

Planning and Rights of Way Panel 2nd August 2022
Planning Application Report of the Head of Green City & Infrastructure

Application address: 59 Burgess Road, Southampton			
Proposed development: Erection of a part single storey, part first floor rear extension with roof alterations to facilitate loft conversion (amendments to LPA ref: 19/01530/FUL)			
Application number:	22/00531/FUL	Application type:	FUL
Case officer:	Rob Sims	Public speaking time:	5 minutes
Last date for determination:	01.06.2022	Ward:	Bassett
Reason for Panel Referral:	Referred by the Head of Green City & Infrastructure due to wider public interest	Ward Councillors:	Cllr L Harris Cllr R Blackman Cllr J Hannides
Referred to Panel by:	N/A	Reason:	N/A
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Akbar		Agent: Toldfield Architects 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 (2019). Policy – CS13 and CS19 of the of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Amended 2015). Policies – SDP1, SDP5, SDP7, SDP9, SDP21 and SDP23 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (Amended 2015). Policies – BAS1 and BAS4 of the Bassett Neighbourhood Development Plan (2016), as supported by the relevant guidance set out in the Residential Design Guide SPD (2006) and Parking Standards SPD (2011).

Appendix attached			
1	Development Plan Policies	2	Relevant Planning History

Recommendation in Full

Conditionally approve

1.	<u>The site and its context</u>
1.1	The application site contains a semi-detached, two storey family dwelling house. The property is located in a residential area with predominantly detached and semi-detached dwelling houses and a suburban character that is located just north of the northern end of Southampton Common.
1.2	The dwelling sits within a large garden plot with large front driveway, fronting onto the busy route of Burgess Road. The driveway provides parking for at least 3 cars. <i>At the rear boundary of the rear garden there is a retaining wall, which is the subject of application 22/00399/FUL which is also being considered at this Planning and Public Rights of Way Panel.</i>
2.	<u>Proposal</u>
2.1	Extensions and alterations to the dwelling were considered at Planning Panel in November 2019 under application 19/01530/FUL, which approved the <i>'Erection of a part single storey, part first floor rear extension and 2.4m high retaining wall.'</i> The extensions to the dwelling have not been implemented, however the retaining wall at the rear has been implemented, albeit not in accordance with the approved plans, hence the consideration under separate application 22/00399/FUL for the 'as built' retaining wall.
2.2	This application seeks to amend the alterations approved in 2019 by adding roof additions to create a loft conversion. The approved first floor rear extension would not be amended. The approved single storey rear extension would be slightly increased in width by 1.02m.
2.3	The proposed roof additions comprise of an 'L shape' flat roof dormer sited on the rear elevation. The dormers would be served by a 'sunsquare' rooflight, and would not have windows within their elevations. The dormers would have timber treated material on the elevations. Two rooflights would be added to the front roofslope. These additions would facilitate a loft conversion to create a 'home office', although this space could be used for any use incidental to the main dwelling.
3.	<u>Relevant Planning Policy</u>
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	Saved Policy SDP1 (Quality of development) of the Local Plan Review seeks development that would not unacceptably affect the health, safety and

