Planning and Rights of Way Panel 23rd September 2025
Planning Application Report of the Head of Transport and Planning

Application address: 35 Luccombe Road, Southampton			
Proposed development: Erection of single storey wrap around extension (Resubmission of 25/00355/FUL)			
Application number:	25/00789/FUL	**Application type:**	FUL
Case officer:	Alex Lindfield	**Public speaking time:**	5 minutes
Last date for determination:	17.09.2025	**Ward:**	Shirley
Reason for Panel Referral:	5 or more objections received	**Ward Councillors:**	Cllr Kloker Cllr Percival Cllr Alexander Winning
Applicant: Mr Fahim Qayumi		**Agent:** Mrs Asma Majid	

Recommendation Summary	**Conditionally Approve**

Community Infrastructure Levy Liable	**Not applicable**
Biodiversity Net Gain Applicable	**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 (revised 2023). Policies CS13 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Amended 2015). Policies – SDP1 and SDP7 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (Amended 2015).

Appendix attached			
1	Development Plan Policies	2	Relevant Planning History

Recommendation in Full

Conditionally Approve

1.	**The site and its context**
1.1	The application site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached residential dwelling located on the eastern side of Luccombe Road, within a well-established suburban area. The property is set back from the highway with a reasonably sized front garden

	and benefits from a driveway providing off-street parking. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, featuring similar semi-detached and terraced properties with consistent architectural styles and building lines. The building is currently undergoing a complete refurbishment.
1.2	The dwelling occupies a rectangular plot with a private rear garden that backs onto other residential gardens. The site is generally level and not subject to any significant topographical constraints. The property is not listed and does not lie within a designated conservation area.
2.	**Proposal**
2.1	This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single-storey wraparound extension, which is a resubmission of previously approved application 25/00355/FUL. The Panel should note that most of the submission already has approval, but the changes proposed warrant a fresh application. The previous consents should be afforded significant weight in this decision.
2.2	The proposal retains the approved depth (3.0m) and height (3.2m) of the rear extension (following demolition of the existing conservatory), but introduces a modest amendment by increasing the overall width of the extension by approximately 2 metres to infill the side of the property (following demolition of the existing garage) and create a wraparound extension. In addition to the change in width, this resubmission also proposes the installation of bi-fold doors to the rear elevation and a window facing the highway at the front elevation. All other aspects of the original scheme remain unchanged.
2.2	Many of the aspects of the application are already approved by previous decisions as detailed below and the Panel's focus should, therefore, be on the changes proposed following these permissions: • Side extension & loft conversion (ref: 25/00308/PLDC) • Single storey rear extension (ref: 25/00355/FUL)
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 2025. Paragraph 232 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	A schedule of the relevant planning history for the site is set out in ***Appendix 2*** of this report.

5.	**<u>Consultation Responses and Notification Representations</u>**
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 **<u>8 representations</u>** and a public petition have been received from surrounding residents. The following is a summary of the points raised:
5.2	**Objections**
5.2.1	<u>Overdevelopment</u> *Response: This concern will be addressed in section 6.3 regarding the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area.*
5.2.2	<u>Out of character</u> *Response: This concern will be addressed in section 6.3 regarding the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area.*
5.2.3	<u>Loss of amenity space</u> *Response: This concern will be addressed in section 6.4 regarding the impact of the development in regard to amenity.*
5.2.4	<u>Concerns regarding Ecology & Wildlife</u> *<u>Response</u>: The applicant cleared their front garden of non-protected planting when they began their project. The proposed extension is of a modest size and the loss of wildlife for this residential extension would not be significant. Under the wildlife act the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994, and to other wildlife legislation (for example Protection of Badgers Act 1992, Wild Mammals Protection Act 1996). These make it an offence to kill or injure any wild bird intentionally, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird intentionally (when the nest is being built or is in use), disturb, damage or destroy and place which certain wild animals use for shelter (including badgers and all bats and certain moths, otters, water voles and dormice), kill or injure certain reptiles and amphibians (including adders, grass snakes, common lizards, slow-worms. This has also been added as an informative to the below list of planning conditions, but is not a reason for withholding planning permission.*
5.2.4	<u>The 2nd floor large dormer overlooks neighbouring properties</u> *Response: This concern will be addressed in section 6.4 regarding the impact of the development on neighbouring properties.*

