

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

15 February 2017

Item: 4

Application No.:	16/03324/VAR
Location:	Tudor Lea 15 Sutton Close Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9QU
Proposal:	Single storey front extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and alterations to ground and first floor right hand side elevation as approved under planning permission 15/02302 without complying with condition 2 (matching materials) 4 (approved plans) to remove the boarding/render to the first floor rear elevation and replace with facing brickwork and alterations to fenestration. Replace approved drawing.
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Smith
Agent:	Mr Jason Lee
Parish/Ward:	Cookham Parish/Bisham And Cookham Ward

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Sheila Bowen on 01628 796061 or at sheila.bowen@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Planning permission has already been granted for a very similar extension, however the extension has not been built in accordance with the approved plans or recommended conditions and therefore this application has been submitted to seek to vary these conditions where necessary.
- 1.2 The rear extension to this house has been built with bricks which match one of the bricks on the original property. The rear patio doors are of grey powder coated aluminium as specified in the original application and approved. The other windows however are also grey rather than white (as required to match the existing) and an objection is raised to this as it is not in keeping with the original house or the character and appearance of the area. None of the rear windows are leaded, nor is this a requirement as none of the rear windows were originally leaded. The applicant has confirmed that they would be willing to coat the grey windows, (not the doors) white to overcome objections and this can be conditioned.
- 1.3 Additionally, the rear gable elevation is of brick rather than being of timber and render as originally approved. Other houses in the close, including the neighbouring one, all have brick rear elevations. It is considered that the proposed rear extension is not of sufficient bulk that it needs to be broken up with this detailing and therefore its omission is considered acceptable. Subject to the windows being coated white the proposal is not considered harmful to the character of the house or the area, and complies with the Cookham Village Design Statement and the relevant Local Plan policies.

It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 9 of this report.

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- At the request of Councillor Saunders, only if the recommendation of the Head of Planning is to grant the variations, because of neighbours, Cookham Parish Council and Cookham Society concerns.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The site is a two storey house situated in a close of 1950's detached houses which vary in size, but which share a prominent design theme encompassing features such as mock-Tudor timbered

front elevations and leaded windows on the front elevations, giving it a highly individual character. The house in question had an original back wall built of brick, without any mock-Tudor features or leaded windows at the rear.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

15/02302 Single storey front extension, part single, part two storey rear extension and alterations to ground and first floor right hand side elevation. Approved 11.9.2015

- 4.1 The proposal is to vary condition 2, which was materials to match, and condition 4, the approved plans, to substitute new plans and elevations.
- 4.2 With reference to materials, it is noted that the bricks which cover approximately half of the rear elevation of the house are slightly different to the other bricks on the house. The new extension has been built of bricks which are an exact match of the bricks on the rear elevation, and which are a close match to the other bricks which make up the west side elevation of the original house.
- 4.3 The windows of the house are of white UPVC, and the new windows and patio doors to the rear extension are of grey powder coated aluminium, whereas the original planning application form for 15/02302 had said that the windows would be of white UPVC to match, and the doors would be of timber/ powder coated aluminium.
- 4.4 With reference to the plans, the extension as built differs from the approved plans in the following ways. The upper floor of the gable end on the left hand side of the rear elevation has been built of facing brick to match the original rear elevation of the house, instead of being of Tudor style timber boarding and render as shown on the original plans. There is a 2.4m wide window on the ground floor in place of one of the approved sets of folding doors. There is no rooflight in the kitchen as had originally been proposed. The rear upstairs windows in the extension are slightly increased in width. Internally the bathroom has been moved from the front of the house to the rear, and the study has been moved to the front. All the windows, in addition to the patio doors, have been built of grey powder coated aluminium, instead of being white UPVC as specified in the application.

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

- 5.1 National Planning Policy Framework Sections 17, 56 and 64.

Royal Borough Local Plan

- 5.2 The main strategic planning considerations applying to the site and the associated policies are:

Within settlement area
DG1, H14

These policies can be found at

https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/downloads/download/154/local_plan_documents_and_appendices

Supplementary planning documents

- 5.3 Supplementary planning documents adopted by the Council relevant to the proposal are:
 - Cookham Village Design Statement.

More information on this document can be found at:

https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200414/local_development_framework/494/supplementary_planning

6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The key issues for consideration is whether the extension as built is harmful to the character and appearance of the original house, the street scene or the area, and also whether the condition imposed was necessary to make the development acceptable.

