**HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/11/69232**

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION | Addition of front and rear dormer windows to provide first floor accommodation |
| ADDRESS | 9 Weavills Road Bishopstoke Eastleigh SO50 8HQ |

| | |
|---|---|
| SITE VISIT DATE | 12/7/11 |
| ARE PLANS ACCURATE? | No. The elevations do not show the proposed velux windows in north and south roof plane. The rear dormer window does not appear to have been accurately scaled and shows as different sizes when viewed from the north and south. The plans also do not accurately reflect the roof lines or the shape of the resultant master and bed 3. |
| HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? | Yes |

**THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

| | |
|---|---|
| DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION | The proposed dvelopment includes the provision of first floor accomodation in the form of four new bedrooms, a bathroom, and en-suite following the addition of:<br>• Two front (western) facing dormer windows with hipped roves and measuring 6.1m(w) by 2.7m(h) by 1.5m(d) (approximately).<br>• Two rear (eastern) facing dormer windows with hipped roves and measuring 6.1m(w) by 2.7m(h) by 2.3m(d) (approximately).<br>• Four velux windows, two in the northern and two in the southern roof planes. |
| TOPOGRAPHY | The site itself slopes upwards in an easterly direction up to the rear elevation of the property and then levels out to become relatively. The road slopes upwards in a southerly direction therefore No.9 is on lower ground and No.11 on higher ground. |
| TREES | No trees will be affected by this planning application. |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | 1.8m close boarded fence with sporadic mature planting in front. |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | Modest sized detached bungalow on a large plot set back from the road with a large front garden and driveway leading up the northern boundary to a large private garden. |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | Residential area of mixed housing types and styles. Immediately adjacent to the site on both sides are two storey period houses and opposite is a row of largely unaltered bungalows. |

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

| REFERENCE | DESCRIPTION | DECISION |
|---|---|---|
| None | | |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| None | |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Bishopstoke Parish Council | No objection |

**POLICY CONTEXT**

| DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE |
|---|
| Within Built-up Area Boundary<br>Within Established Residential Area |

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh

**CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA**

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area – BiFOHH 15

**SPECIAL POLICY AREA**

Not within a Special Policy Area

**PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| PPS | - | 1 Delivering Sustainable Development |

**POLICY COMMENTARY**

The above policies 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 | x | |
| N/A | | | | |

**COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| None received | x | See below | | |
| N/A | | | | |

**PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS**

Planning obligations not required as a result of this application.

**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 application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principal of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable.

The proposals are not considered to cause any unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, or overbearing impact. Ample parking for the enlarged dwelling can still be provided and the private rear garden is still appropriate for the increase in bedrooms.

The street is mixed with clusters of different types and styles of housing. The property is flanked on either side by a Victorian two storey houses however is of a similar style of bungalow to those opposite. The bungalows opposite have a sub character, in that they are largely unaltered, pyramid roved bungalows with clean roof planes. The application site is considered to add to this sub-character despite being on the opposite side of the road. The proposal is considered to have a detrimental impact on this sub-character but introducing large front dormers to the street scene.

The proposed rear dormer, although part of this application, could be constructed under permitted development rights, and although not the most attractive design is isolated to the rear and would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. The rear dormer is therefore considered acceptable. However, when considering the overall proposal, the size and design of the proposal is of concern in that the resultant built form would be unattractive, unsympathetic to, and is to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling. In addition the proposal is considered an over-development of the roof space, which is highlighted by the need for numerous different sizes and styles of windows scattered over the four main roof planes.

**OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above this application is considered to be contrary to Policy 59.BE and is therefore recommended for refusal.