be set down from the ridge line and eaves by approximately 0.4m. These roof alterations would provide a bedroom and en-suite, with windows on the east side elevation serving the bedroom and stairwell.
- 2.4 The proposed single storey rear extension would extend 4.0m from the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse and would have an eaves height of approximately 3.3m with a flat roof profile. The existing outbuilding would be removed.
- 2.5 At the front of the property the existing two-storey bay window feature would be squared-off and a first-floor extension would be sited above the existing ground-floor 'lobby'.
- 2.6 Additionally, the application proposes the erection of a single-storey garage on the eastern side of the dwellinghouse, extending 2.7m from the existing side elevation up to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property No.1 Raymond Road. The proposed garage would have a flat roof profile with an eaves height of 2.6m, with traditional up-and-over garage doors.
- 2.7 External facing materials would include brickwork to match the exiting dwellinghouse, white uPVC double glazed windows and doors, black uPVC

gutters and downpipes, and plain clay rooftiles to match.

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) and the City Centre Action Plan (adopted 2015). The most relevant policies to these proposals are set out at **Appendix 1**.

3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in 2021. Paragraph 219 confirms that, where existing local policies are consistent with the NPPF, they can be afforded due weight in the decision-making process. The Council has reviewed the Development Plan 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 No relevant planning history on record.

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. At the time of writing the report **18 representations** have been received from surrounding residents. The following is a summary of the points raised:

5.2 *The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site.* **Response**

While the proposed extensions would increase the footprint of the dwellinghouse, the total site coverage remains below 50%. The site would retain a large, usable rear garden and, as such, the proposed scheme is not considered to result in overdevelopment of the site.

5.3 *The proposal would result in the loss of a view from No. 7 Raymond Road.*

Officer Response

The loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

5.4 *The proposal would result in a loss of light to neighbouring properties.* **Response**

Due to the orientation, proximity, and relationship of the application property to neighbouring dwellings the existing dwelling overshadows the flank wall and breakfast room of the neighbouring property, No. 5 Raymond Road during the morning. While officers acknowledge that the proposed two-storey extension would result in a loss of diffuse light, particularly with regard to the

two side-facing windows, the overall impact is not considered to result in an unacceptable or adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity given the current arrangements and the proposed change.

5.5 ***The proposal would result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.***

Response

The proposed side-facing windows would at first floor would serve bathrooms and would be conditioned to be obscurely glazed. The windows of the proposed dormer would face onto the blank roof slope of No. 1 Raymond Road and, as such, are not considered to reduce the level of privacy currently enjoyed by neighbouring occupants. In addition, the back-to-back separation distance between habitable rooms at first-floor would measure approximately 36m, in excess of the minimum separation distance of 21m as set out in section 2.2.4 of the approved Residential Design Guide (2006).

5.6 ***The proposal would result in increased traffic and parking issues.***

Response

The proposed scheme would increase the number of bedrooms from 4 to 5/6. The Parking Standards SPD (2011) states that the maximum provision for a 4+ bedroom dwelling is 3 spaces. Given that the application site will remain a single family dwellinghouse and that provision of fewer than the maximum number of parking spaces is permissible, it is not considered that the proposed scheme would have a detrimental impact upon parking amenity or local traffic.

5.7 ***The dwelling could be converted into a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).***

Response

The application does not involve a change of use to an HMO. Converting the property to an HMO would require a separate planning application. The current scheme is limited to extensions and modifications to a family dwellinghouse and, therefore, the speculation of future applications is not a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into consideration in the decision-making process for this application.

Consultation Responses

5.8 None sought.

6.0 Planning Consideration Key Issues

6.1 The key issues for consideration in the determination of this planning application are:

- The principle of development;
- Design and effect on character;
- Residential amenity;
- Impact on Parking

6.2 Principle of Development

6.2.1 The application site lies within an urban area in which dwellings in the immediate and nearby area have been extended and modified overtime and where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable. The planning assessment must now consider whether the nature, design and impact of the proposal are appropriate and in accordance with relevant Local Plan policies and supplementary guidance.

6.3 Design and effect on character

6.3.1 The proposed raising of the height of the roof would bring the ridge line broadline in line with neighbouring properties and is considered to be sympathetic to the character of the local area. A streetscene has been provided to show this relationship. The dormer window is considered modest in terms of scale and design, incorporating a set-down from the ridge line of the main roof and a set-back from the eaves, and is therefore considered to be an appropriate and acceptable addition to the existing dwelling.