	<p>amenity of the city and its citizens. Policies SDP7 (Context) and SDP9 (Scale, massing and appearance) of the Local Plan Review, policy CS13 (Fundamentals of Design) of the Core Strategy, and policies BAS1 (New Development) and BAS4 (Character and Design) of the Bassett Neighbourhood Plan, assesses the development against the principles of good design and seek development which respects the character and appearance of the local area. These policies are supplemented by design guidance and standards set out in the Residential Design Guide SPD, which seeks high quality housing, maintaining the character and amenity of the local area.</p>
3.3	<p>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.</p>
4.	<p><u>Relevant Planning History</u></p>
4.1	<p>A schedule of the relevant planning history for the site is set out in Appendix 2 of this report. The most relevant planning history is the previously mentioned full application (19/01530/FUL) approved on the 13th of November 2019 by the Planning and Rights of Way Panel for the Erection of a part single storey, part first floor rear extension and 2.4m high retaining wall. The previously approved extensions can still be implemented and are material to the Council's assessment of this application. The retention of the 'as built' retaining wall is the subject of application 22/00399/FUL and is not for consideration as part of this scheme.</p>
5.	<p><u>Consultation Responses and Notification Representations</u></p>
5.1	<p>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 4 <u>representations</u> have been received from surrounding residents. The following is a summary of the points raised:</p>
5.2	<p>The reconfiguration on the first floor and further floor in the roof to accommodate a dormer for an office would overlook neighbouring properties. The dormer, although containing no windows, would be overbearing and visually invasive. From Burgess Gardens the impact of this invasive enormous dormer would have a detrimental impact on the street view, unsightly and unbalanced. It is not in keeping with the area and would be visually very dominant.</p> <p><u>Response</u> The impact of the dormer addition and rooflight on neighbour amenity will be considered in Section 6 below.</p>

5.3	<p>A structure for office/leisure use of the previously agreed 20m squared footprint is acceptable, providing that it is not a dwelling, and no utilities (water, sewage etc) are included. It would have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the local area overall, as well as our personal enjoyment of our property.</p> <p><u>Response</u> The ‘solar glass house’ building shown on the proposed plans is <u>not</u> for consideration under this application. No elevational details of this building have been provided, however it is likely that permitted development rights for this building would be utilised and, therefore, no planning permission would be required.</p>
5.4	<p>Disappointed that the Council has verified yet another planning application from applicants, who have shown a total disregard for the Council and their neighbours in previous applications, and still have a number of outstanding issues from previous poor-quality work, that is not approved, and of which, the Council may yet have to enforce removal, and alteration.</p> <p><u>Response</u> Whilst the frustration of the local community to the manner in which the applicants are developing their site is noted, and forms part of a separate enforcement investigation, it should also be noted that this application is not retrospective as the previously approved extensions have not been implemented. The Council cannot refuse to validate a planning application which has not previous been considered and determined. The applicant has submitted a separate planning application to regularise the ‘as built’ retaining wall.</p>
5.5	<p>The layout plan, existing site plan and proposed site plan are riddled with drawing mistakes, including redrawn boundaries, walls out of place, walls of incorrect materials, and non-approved items, as the front drive and solar glass house included. Whether you approve the loft conversion or not, the application contains multiple errors, such as encroachment into many neighbours' properties, and also additions, which cannot be ignored or passed at the same time.</p> <p><u>Response</u> The issue of encroachment relates to the planning application for the retaining wall and not the proposed roof works. The boundary plan referenced by the objector has been updated with a land registry plan to show potential encroachment, however this does not relate to this application.</p>

<u>Consultation Responses</u>		
5.4	Consultee	Comments
	Old Bassett Residents Association	<p>These comments are submitted on behalf of Old Bassett Resident's Association. We object to this application because it represents yet more development and enlargement of the property and represents over development of questionable design. We request that the following observations be considered by the case officer in assessing this application.</p> <p>(1) The application relates to an original 2 up, 2 down Victorian semi-detached house which has already undergone multiple and substantial extensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - early probable single storey rear extension (it doesn't match #61, the other semi). - 2 storey side extension, front to back of original 2 storey property (M19/1661/22463 (1985)). - conversion of garage in 2 storey side extension to "guest room" with toilet and kitchenette (effectively a self-contained, internal annexe). - conservatory. Beyond this existing extension, which already represents a near doubling of size compared to the original property. - there is in-date planning consent for considerable extra 1 and 2 storey rear extensions, first issued under 19/01530/FUL and then under those documents from 19/01530/FUL that were carried forward to 20-00631-FUL (application for variation of conditions on 19/01530/FUL). - under 19/01530/FUL, but not shown in any of the plans carried forward to 20/00631/FUL, the applicant received approval for a reasonably large (4m x 5m), single aspect garden room. Under 22/00399/FUL (another application, currently under consideration and referred to Planning Panel), the applicant has substituted a massive 11m x 7m, dual aspect structure of unspecified appearance, internal layout, features or use. 20/00531/FUL (this application) now seeks yet further significant expansion of the property with a large roof extension which requires raising the roof line at the rear by 600mm. We consider this plethora of overlapping planning applications to represent significant overdevelopment of the site. <p>The Bassett Neighbourhood Development Plan calls for retention of a diverse range of property sizes and the continued extension of existing properties is resulting in a lack of the smaller houses so desperately needed by those seeking to get onto the property ladder. Ultimately this is</p>