Character and appearance

- 6.2 The original house had a back wall built entirely of brick, so the extension as built matches this completely. The original plans approved for the rear elevation showed the upper floor of the gable end wall to be built of Tudor-style timbers and render to match the front of the house; however it is not thought to be necessary to retain this feature, as it is not a feature of the original rear elevation of the house. It is noted that the rear elevation of the house to the East is of brick rather than being of Tudor style. It is noted that the new brick matches the brick on the remaining part of the rear elevation of the house, and is a close match to the brick on the side elevation of the house which differs slightly from the rear elevation. If the brick on the extension were coloured to match completely the West side elevation of the house, as suggested by a neighbour, then it would not completely match the brick on the remaining part of the rear elevation of original house. It was not therefore necessary to make the development acceptable. The rear elevation as built does not harm the character and appearance of the original house, the street scene or the area.
- 6.3 The changes to the fenestration from those originally proposed and approved are also not considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the house, the street scene or the area. It does not diminish the design quality.
- 6.4 It is noted that the Cookham Village Design Statement refers to Sutton Close having a prominent design theme encompassing features such as mock-Tudor timbered front elevations and leaded windows on the front elevations, giving it a highly individual character. It does not say that the rear elevations match these front elevations, and in the case of this house, the rear elevation of the original house did not match the front elevation. The use of brickwork on the rear elevation therefore is not contrary to the Cookham Village Design Statement.
- 6.5 The rear windows of the original house were of white UPVC and were unleaded. The remaining original upstairs window of the rear elevation has been changed to grey powder coated aluminium, and the windows in the extension have been built to match this window and the patio doors. The planning application forms of the original application stated that the existing windows were white UPVC and the proposed windows would also be of white UPVC, while the original doors were white UPVC while the proposed doors would be timber/ powder coated aluminium. The windows and patio doors as built are of grey powder coated aluminium, and are unleaded. As the rear windows of the house were previously unleaded, this aspect of the windows matches the house. It is considered that the grey coloured window frames are harmful to the character of the area, and that they should be coloured white to match those at the front of the house. The applicant has agreed to this and a condition is therefore proposed that the window frames in the extension be sprayed or coloured white to match the other windows in the house, and maintained as such. The patio doors can remain grey, as this was approved in the original application.
- 6.6 It is considered therefore on balance that the proposal to vary conditions 2 and 4 of the original permission, concerning matching materials and approved plans, is acceptable with a condition about colouring the window frames white, and as such the development complies with the Cookham Village Design Statement and Policies H14 and DG1 of the Local Plan.

7. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

4 occupiers were notified directly of the application.

The planning officer posted a site notice advertising the application at the site on 3.11.2016.

Neighbours were notified of the application, and then subsequently they were notified that the planning application's description had been changed to delete reference to condition 2 (on the advice of the planning officer). On further consideration of the application the description was further amended to re-include reference to condition 2, and neighbours were re-notified of this. Unfortunately an error occurred on the second notification and it contained text belonging to a different application concerning a public car park, so a further letter was sent out correcting this. Two neighbours commented on receiving 4 notifications for the same planning application.

4 letters were received from one neighbour, and 4 letters and emails from 4 other neighbours were received objecting to the application, summarised as:

Comment		Where in the report this is considered
1.	We think that the requirements of the existing permission to match existing brickwork and windows (including leaded lights) reflect Policy H14 and VDS recommendations 6.9a and 6.11.	6.2-6.6
2.	There is no explanation of why or what has changed.	7
3.	This is the wrong type of application for a public car park.	7
4.	The extension has not been built with matching brickwork and has grey window frames, unlike the original house. It is unsightly and has a major impact on neighbouring properties. Relaxation of the matching materials condition is contrary to approved planning policies and the VDS.	6.2-6.6
5.	Whilst we support removing the requirement for timber and rendering to the gable end on the South elevation, the gable itself remains an overbearing feature which is contrary to good design and, more specifically, to the requirements of the VDS. It should be either hipped or amended to follow the precedent on the street elevations of nos. 1 and 17 Sutton Close (photo attached showing verge detail with mortar pointing to exposed edge of tiles, and eaves detail using inverted plinth bricks)(photo attached showing no.16 has white framed windows and leaded lights at the rear)(photo attached showing grey window frames and poor match to brickwork).	6.2-6.6
6,	The drawings are incorrect – they show a first floor window in the West elevation which has not been constructed.	This is in the existing wall and does not form part of the application.
7.	The application should be treated as a whole and no consent for any part of it should be granted until all matters have been satisfactorily resolved.	6.2-6.6
8.	The application should be considered by the full Development Control Panel and not dealt with under delegated powers.	Entire report.
9.	The full requirements of the 'existing materials' condition should be complied with before any re-application is accepted by RBWM.	6.2-6.6
10	The use of smoked grey aluminium windows is detrimental to the visual impact of the development, is in contravention of the requirement to use matching materials, and marks out the development as being out of line with all the other developments in Sutton Close.(2)	6.2-6.6
11	Whilst the brick match is poor, we understand there is a facility to colour the bricks to produce a better match, and we would request that this is undertaken.(2)	6.2
12	The development contravenes the Village Design Statement for the area in its use of non-matching materials.	6.2-6.6
13	We have no objection to the replacement of the black timber and whitewash on the South elevation as it was out of keeping and detrimental.	6.2

14	The use of smoked grey aluminium windows should be a planning concern. Should preserve the integrity and quality, through the application of the VDS, or what is a unique visual group of houses in the area.	6.2-6.6
15	Should be matching materials like other houses in the close.	6.2-6.6
16	Should adhere to the VDS in terms of matching windows and brickwork.	6.2-6.6
17	In all the other 8 extensions in the close the builders have been careful to maintain the existing design features in order to match neighbouring properties, often incurring additional costs.	6.2-6.6
18	Relaxation of the conditions would permit ongoing (and future) use of brickwork and windows entirely incompatible with the original grant of permission.	6.2-6.6
19	The application compromises Local Plan Policy DG1.	6.2-6.6

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Parish Council	Stipulated conditions must be enforced. No amendments are acceptable. The amendments do not comply with the requirements of the VDS.	6.2-6.6

Other consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
The Cookham Society	The proposal does not conform to the guidance contained in the Village Design Statement... 'timber front elevations and leaded windows'. In particular the windows are not leaded and the materials used for the window frames do not accord with other houses. Detracts from the homogeneous look of Sutton Close.	6.2-6.6

8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan
- Appendix B – Approved plans and elevations reference 15/02302
- Appendix C – Plans and elevations as built, subject of current application.

9. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED

- 1 All of the side and rear grey windows shall be coated white to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of the date of this decision notice and thereafter maintained as such..
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans 15-010-10c.
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.