6.3.2 The proposed alteration to the two-storey bay window feature and first-floor extension at the front of the property would change the appearance of the dwelling. However, these modifications are considered sympathetic to the existing dwelling and would not have a detrimental impact upon the appearance of the property or the character of the wider area.

6.3.3 The proposed single-storey garage on the eastern side of the property is considered modest in terms of scale and massing and is considered to be an appropriate addition to the existing dwelling, whilst maintaining separation between buildings in the wider streetscene.

6.3.4 The proposed rear extensions and changes to the roof form at the rear of the dwelling would not be visible from the adjacent highway and are not considered to have a harmful impact upon the character of the area. Additionally, a useable rear garden size of approximately 233sq.m would be retained, in excess of the minimum garden size of 90sq.m for a detached dwelling as set out in section 2.3.14 of the approved Residential Design Guide (2006).

6.3.5 The proposals would utilise a traditional palate of materials that would match or be similar in appearance to those of the existing dwelling in order to maintain the character and appearance of the existing property and the wider surrounding area.

6.3.6 On this basis, the proposed scheme is not considered inappropriate and will not have a harmful effect on the character of the application site and the wider surrounding area.

6.4 Residential amenity

6.4.1 The existing property features a single-storey and two-storey rear outshot. The proposed two-storey rear extension would infill the current staggered footprint at the rear of the property in line with the main dwellinghouse.

6.4.2 Neighbouring residents have raised concerns regarding overshadowing and loss of light from the raising of the roof and the two storey rear extension. In particular, concerns have been raised by the neighbouring dwelling to the west, No. 5 Raymond Road regarding the loss of light from to their 'breakfast room' on the ground floor. This room features one window on the rear elevation facing the rear garden and two windows on the side elevation facing towards the application site. By virtue of the north facing orientation of the rear elevation of these properties and east facing side windows, the existing dwelling already overshadows the neighbouring flank wall and breakfast room in the morning. Therefore, the potential of increased overshadowing and loss of sunlight to this room is restricted to the morning and is limited by the existing degree of overshadowing caused by the existing dwelling. On this basis the proposals would not significantly increase overshadowing or loss of sunlight to the neighbouring windows beyond the existing situation.

6.4.3

With regards to the loss of daylight, the neighbour has commissioned a daylight and sunlight report based on guidance by the Building Research Establishment (BRE), which seeks to demonstrate that the proposed extension does not comply with BRE daylight requirements. This is a material consideration and can be viewed on Public Access. In particular the report identifies that 'diffuse daylight' (light received from the sun that has been diffused through the sky) would be adversely affected by the proposed extension. In order to help quantify the loss of daylight, the BRE guide prescribes a Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test which is used to ascertain the amount of daylight a room receives. Diffuse daylight is considered adversely affected if, after a development or extension, the VSC is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value.

6.4.4

The submitted BRE report concludes the following:

The breakfast room at our client's property has three windows of equal size. The enclosed results confirm that the mean average VSC for the breakfast room windows is 21.33% before the development, and this would be reduced to 15.76% afterward. The daylight would therefore be reduced to 0.74 times its former value. Since the VSC after the extension is less than 27% and since the light is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value, the proposed extension fails to meet the BRE guidelines.

6.4.5

Officer's acknowledge that the size, siting and design of the proposed extensions would result in some loss of daylight to these neighbouring ground floor windows in the side elevation and do not dispute the above findings. However, it must also be acknowledged that the breakfast room is also served by a third window in the rear elevation facing down the garden.

When assessed against the VSC, light to this third window is reduced from 26.1% to 23.7% (2.4% loss) and 0.91 ratio. Therefore, this loss would not be significant. In calculating the level of harm, the BRE guidelines advises that where there is a decrease in daylight or sunlight and such rooms fail to meets the guidelines, factors such as whether a small number of windows or limited area is affected, whether the loss of light is only just outside the guidelines, and/or whether an affected room has other sources of light, must be taken into account. In this instance the breakfast room is served by another light source, which would not experience any significant additional loss of daylight as a result of the extension.