	<p>unsustainable and the applicant has already benefited from multiple extensions.</p> <p>(2) For the avoidance of doubt, the description of the development on the portal as "amendments to LPA ref: 19/01530/FUL" is incorrect. 19/01530/FUL is no longer a valid application. As a result of the applicant having placed weep holes in the rear retaining wall (as sought under 20/00631/FUL), as opposed to the soakaways specified under 19/01530/FUL, Council has confirmed that it considers that the applicant has undertaken development according to the approved documents for variation of conditions document 20/00631/FUL which included some, but not all, of the documents approved under 19/01530/FUL, and therefore 19/01530/FUL is no longer, in itself, an approved planning application.</p> <p>(3) We acknowledge that the impact of the proposed roof extension on the street scene would be minimal (2 velux type windows) if built according to the plans.</p> <p>(4) According to submitted plan 190602 TA P A P04, the existing property has, on the first floor 4 bedrooms, a toilet/no basin(!), a toilet/shower/basin and a bath/basin. Under the current approval (20/00631/FUL - 190602 T A P A P09), the applicant has permission to convert current bedroom 3 into (1) a bath/shower/toilet/basin and (2) a toilet/basin shower and to remove the existing toilet/no basin, toilet/shower/basin and bath/basin and merge the space to create an enlarged bedroom 3. This represented an improvement on the existing by placing a basin with each toilet.</p> <p>This application proposes something significantly different in terms of rearrangement of the first floor space (190602 TA P A P14), which is not mentioned anywhere in the application, namely to convert bedroom 4 to a bathroom with toilet/basin/shower/bath and to convert and remove the existing toilet/no basin, toilet/shower/basin and bath/basin and merge the space to create an enlarged bedroom 4.</p> <p>We submit that this unremarked change represents poor design and inadequate provision of bathroom facilities compared to the current approval shown in 20/00631/FUL - 190602 T A P A P09, and therefore request that this change be refused.</p> <p>(5) We note that the application form falsely claims that none of the proposed development has yet started. It claims the front drive to be tarmac and proposes concrete. That</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

development has already taken place and is part of retrospective application 22/00399/FUL. We objected to this under hardstanding under 22/00399/FUL and repeat the objection here because, irrespective of Southern Water not objecting to 22/00399/FUL:

(1) use of non porous hardstanding is contrary to the City's adopted residential design guide.

(2) surface water should be managed within the curtilage, not discharged into the sewer system.

(3) the discharge of surface water to a foul sewer (a) is contrary to Building Regs H and (b) does not represent sustainable development, it overloads local sewer systems to the detriment of residential amenity, making it someone else's problem. Other local residents have commented on increased flooding in the area over the past few years. Council should be promoting sustainable development, not the laziest, cheapest option for applicants.

