HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. H/17/80465

DESCRIPTION	Insertion of dormer windows to front and rear roof slopes
ADDRESS	72 Astral Gardens, Hamble-le Rice, Southampton SO31 4RY

SITE VISIT DATE	1/8/17
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Note that proposed front elevation does not show the gap between bottom of rear dormer and eaves which appears in the side elevation. Also note that scale on dwg. 06 indicated as 1:50 is incorrect- assumed to be 1:100.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes.

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Front dormer: to be located to right side of single front roof plane. 1.5m wide; 1.8m high to topmost part of its small gable roof. Set 0.65m above main eaves and 0.2m below main ridge. Well in from sides. One 2 pane window, in uPVC, to front. Clad in 'Cedral' a concrete/synthetic fibre based wood effect cladding (colour and finish not given). Roof in 'concrete tiles'. Rear dormer: substantial dormer- 5.65m wide on a 6.65m wide roof. 0.4m below main ridge. Note that whilst the proposed rear elevation does not show a gap between the bottom of the dormer and the extant eaves that the proposed side elevation shows a gap of 0.7m between the outermost part of the eaves and the dormer. The dormer would have one 2 pane window and a set of bi-folding doors giving out onto a 'Juliette' balcony- no details given. Materials as per front dormer.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level
TREES	Rear site boundary has tree belt
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Hedge
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Small plot with open land to rear. Detached garage at rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Tightly configured modern housing estate. Mix of detached, semi-detached and small terraces- all two storey.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hamble Parish Council	'That the officer should decide the application'.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within HRA Screening Area

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (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'

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area: Summary Area 60: *1980s/1990s terraced/detached development on multi-headed cul-de-sacs in west Hamble.*

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

N/A

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 assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, trees, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

The Council's adopted 'Quality Spaces SPD' considers design matters related to dormer windows. It advises that a dormer *should not dominate the roof, but should complement the existing features of the house in terms of proportion, size, position and detailing. They should line up with the existing windows and be kept well away from the ridge and edges of the roof..*

In terms of the front dormer it is noted that the existing subsidiary small feature gable is removed and the new dormer is positioned above the location of the removed gable. The front dormer would reflect the other small feature gables in this part of the estate and meets the advice in the SPD and is thus considered acceptable.

Unlike front dormer windows there are permitted development allowances for rear dormers under Class B.1 of Part 1, Sch,2 of the GPDO. The rear dormer proposed here would comfortably meet the $50m^3$ volume allowance, being $17.8m^3$. It would fall within the other limitations of Class B.1 with the possible exception of (bb) wherein the dormer must be a minimum of 0.2m from the eaves. Here the rear elevation shows the dormer reaching down to the eaves but the side elevation suggests a 0.7m gap. The GPDO allowance has the additional condition, B.2, requiring the materials to be of *'similar appearance'* to the existing roof. It is not considered that the proposed 'Cedral' cladding could be so described in relation to the concrete tiling. Whilst the proposed rear dormer window does not meet many of the considerations set out in the Quality Places SPD it should be borne in mind that little amendment would be required to render this dormer permitted development. Additionally the rear elevation does not form part of the streetscene. It could only, potentially, be viewed form the disused railway line (now a walking trail) and 'disused airfield' beyond it which the property abuts at the rear. It is separated from these by trees on the rear boundary. In the circumstances it is not considered that there are strong reasons for refusal on design grounds.

There would not be an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking.

The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

Nature conservation
The proposal is not considered to result in a likely significant impact on a European Protected site (SPA,SAC or Ramsar). HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was/was not required for this development as it falls outside/inside the designated zone of impact.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSION

Permit