6.4.6

Finally, it remains the case that the BRE Report is not a test to determine whether a development “Passes” or “Fails”, but rather “A Guide to Good Practice”. The BRE guide is a material consideration but does not form part of the Development Plan. Furthermore the National Planning Practice Guidance advocates flexibility when considering daylight and sunlight tests, which includes consideration of detailed design, which in this instance includes the relevance of the orientation and the fact that the affected room has an alternative source of light:

All developments should maintain acceptable living standards. What this means in practice, in relation to assessing appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight, will depend to some extent on the context for the development as well as its detailed design. For example in areas of high-density historic buildings, or city centre locations where tall modern buildings predominate, lower daylight and daylight and sunlight levels at some windows may be unavoidable if new developments are to be in keeping with the general form of their surroundings.

6.4.7

With this in mind, the additional loss of daylight to these windows beyond the existing situation is not considered to be significant, and is not considered substantial enough to warrant a stand-alone refusal reason. As such the proposal is not considered to result in a significant loss of amenity to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

6.4.8

In terms of outlook, with regard to the window on the rear elevation of the breakfast room, the 45 Degree Line (as set out in section 2.2.11 of the Residential Design Guide) will be maintained as a result of the two-storey extension, retaining acceptable outlook. The proposed single-storey rear extension would contravene the 45 Degree Line, however as the extension would be single-storey it is not considered to have an unacceptable or adverse impact upon the outlook from the rear window.

6.4.9

By virtue of the existing first-floor rear projection, the proposed two-storey rear extension is not considered to have an impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring property to the east, No. 1 Raymond Road.

6.4.10

In terms of privacy, the additional side-facing windows at first floor would serve bathrooms and would be conditioned to be obscurely glazed. The retention of the existing side-facing window at first floor is not considered to

have an impact on privacy. Additionally, the windows of the proposed dormer would face onto the blank roof slope of No. 1 Raymond Road and, as such, are not considered to reduce the level of privacy currently enjoyed by neighbouring occupants. Furthermore, the back-to-back separation distance between habitable rooms at first floor would measure approximately 36m, in excess of the minimum separation distance of 21m as set out in section 2.2.4 of the Residential Design Guide (2006). As such, the application is considered to meet the requirements of saved Policy SDP1(i) from the Local Plan.

6.5 Impact on Parking

6.5.1 The proposed works would result in a 6-bedroom family dwelling. The maximum provision of car parking spaces would remain unchanged. The existing driveway and attached garage are capable of accommodating the required off street parking. On this basis parking provision in accordance with the council's parking guidance.

7. Summary

7.1 The proposed extensions are not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, in accordance with CS13 of the City Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy, and, SDP1(i), SDP7 and SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (amended 2015).

7.2 Whilst the proposed scheme would have an impact on the neighbouring properties at No. 5 in terms of some loss of diffuse daylight, on balance this is not considered to amount to significant harm to residential amenity given the extent of existing degree of overshadowing and alternative light source serving this room. Therefore, the proposals would comply with saved Policy SDP1(i) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (amended 2015) and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. As such, officers recommend approval of the application.

8. Conclusion

8.1 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out below.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Documents used in the preparation of this report Background Papers

1. (a) (b) (c) (d) 2. (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) 4.(f) (g) (vv) 6. (a) (b) 7. (a)

Laura Treagus PROW Panel 24/05/22

PLANNING CONDITIONS to include:

1. 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).

2. 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.

3. Materials as specified and to match (Performance Condition)

The materials and finishes to be used for the external walls, windows (including recesses), drainage goods and roof in the construction of the development hereby permitted, shall be as specified on the approved plans. Where there is no materials specification on the approved plans, the materials shall match in all respects the type, size, colour, texture, form, composition, manufacture and finish of those on the existing building.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interest of the visual amenities of the locality and to endeavour to achieve a building of high visual quality and satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

4. Obscure Glazing (Performance Condition)

All windows in the side elevations, located at first floor level and above, in the side elevations of the development hereby approved, shall be obscure 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.

5. 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.

POLICY CONTEXT

Core Strategy - (as amended 2015)

CS13 Fundamentals of Design

City of Southampton Local Plan Review – (as amended 2015)

SDP1 Quality of Development

SDP7 Urban Design Context

SDP9 Scale, Massing & Appearance

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Residential Design Guide (Approved – September 2006)

Parking Standards SPD (September 2011)

Other Relevant Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (2021)