(6) We repeat our previously advised concerns that #59 and #61 share a common chimney stack and that #61 has already removed the chimney breast on the ground floor (190602 TA P A P14 LHS), leaving the stack above without apparent support, creating lateral tension and increasing the loading on #61's footings. This application proposes to also remove the chimney breast on the first floor (190602 TA P A P14 RHS vs 190602 TA P A P04 RHS) whilst retaining the stack in the roof space and above the roof, apparently unsupported and increasing stresses on #61's stack and footings (190602 TA P A P06). Whilst these structural concerns might not be direct planning matters, the potential consequences of structural collapse could prove fatal to occupants in either property. This is a party wall and therefore the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 applies. For the sake of due diligence, we therefore we request that, if Council is minded to approve this application, that it imposes a condition that the applicant shall obtain a formal legal agreement under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 with the owners of #61 and provide Council with a copy of said agreement to approve prior to any works being permitted to start. In the absence of agreement development should not be allowed to start.

(7) The application seeks to add an extra 600 mm of brickwork to the existing separating wall top (with #61) to the rear in order to provide headroom in the roof conversion. This will add significant extra weight loading onto an already unbalanced and stressed original Victorian dividing wall and footings. Again, this is a party wall and therefore the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 applies. For the sake

	<p>of due diligence, we therefore we request that, if Council is minded to approve this application, that it imposes a condition that the applicant shall obtain a formal legal agreement under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 with the owners of #61 and provide Council with a copy of said agreement to approve prior to any works being permitted to start. In the absence of agreement development should not be allowed to start.</p> <p>(8) No design and access statement has been provided with this application to address issues like sound and thermal insulation. This roof space will get very hot in summer and there seems to be no potential for air circulation unless the roof lights are of a opening design, which is not stated.</p> <p>(9) In terms of basic design, creation of a separate landing for the attic room seems a pointless waste of space, why not open the stairs straight into an enlarged room space? This is poor design.</p> <p>(10) Given that:</p> <p>(a) Council has admitted that it approved the wrong documents in the discharge of conditions for 20/00631/FUL, and thus failed to secure proper conditions to protect neighbourhood amenity under 20/00631/FUL</p> <p>(b) when building the rear retaining wall at this property there was repeated, significant and blatant breach of both the site safety (site shoring, site fencing etc.) documents and work conditions / environment protection documents (bonfires, hours of work, weekend work, bank holiday work etc.) which the applicant had submitted.</p> <p>if Council is minded to approve this application, we request that it imposes a condition requiring the applicant to submit fresh sets of site safety and environmental / work conditions for approval by Council before any work can commence. Further, we request that the approved conditions be placed on the portal so that any further breaches can be identified and reported.</p> <p>In summary, we believe that, on top of the existing extensions and already approved, but not yet started, extensions, this application represents over development of poor design and request that it be refused. We appreciate that more limited roof conversion could be undertaken under PDR.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Officer comment These detail comments are noted and the Planning Department continues to work with all affected parties. Not all the matters raised are Planning specific and those considerations that are materials to this planning application are addressed later in this report.</p>
	SCC Ecology	I have no objection to the proposed development.
	Trees & Open Spaces	No objections
6.0	<u>Planning Consideration Key Issues</u>	
6.1	<p>The key issues for consideration in the determination of this planning application are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design and effect on character; - Residential amenity; - Parking highways and transport; and - Other matters raised locally 	
6.2	<u>Design and effect on character</u>	
6.2.1	<p>Despite the lengthy and contentious planning history to this property the proposals are for the erection of a part single storey and part first floor rear extension and insertion of a rear dormer window and two front rooflights to facilitate a loft conversion.</p>	
6.2.2	<p>The proposed first floor extension has previously been approved under application 19/01530/FUL and would not have materially different impacts to those previously approved. Similarly, whilst the single storey rear extension would be 1.02m wider than previously approved, this would not result in a significantly more harmful addition in terms of size, scale and design. Therefore these elements are considered to be appropriate and acceptable.</p>	
6.2.3	<p>The proposed dormer comprises of an L Shape that would straddle the main roof and the existing two storey rear addition. The dormer would be set lower in height than the main roof and inside of the roof edge and therefore would appear as modest and proportionate additions to the existing property and would not be visible from the public road. The generous proportions of the application site and host dwelling are large enough to accommodate the proposed extensions without them appearing as an overdevelopment of the property. Whilst the dormer does not contain any windows in the elevation, and this affects its design, this is to avoid potential overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbours. The dormers would be served with a 'rooflight' which would not be visible in the public realm. On this basis the proposed dormers are considered to be acceptable and sympathetic additions to the existing property. Likewise the proposed front rooflights would not visually harm the</p>	

