REF. NO. L/15/77025

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Listed Building Consent: Replacement windows to front and side elevations 34 High Street Botley Southampton SO30 2EA

SITE VISIT DATE	09/09/2015	
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes	
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED		Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Replacement timber sash windows to front and side elevations.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	n/a
TOPOGRAPHY	n/a
TREES	None affected by the proposals.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	This is a Grade II listed building built during the early 19th Century. It is a two storey dwelling, with red tiled roof and cream render to front wall with projecting quoins, brick gothic porch to the centre front and sash windows.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The property is located within the designated Botley Conservation area and close to the village centre. Mixture of residential and retail within the area, and varying styles to types of dwelling nearby many of which are also listed.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
L/16818/001/00	Double garage.	Grant Listed Buiding Consent – 03/07/1979
L/16818/002/00	Alterations to existing house.	Grant Listed Building Consent – 03/07/1979
L/16818/003/00	Re-siting and renovations to existing granary.	Grant Listed Building Consent – 03/07/1979
L/16818/007/00	Construction of two storey side extension,	Grant Listed Building Consent –

REF. NO. L/15/77025

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	rear dormer window and porch to rear elevation.	11/04/1991
Z/16818/006/00	Construction of two storey side extension, rear dormer window and porch to rear elevation.	Permit – 11/04/1991

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received.	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Head of Planning Policy and Design – Conservation Officer	1. The drawings numbered page7 and page8 in our system (sheets 3 & 4) included in this application seem to show the sections of material for the windows to be UPVC or aluminium which is not acceptable. The script suggests that the windows will be timber. 2. The details of the windows frames show spring balances which are a relatively modern invention; these would have been box sashes with weights. While I am prepared to accept spring balances in this situation where the originals are long lost anyway, could we not have the stiles doubled up or with boards front and back to simulate box sashes? This would give the impression of more original looking replacements. 3. The cills look unrealistically skinny which again is a modern phenomenon. 4. The head of the 'study' window at the front would be vastly improved if it were curved to follow the line of the brickwork arch in which it is set, at least on the underside. 5. The detail drawings show a cavity wall. As an early 19th. Century building with alternate courses of headers in the end wall it is extremely doubtful that there is a cavity in the wall. 6. The replacement windows should be set with the outside in the same position as the existing which appears to be at the back of the render return into the window apertures. Any beading or quad should be as small as possible, maximum half inch or 12mm but the staff bead shown on the head detail would be preferable. 7. The jamb detail shown is back to front of the traditional way where the staff bead to retain the sash is on the inside and the board is on the outside covering the weight box in addition to the jamb and reducing the opportunities for rot starting and being more secure.(The beading can be removed far more easily than the board which is more part of the structure of the window.) 8. A sketch - traced from the Everest sheets - of a more appropriate method is attached to the e-mail that accompanies these comments. Further response from Tim Dyer (Conservation & Architecture Officer)

REF. NO. L/15/77025

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	Architect) 14/10/2015 – Thank you for your e-mails concerning the replacement windows for 34 High Street, Botley. The reply from Everest is a tad confusing. While the start makes sense, reducing the size of the frame and adding packers and trims there is then reference to some of these being added to the vertically sliding elements which would be the sashes themselves. For clarity, the packers should be between the frame and the wall opening and covered inside and out by the trims with the vertically sliding elements, i.e. the sashes, moving up and down within the frame as originally shown. I think it would be as well to see a drawing of exactly what they propose to do, for certainty. Everest's apparent acceptance of this method of construction is gratifying and will produce a more authentic looking product for this building in such a prominent position without the considerable extra cost of genuine box sash windows. While there is a little extra cost involved in the additional woodwork there is equally a saving in the reduced size of the original window. On the condition that we see a detail drawing prior to manufacture, I am quite happy for listed building consent to be granted. The detail is so important with listed buildings – hence the legislation.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Designated Conservation Area Listed Building Grade II

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policy 174.LB

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014 Policy DM10, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising:

- Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and
- Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014'

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be

REF. NO. L/15/77025

POLICY COMMENTARY

assessed with particular regard to the

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Comments from Heritage Architect noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

n/a

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

"In considering whether to grant Listed Building Consent for any works, the Local Planning Authority … shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Development Plan Policies:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011:

Saved Policy 174.LB states that the alteration or extension of a listed building or any development within the curtilage of a listed building will not be permitted if it would result in a detrimental impact on the building or its setting.

Assessment of Proposals:

The application is considered to comply with the aforementioned development plan policies as well as the relevant legislative background and national planning policies for the following reasons:

The proposals will not result in any detrimental impact to either the listed building or its setting and will not detract from its special character or qualities. The works are for the replacement of windows to the front elevation and 2no.windows to the side elevation and will therefore not alter the buildings current shape, scale or form.

As per the comments of the Council's Conservation Officer, the replacement timber sash windows are appropriate, but are subject to the detail of the manufacture. Therefore a condition is imposed such that drawings and details are submitted concerning the construction of the windows prior to development commencing.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

Recommend listed building consent.