

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/100080

Site Address: 94 SATCHELL LANE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 4HL

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer with balcony to facilitate a loft conversion

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within the Urban Edge • Within Established Residential Area • Within Built-up Area Boundary		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/24868/000/00 - Erection of detached replacement garage - Permit - 29/12/1980 • Z/37148/000/00 - Construction of detached garage with first floor loft following demolition of existing garage - Permit - 20/10/2000 • F/06/57315 - Erection of detached 2 bed dwelling with vehicular access to Cerdic Mews, following demolition of existing garage - Withdrawn By Applicant - 17/08/2006 • F/06/58750 - Construction of detached dwelling with vehicular access to Cerdic Mews, following demolition of existing garage - Withdrawn By Applicant - 23/01/2007 • H/18/82548 - Single storey rear and two storey side extension - Permit - 09/05/2018		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Two objections were originally received, followed by one further objection after submission of amended plans. The original objections raised the following concerns: • The proposal was considered to be unsympathetic to the existing building form, particularly the alteration of the roof profile. • Reference was made to the Council's Urban Character Area Appraisal, noting that the property forms part of a row of Victorian cottages (Daffodil Terrace) and that the existing roofline contributes to the character of the terrace. • Concern that the front roofline should be preserved to retain the traditional appearance and character of the terrace. • It was stated that while there was no objection to development to the rear, the hip-to-gable element was considered harmful to the character of the terrace. Following the submission of amended plans, a further objection was received raising the following points:		

	• The proposal was described as a poor design, unsympathetic to a row of Victorian cottages within a character appraisal area. • The development was considered to represent overdevelopment of a small “two-up, two-down” cottage. • Objection to the hip-to-gable roof alteration, which was considered inconsistent with the corresponding property at the opposite end of the terrace. • Objection to the glass balustrade, which was considered overly modern and visible from the front of the property. • Suggestion that additional accommodation could instead be achieved through a side extension, retaining the existing hipped roof. • General concern regarding the need to protect heritage properties.
Parish Council:	The Parish Council reviewed the application and raised an objection on the grounds that the proposed development was considered to be unsympathetic to its surroundings and to represent overdevelopment of the site. Following the submission of amended plans, the Parish Council has confirmed that its previous objection remains unchanged.
Ecologist:	<u>10/12/2025</u> No objection. Please ensure that some biodiversity enhancements are provided in line with Local Plan policy DM 11 and NPPF (December 2024) paragraphs 187d and 192b. <u>13/11/2025</u> I have reviewed the photographs, and I don't see any potential bat roost features in the house. <u>24/10/2025</u> To determine whether any bat surveys will be required I need to review close up photos taken in good light of all areas of the roof, fascia, soffits (standing next to building and looking upwards), flashings, hanging tiles, the elevations to be affected by the proposal and any potential gaps or openings. Photos of any areas of the garden affected by the proposal are also required. Biodiversity enhancements will be required in accord with Local Plan policy DM 11 and NPPF (December 2024) paragraphs 187d and 192 b. A bat box and a swift nest box may be appropriate for this building.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 16 th October 2025.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance
Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM11 and DM14.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisal for Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound (BHH 32)

Assessment:

Site context and surroundings

The application site comprises a two-storey, end-of-terrace, three-bedroom dwelling which forms part of a row of eight properties, characterised by brick construction and pitched hipped roofs. A two-storey flat-roofed rear/side addition, which was granted planning permission in May 2018, projects beyond the original side elevation and is visible from the public realm at oblique angles.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprising a mix of historic cottages and later residential development. While the terrace has historic origins, the site is not located within a conservation area, nor is the building listed or locally listed.

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a hip-to-gable roof extension and the erection of a rear dormer with balcony to facilitate a loft conversion, providing additional accommodation at second-floor level.

During the course of the application, it was identified that the originally submitted drawings were not fully coordinated, with discrepancies between the floor plans, roof plan, and elevations. As a result, the original drawings did not accurately represent the proposed massing of the development.

On this basis, the applicant was requested to submit amended drawings to clarify the form and extent of the rear dormer and to ensure consistency across all plans and elevations. The applicant was also advised that a dormer projecting flush with the side of the extension would appear visually awkward and overly dominant, and that any revised design should reflect the general proportions of a permitted development-style dormer, set in from the outer edge of the rear roof slope.

In response, the applicant has submitted a revised set of drawings. The amended scheme shows the rear dormer set in from the edges of the rear roof slope. The revised drawings are now consistent across the floor plans, roof plan, and elevations and accurately reflect the proposed development.

The amended plans also confirm that the hip-to-gable infill will be constructed in matching brickwork, rather than cladding, ensuring the gable reads as an integral part of the host dwelling.