	character and appearance of the existing property or street scene.
6.3	<u>Residential amenity</u>
6.3.1	The proposed single storey and first floor extension have previously been approved under application 19/01530/FUL and the slightly larger single storey extension would not have materially harmful impacts on neighbour amenity than those previously approved. The proposed dormers would be sited on the rear elevation, however they do not contain any windows in their elevations would not result in an increase in overlooking, or overshadowing to neighbouring properties and would not appear overbearing to neighbouring properties.
6.3.2	<p>The potential impact of construction noise on neighbouring residents can be mitigated by way of a condition restricting the permitted working hours. Furthermore a 'Construction Environment Management Plan' and 'Construction Management Plan' showing a site set up arrangement during construction have been approved under applications 20/00206/DIS and 20/00631/FUL which included the following measures to be implemented during the construction works to minimise the impact of noise, vibration, dust and odour on neighbouring properties and their occupants.</p> <p>Noisy operations will be restricted to the hours of 0800-1800 Monday to Friday and 0900-1300 Saturday.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant and equipment will comply with EU noise emission limits. • Compressors and pneumatic tools will be fitted with silencers or mufflers. • Plant will be located away from sensitive receptors where possible. • Plant will be regularly serviced to maintain noise efficient performance. • Deliveries will be made during normal working hours, 8:00–18:00 Monday to Friday and 0900-1300 on Saturdays. • Vehicles will be prohibited from waiting with their engines running • All vehicles carrying granular / dusty materials shall be sheeted to prevent particle migration. • All drilling, cutting and grinding operations will be dampened down to prevent dust with on-site hose pipe. • All stock piles to be sealed or covered and located downwind from sensitive receptors where possible. • No fires will be permitted • No radios or other audio broadcasting equipment to be permitted on site. • No lorry shall leave the site until its wheels are sufficiently clean to prevent mud being carried onto the highway. <p>Compliance with this statement would ensure deliveries of materials, storage of materials and control of dust would be controlled and avoid adverse impacts on neighbouring properties in terms of noise and disturbance.</p>

6.3.3	On the above basis, the proposals would not result in harm to the occupiers of neighbouring properties, subject to compliance with conditions securing details of the proposed materials and a construction method statement and construction hours. The application, therefore, complies with saved Local Plan Policy SDP1(i).
6.4	<u>Parking highways and transport</u>
6.4.1	There is no change to the amount, or arrangement of the existing parking on the front driveway. The provision of 3 parking spaces for a dwelling with 4 or more bedrooms would meet our maximum standards in the Parking Standards SPD.
6.5	<u>Other Matters</u>
6.5.1	<p>The Old Bassett Residents Association make reference to a number of other points, some of which require a response as follows:</p> <p><i>Reference to 19/01530/FUL is incorrect as it is no longer, in itself, an approved planning application.</i></p> <p>As application 19/01530/FUL included the retaining wall in its original description, and the drainage scheme for the wall was subsequently amended and approved under Planning application 20/00631/FUL as a variation of condition application (with no changes to the extensions to the property), it is considered that application 20/00631/FUL has been implemented, albeit not in accordance with the approved plans (hence the need for application 22/00399/FUL. As this application relates to amendments to the extensions to the property and does not include reference to the retaining wall, it is appropriate to reference the proposed works as an amendment to application 19/01530/FUL as that permission remains extant for works relating to the extensions. This does not affect the above assessment.</p> <p><i>Internal floor plan is inaccurate and impractical</i></p> <p>The proposed internal layout does not have direct impacts on the external appearance of the extensions, especially at first floor level where the external appearance remains the same. Therefore the practicality of the internal floor layout is not a planning consideration of this application.</p> <p><i>Porous Surfacing and Surface Water Drainage</i></p> <p>Permeable block paving was originally approved on plan number 19062-TA-P-A-P08 Revision A Site Plan 26.09.2019 under application 19/01530/FUL. However this was not included on the list of approved plans carried forward in planning permission 20/00631/FUL, therefore the Council cannot insist on that block paving being provided. In any case the existing hardstanding is concrete and the proposed plans show a concrete surface to be retained. Therefore planning permission is not required to retain this existing concrete treatment.</p>