5.2.5	<u>The development will be converted into an HMO</u> *<u>Response:</u> Concerns have been raised regarding the potential future conversion of the property into a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). While these concerns are noted, it is important to clarify that this application relates solely to the proposed physical extension of the property as described in the submitted plans. No change of use is proposed and the Council cannot determine an application as though it is.* *The planning authority is required to assess the application based on its current form and intended use as presented. Any future change of use, including conversion to an HMO, would require the submission of a separate planning application. Such an application would be subject to the usual planning process, including public consultation and assessment against relevant policies and standards, such as those relating to residential amenity, parking provision, and housing mix.* *As such, the current proposal must be considered independently of any speculative future use.*
5.2.6	<u>Concerns regarding parking and access</u> *<u>Response:</u> This concern will be addressed in section 6.5 under the Parking section.*
5.2.7	<u>Loss of amenity to neighbours</u> *<u>Response:</u> This concern will be addressed in section 6.4 regarding the impact of the development on neighbouring properties.*
5.2.8	<u>Noise, waste and management issues</u> *<u>Response:</u> The proposed development does not involve a change of use and will remain residential. Any increase in noise or waste is expected to be in line with typical residential activity and managed through existing services.*
5.2.9	Poor Design *<u>Response:</u> This concern will be addressed in section 6.3 regarding the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area.*
	<u>Consultation Responses</u>
5.4	**Consultee** / **Comments** N/A /
6.0	**<u>Planning Consideration Key Issues</u>**
6.1	The key issues for consideration in the determination of this planning application are: - Design and effect on character

	- Residential amenity - Parking
6.3	<u>Design and effect on character</u>
6.3.1	The proposed development represents a minor amendment to the previously approved single-storey wraparound extension (ref: 25/00355/FUL). The proposed changes would constitute a 2.0m increase in the width of the rear extension which would then infill the gap between the approved side elevation of the approved extension and the side boundary. This would result in a wrap-around extension that combines a rear and side extension that falls outside the scope of permitted development hence the need for planning permission. The 'fallback' permission is, however, a material consideration.
6.3.2 6.3.3	The amendments are largely confined to the rear elevation, with limited visibility from the public realm, except for the front of the side extension, which will be visible from the street, replacing an existing garage and being set back from the highway. While some concerns have been raised regarding overdevelopment and that this scheme reflects poor design, the proposed changes are considered modest and must be considered in the context of existing approvals. The previous application 25/00355/FUL provided express planning consent for a single-storey rear extension, and application 25/00308/PLDC has confirmed that a single storey side extension (2.8m wide x 5.8m long) and roof alterations with dormers, benefits from permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A and B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2025. Therefore, the siting and height of a single storey side and a single storey rear extension has already been established through these previous consents. It is only the infill of the gap 2.6m wide x 2.7m deep gap which represents the additional development from that already benefits from planning consent. This addition, at the rear of the previously consented side extension, is considered to be small and would not result in an obtrusive or harmful feature to the area, or the existing property.
6.3.4	The proposed amendments would result in a reduction of the rear garden, leaving approximately 53sqm of usable amenity space which is contrary to policy CS16-Housing Mix and Type for a new semi-detached dwelling, which would normally require 70sqm. However, it is noted that the implementation of existing permissions and permitted development rights would already reduce the garden to around 63sq.m. Therefore, the actual loss attributable to the amended scheme is approximately 9sq.m. This is not considered to be a significant loss of rear amenity space, or detrimental to occupier amenity to warrant a refusal of planning permission on these grounds.
6.3.5	In addition, section 2.3.14 of the Residential Design Guide recognises that garden sizes vary across the city, and that in many areas, including this part of Luccombe Road, gardens are typically smaller in nature. The proposed extension would not be out of character with the surrounding pattern of development, where similar rear extensions are evident. Notably, the attached neighbour at No. 6 Luccombe Road has a rear extension of comparable depth, reinforcing the opinion that the proposal would not be out of character with development in the area.

