HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/72814

DESCRIPTION	Front and rear dormers
ADDRESS	25 Park Road Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 2EW

SITE VISIT DATE	21/08/13
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Front dormer, pitched roof, 1.5m wide, 2.3m high to the ridge of the dormer, and projecting 1.7m from the roof slope. Rear dormer, hipped roof, across the width of the top of the roof slope, 3.5m wide, 2.6m high to the ridge, and projecting 1.8m from the roof slope.
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat site.
TREES	None affected by this application.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Conifers trees along side boundaries, mix of tree species along rear. Front boundary treatment consists of low level wall with conifer hedging.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached bungalow within medium sized plot. Medium sized, well-screened, rear garden. Gravelled parking area to the front. Fairly attractive red brick property, with red/brown clay roof tile. Rear, flat roof conservatory of brick/uPVC construction. Large greenhouse in rear garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Park Rd is a mix of 2 storey houses and bungalows. The side of the road on which number 25 is located, consists primarily of bungalows with properties increasing in height as they move towards Hursley Road. Some variation in design of bungalows, and one unit with flat roof, front dormer.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/07/59919	Front and rear dormers	26/06/2007 per
F/10/67406	Renewal of planning permission F/07/59919 for front and rear dormers	10/08/2010 per

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	No comments received

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CFD	Delegated decision - No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Lower part of garden within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (not applicable to application).

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

n/a

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, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

x	None received		See below		
Other …					

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

The proposed scheme is identical to the approved schemes listed above. The policy situation has not changed significantly and the considerations are the same.

The dormers are considered to be appropriate for the character of the bungalow and will not result in significant overlooking. There is variation along the street and in the design of the bungalows in this section of the street. There will be no significant impact on the street scene.

The development is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. 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.

CONCLUSION

Recommend permission.