Following receipt of the amended drawings, a re-consultation was undertaken to notify neighbouring residents and relevant consultees of the changes. Any additional representations received have been taken into account in the assessment below.

Policy and Principle

- The application site lies within an established residential area where the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being based upon the exact nature, design, and impact of that proposed being considered acceptable and in accordance with the relevant policies within the adopted local plan and supplementary planning guidance.

- The site is also part of the character area of Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound (BHH 32) which provides the following guidance on developments and that they should ensure that:
 - i) Retain the soft verges and supplement with additional planting in order to maintain the 'lane' character.
 - ii) Retain and extend the continuity in building line at the southern end of Satchell Lane.
 - iii) Ensure that any back land development is subordinate to the existing development and serviced via a separate access road.
 - iv) Maintain the predominant deep building setbacks in order to retain/reinforce the existing levels of on-plot planting

Layout, design, and impact upon the character of the area

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design, and siting.
- It is acknowledged that the proposed hip-to-gable roof extension will alter the existing roof profile and will change the appearance of the end of the terrace. However, it is noted that roof alterations of this nature can, in principle, be carried out under permitted development rights, subject to compliance with the relevant limitations and conditions. This is a material consideration which indicates that the principle of the development is acceptable.
- In this case, the amended plans confirm that the new gable will be constructed in matching brickwork, ensuring that it reads as an integral part of the host dwelling, rather than as an incongruous addition. Given the site's end-of-terrace position, the proposed gable would not disrupt a continuous roofline and is considered to sit comfortably within the context of the terrace.
- The rear dormer has been revised and is now shown to be set in from the edges of the rear roof slope, reflecting the typical proportions of a permitted development-style dormer. This design approach avoids an overly dominant or visually awkward projection and ensures that the dormer remains clearly subordinate to the main roof form. It is noted that other properties within the terrace have incorporated rear dormer extensions to facilitate second-floor accommodation. As such, rear dormers are not an unfamiliar feature within the local context. In addition, due to its rearward position, combined with the building's orientation and the presence of intervening vegetation, the dormer would not be readily visible from the public realm and would have a limited impact on the street scene and the character of the area.
- Concerns have also been raised in relation to the contemporary detailing, including the use of a glass balustrade to the balcony. However, this element is set well back from the principal elevation and, taking account of existing boundary vegetation and separation distances, is not expected to be prominent in wider public views. As such, it would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the terrace or the surrounding area.
- Concerns regarding overdevelopment have been carefully considered. The proposal is confined to the existing built envelope and roof space of the dwelling and would not increase the building's footprint. The scale of the development is therefore considered proportionate to the host property and would not result in visual overcrowding.

- While the terrace has historic origins and contributes positively to local character, the site is not located within a conservation area, and the dwelling is not a designated heritage asset. The properties along this section of Satchell Lane are also varied in style. The proposal is therefore considered to achieve an appropriate balance between providing additional accommodation and respecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Impact on residential amenity

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulate that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.
- As an end-of-terrace property, the dwelling most likely to experience the greatest potential impact from the proposal is only No. 92 Satchell Lane. However, the proposed development is largely confined to the existing roof space of the dwelling. In addition, the existing rear-facing hipped roof element of the host property would act as an effective buffer, introducing a degree of visual interruption in views from No. 92 towards the proposed development and helping to reduce its perceived scale. As a result, the proposal is not expected to appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties and would be unlikely to result in a harmful loss of light or loss of outlook.
- With regard to the proposed balcony, while this would provide an external amenity space, its position and limited extent, together with the presence of the rear-facing hipped roof element, would mean that views would be primarily directed towards the applicant's own garden area rather than directly into neighbouring habitable room windows. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in harmful overlooking.
- In addition, existing boundary treatments and intervening vegetation along the northern boundary provide a further degree of screening, which would help to limit any potential impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

Ecology

- Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.
- The application has been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist, who raises no objection to the proposed development.
- Following a review of site photographs and the amended plans, it was confirmed that the dwelling does not contain any potential bat roost features. On this basis, no bat survey is required, and the proposal is not expected to result in harm to protected species.

Highways and parking

- Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires residential development to provide off-highway parking which is adequate in terms of highway safety/traffic management.

- The proposal would increase the accommodation within the dwelling from three bedrooms to four bedrooms as a result of the loft conversion.
- The property benefits from a long driveway to the side of the dwelling, which is capable of accommodating at least three vehicles. As a result, it is considered acceptable in respect of parking provision.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

The NPPF, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications

Conclusion:

Permit subject to conditions.

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☒	REFUSE ☐
-----------------	---	--