	<p><i>Requirement to engage with Party Wall Act Agreement for various works</i></p> <p>A party wall act agreement is a private matter for the applicant and neighbouring properties to enter. An informative can be added to remind the applicant to enter in this agreement when carrying out works.</p>
7.	<u>Summary</u>
7.1	The proposed extensions to an existing dwelling would not cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents, and the design of the extensions and alterations would not appear out of character with the host dwelling. Moreover, the site is large enough to accommodate the proposals, and the existing parking would not be compromised.
8.	<u>Conclusion</u>
8.1	It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to 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)

Case Officer **Rob Sims** PROW Panel 02/08/2022

PLANNING CONDITIONS

01. Full Permission Timing Condition (Performance)

The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 14th November 2022.

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

02. 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.

03. Construction Environment Management Plan

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with approved Construction Management Plan submitted and approved under application 20/00206/DIS Ref: 19602, Date: 16.07.2020 and in accordance with the Construction Environment Management Plan received 12/06/2020 and approved under application 20/00631/FUL and no variation shall be made without prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.

04. Obscure Glazing (Performance Condition)

All windows in the side elevations, located at first floor level and above 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.

05. 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 relating specifically to the construction of the extensions to the main dwelling 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.

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.

Party Wall Informative:

These works may require approval under the Party Wall Act. Further details can be obtained from the Council's Building Control Service.

POLICY CONTEXT

Core Strategy - (as amended 2015)

CS13 Fundamentals of Design

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

SDP1 Quality of Development

SDP5 Parking

SDP7 Urban Design Context

SDP9 Scale, Massing & Appearance

Bassett Neighbourhood Development Plan – (Adopted 2016)

BAS1 New Development

BAS4 Character and Design

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Residential Design Guide (Approved - September 2006)

Planning Obligations (Adopted - September 2013)

Parking Standards SPD (September 2011)

Bassett Neighbourhood Plan (July 2016)

Other Relevant Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

The Southampton Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (September 2013)

Relevant Planning History

Case Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
M19/1661	ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION	Conditionally Approved	14.05.1985
18/00749/FUL	Erection of a two-bedroom bungalow with associated bin and refuse storage. Alterations to existing dwelling and narrowing of its width to facilitate vehicular access to rear.	Application Refused	20.08.2018
19/01530/FUL	Erection of a part single storey, part first floor rear extension and 2.4m high retaining wall	Conditionally Approved	14.11.2019
20/00206/DIS	Application for approval of details reserved by conditions, 4 (construction method statement), 5 (materials - retaining wall), 6 (replacement planting scheme) and 8 (implementation timetable - retaining wall) of planning permission ref 19/01530/FUL for a rear extension and retaining wall	No Objection	02.11.2020
20/00631/FUL	Application for variation of condition 3 (Drainage - retaining wall) of planning permission ref 19/01530/FUL to alter the proposed drainage system.	Conditionally Approved	05.11.2020
22/00399/FUL	Retention of "As Built" rear Retaining Wall and erection of additional fencing to the rear boundary treatment		
22/00531/FUL	Erection of a part single storey, part first floor rear extension with roof alterations to facilitate loft conversion (amendments to LPA ref: 19/01530/FUL)		