

Planning and Rights of Way Panel 13th July 2021
Planning Application Report of the Head of Planning & Economic Development

Application address: 11 Monks Way, Southampton			
Proposed development: Erection of a single storey side extension			
Application number:	21/00619/FUL	Application type:	FUL
Case officer:	Killian Whyte	Public speaking time:	5 minutes
Last date for determination:	11.06.2021	Ward:	Swaythling
Reason for Panel Referral:	5 or more letters of objection and Ward Cllr referral	Ward Councillors:	Cllr Lorna Fielker Cllr Sharon Mintoff Cllr Spiros Vassiliou
Referred to Panel by:	Cllr Lorna Fielker and Cllr Spiros Vassiliou	Reason:	Development is out of keeping with the character of the Herbert Collins Estate and would affect visibility and set an unwelcome precedent
Applicant: Mr Eric Stone		Agent: Mr Steve Walker	

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 of the of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Amended 2015). Policies – SDP1, SDP7, SDP9, of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (Amended 2015) 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		

Recommendation in Full

Conditionally Approve

1. The site, its context and background to the scheme

- 1.1 The application site is a two-storey terraced dwelling in a residential area characterised by two storey terraced dwellings fronting open space.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is for a 3.6m high, 3.2m wide and 9.1m depth west facing single storey side extension. The original application also included the insertion of a side facing dormer, which would have faced Monks Way.
- 2.2 The proposals have been amended during the course of the application to address some neighbour and officer concerns. The roof dormer has been relocated from the side to the rear and now falls under permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development (PD)) Order 2015 (as amended) as the dormer does not exceed 40m³ of the original roof space. Following this amendment the dormer has been removed from the description of the development as it does not require planning permission.

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), the City of Southampton Core Strategy (as amended 2015) and the City Centre Action Plan (adopted 2015). The most relevant policies 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 amenity of the city and its citizens. Policies SDP7 (Context), SDP9 (Scale, massing and appearance) of the Local Plan Review, policy CS13 (Fundamentals of Design) of the Core Strategy 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.
- 3.3 Policy SDP 7 from the Local Plan (2015) says that any development proposal should both respect the existing layout of buildings within the streetscape and the scale, density and proportion of existing buildings. It is considered that this proposal will achieve that through its design, which like No.1 Monks Way integrates into the character of the existing property.
- 3.4 Policy SDP 9 on scale, massing and appearance from the Local Plan (2015) says that any development proposals should respect their

surroundings in terms of the impact on surrounding land uses and local amenity. It is considered that this proposal will respect its surroundings in terms of its material use as well as will integrate well into the character of the building and the surrounding area.

- 3.5 Section 2.5.2 of the Residential Design Guide (2006) says that any roof of a proposal must relate to the original design of the building and existing roof which usually means a pitched roof (hipped or gabled) set lower than the ridge of the main roof. Furthermore, roof tiles or slates, ridge, hip, valley and ventilation tiles and or details, and valley details should be the same for extensions as for the original building and use the same sized, coloured and textured tiles or slates. It is considered that the hipped roof and the design materials integrate and matches the existing property. Furthermore, it is single storey only and thus will not take away from the character and amenity of the existing property.

4. Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 There is no relevant planning history at this site.

5. Consultation Responses and Notification Representations

- 5.1 Following the receipt of this 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 **7 representations**.

The following is a summary of the points raised:

- 5.1.1 *'The plans clearly shows the plans are for a Front Extension as opposed to a side extension'.*

Response: This proposal takes place at the side of this property, as the front of this property is North facing in line with the line of residential properties in this row of terraced properties. The side of this property is west facing.

- 5.1.2 *'These plans would cause damage to the look of the whole estate and the erode the historical importance of this Herbert Collins Estate. Which is designed and built on the garden city movement, of houses set back with large front gardens, with the open plan design of the whole estate'.*

Response: This property does not fall within a conservation area and this property is not listed. There is no designated heritage conservation attached to this area and whilst the surrounding area is in the Herbert Collins style, it has not been designated as a conservation area. This proposal will not erode a front garden as it is taking place at the side of this particular property.

- 5.1.3 *'These plans would stick out beyond everyone's property, overshadow neighbouring properties and front gardens, reduce the front garden of this property ruining the look and symmetry of the road'.*

Response: Whilst it is acknowledged that this property would be immediately visible from the main streetscene, the design incorporates well into the main property and it is considered that this proposal to the side of this property will not cause any overshadowing to the neighbouring property to the south at No.13. The front part of this terrace will not be impacted by this proposal. Given the single storey nature of the development the shadow will fall predominantly across the application site rather than its neighbours.

- 5.1.4 *'These plans would change the whole look when you are approaching Monks Way, as the terraces would not be the same'.*

Response: This is a modest alteration to the property, it is single storey only and its design incorporates well into the existing property. Thus, it is considered that this proposal will not have a negative impact on the amenity on both the existing property and the surrounding area.