6.4	Residential amenity
6.4.1	As previously addressed in this report there are elements to this scheme that have already gained express and deemed consent through previous decisions. The proposed alterations would include an increase to the width of the rear extension by an approx. 2.0m to create a wraparound extension. The proposed changes will not increase the height nor the depth of that already approved and therefore the harm to amenity would be minimal (when assessed against what could be built under 'permitted development').
6.4.2	The adjoining neighbouring property to the east of the site is 6 Luccombe Place. This property already has a single storey rear extension, with a depth in excess of 3.0m and, therefore, the proposals would not result in any additional impact to this neighbour than already considered and assessed under application 25/00355/FUL. No. 37 Luccombe Road is a semi-detached property located to the north of the application site. The wrap around infill extension would be located nearer to this property than previous proposals, however the extension would only project beyond the main neighbouring rear building line by 2.6m, which also incorporates a rear porch. Therefore, the addition would not result in any significant harm to neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light or outlook.
6.4.3	This application also includes the installation of bi-fold doors on the rear elevation and a new window on the front elevation, where the existing garage is to be replaced. The bi-fold doors will replace existing ground floor windows at the rear of the property, so the outlook will remain unchanged. The proposed front-facing window, although oriented toward the highway, is set back from the street and would not result in any greater impact than a typical ground floor window on the existing dwelling.
6.4.4	There have been concerns raised regarding overlooking and loss of light by the 2nd floor rear dormers, however as this aspect of the scheme has been approved under a lawful development certificate and would constitute 'permitted development' this issue is not for consideration as part of this application.
6.4.5	On the above basis it is considered that the amended proposals would not result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents and the scheme complies with saved Local Plan Review Policy SDP1(i).
6.5	Parking
6.5.1	Concerns have been raised regarding the potential impact on parking provision. Under the previously approved application (ref: 25/00308/PLDC), the number of bedrooms was increased from three to five through the roof alterations. These additional bedrooms could be provided under 'permitted development' without the need for planning permission.
6.5.2	The current proposal does not seek to increase the number of bedrooms, and as such, it is not anticipated to generate additional parking demand. Furthermore, it is noted that the street benefits from unrestricted on-street parking, which is not subject to permit controls, thereby providing additional capacity for residents and visitors.

6.5.3	With regards to emergency vehicle access, the proposal does not alter the existing access arrangements to the site; especially given the existing single storey garage. The extension is of a domestic scale and does not obstruct or restrict access for emergency services. The development is therefore considered acceptable in terms of parking and access.
7.0	**Summary**
7.1	The amended proposals to enlarge the previously consented rear and side extension would not give rise to significant harms in terms of the character of the area, neighbouring amenity or parking in the vicinity. Any suggestion that the property will be used as an HMO cannot be taken into consideration as part of this application and would need planning permission to change the use.
8.0	**Conclusion**
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 **Alex Lindfield** PROW Panel 23.09.2007

PLANNING CONDITIONS

1) Full Permission Timing (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) Materials in accordance with submission (Performance)
The materials and finishes to be used for the external walls, windows (including recesses), drainage goods and roof in the construction of the building hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the submitted plans and information hereby approved.
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.

3) Approved Plans (Performance)
The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in the schedule attached below.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Application 25/00789/FUL

APPENDIX 1

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Residential Design Guide (Approved - September 2006)

Parking Standards SPD (September 2011)

Other Relevant Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (2025)

The Southampton Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (September 2013)

Application 25/00789/FUL

APPENDIX 2

Relevant Planning History

Case Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
25/00308/PLDC	Application for a lawful development certificate for a proposed single storey side extension and roof alterations including hip to gable, rear dormer and roof lights to facilitate loft conversion.		06.05.2025
25/00355/FUL	Erection of a single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory.	Conditionally Approved	14.05.2025