- 5.1.5 *'The extension would be too dominant in the street scene, too other properties, effect the openness of the location, effect visibility for motorists and pedestrians'.*

Response: This proposal due to its scale and position at the side of this property is considered not to have a negative impact. Furthermore, this proposal is set in by approximately 6m from the public highway and thus will not have a negative impact on highway safety on this section of Monks Way.

- 5.1.6 *'The traffic at this end of Monks way is already dangerous to the community and an extension down there would only make matters worse. This proposal could also affect the visibility of drivers as this is on a corner property'.*

Response: This proposal is set in by at least 6m from the public highway and thus will not have a negative impact on highway safety on this section of Monks Way. This proposal will not have any impact on sightlines in this section of Monks Way.

- 5.1.7 *'There are covenants in place relating to the Mansbridge area which this overdevelopment breech since most cover the preservation of the dwellings and this proposal is contrary to this'.*

Response: Residential covenants are not Planning matter and can be enforced in other ways.

5.1.8 *'The main lines for services such as gas, water and sewage run close to the surface and it is more likely than not that neighbours would be adversely affected'.*

Response: This is not a Planning consideration and, if necessary, can be resolved at the Building Regulations stage.

5.2 Consultation Responses

5.2.1 Cllr L Fiekler:

I object to this extension. The plans show an extension to the front not side of the property This is out of keeping with the character of the Herbert Collins Estate.

5.2.2 Cllr S Vassilliou

I wish to object to this application for the following reasons and ask that final determination goes to the planning panel for consideration:

- 1) This extension would cause damage to the look of the estate and would not be in keeping with the area as it would be overbearing to the front of the property and out of character.
- 2) It could effect the visibility of drivers as this is on a corner property.
- 3) This is a historical Herbert Collins Estate and this could set an unfortunate precedent in undermining the open green plan of the estate.

6.0 Planning Consideration Key Issues

6.1 The key issues for consideration in determining this planning application are:

- (i) Design; and,
- (ii) Residents' amenity.

6.2 The application description initially referenced a small rear roof dormer located in the southern roof slope. The proposed dormer would extend the existing roof with a volume of 2.1m³ which is significantly under the PD allowances for a terraced property which is 40m³. As such the dormer could be constructed under permitted development and does not require express planning permission. Therefore, these works have a material fallback position of permitted development and therefore it would be unreasonable to refuse permission for the roof works in this instance.

6.3 Design

6.3.1 No.11 Monks Way is an end of terraced property which forms part of a crescent of terraced properties facing north on to public amenity land. The side elevation of the property runs parallel with Monks Way and incorporates a side access door. Towards the rear of the site is a fenced off area associated with the rear garden of the property. Between the side elevation and Monks Way is a deep verge and footpath. The proposals are for a single storey side extension that would run the length of the flank

elevation of the property. The side extension would have a hipped roof and incorporate a new access door. The siting, size and design of the extension would be highly visible from Monks Way. Due to its location between the side elevation of the property and a highway, planning permission is required.

- 6.3.2 Whilst the side extension would be highly visible in the street, it is not considered it would detract from the existing property or result in an incongruous or harmful addition to the street scene. The use of hipped roof would lean in to the existing dwelling and reduce any bulk to the roof and the width and depth of the extension would be proportionate with the existing dwelling. On this basis the extension is considered to be a proportionate and sympathetic addition to the existing property. No.1 Monks Way also has a similar sized side extension which is prominently visible from Mansbridge Lane, which appears as a sympathetic addition to the street scene. In this instance the extension is also considered to be sympathetic and would not be harmful to pattern of development in the area or the character and appearance of the area. On this basis the proposals are considered to be acceptable and would comply with the requirements of the relevant Development Plan policies listed above, and guidance contained within Section 12 of the NPPF.

6.2 **Residential Amenity**

- 6.2.1 No.s 9, 12 and 13 Monks Way would look out on the single storey extension. However, given the single storey scale of the development, coupled with its location parallel to Monks Way and significant distance to neighbour properties (over 15m from the nearest neighbour to the south), it is not considered that that proposed extension would result in significant overlooking impacts or overshadowing to the amenities of the nearby occupiers. On this basis the proposals are considered to be acceptable when assessed against saved Local Plan policy SDP1(i).

7. **Summary**

- 7.1 In summary, the proposals would integrate well with both the character of the property and the surrounding area. In addition, this proposal will not have a negative impact for neighbouring properties and the proposals would comply with the relevant Development Plan policies.

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) (d) (g) 4.(f) (vv) 6. (a) (b)

KW for 13/07/2021 PROW Panel

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. 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. Materials as proposed (Performance Condition)

The materials and finishes to be used for the walls, roof, windows and doors hereby permitted shall be as specified and detailed in the application form, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

POLICY CONTEXT

Core Strategy - (as amended 2015)

CS13 Fundamentals of Design

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

SDP1 Quality of Development
SDP4 Development Access
SDP5 Parking
SDP7 Context
SDP 9 Scale, Massing and Appearance
SDP10 Safety & Security

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Parking Standards SPD (September 2011)

Residential Design Guidance

Other Relevant Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (2019)