

WINDSOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

29 March 2017

Item: 3

Application No.:	17/00056/FULL
Location:	133 Arthur Road Windsor SL4 1RU
Proposal:	Alteration to front roof plane to raise the main ridge and L-shaped dormer to the rear
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Lloyd
Agent:	Mr Rees
Parish/Ward:	Windsor Unparished/Castle Without Ward

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Brian Benzie on 01628 796323 or at brian.benzie@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The increase in the main ridge height, along with the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer extension, would significantly detract from the character of the host dwelling and be at odds with the roofscape of other dwellings in the terrace. The proposals will appear visually discordant and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. While the extensions would be long and bulky, the location of the neighbour's windows away from the development will mean that there will not be any significant impact. The site lies close the Windsor Town Centre where there is a range of services and facilities which means off-street parking will not be required.

It is recommended the Panel refuses planning permission for the following summarised reasons (the full reasons are identified in Section 9 of this report):

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | The increase in ridge height and excessive mass and bulk of the dormer window and its poor design would result in a discordant form of development which is unsympathetic to the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area. |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

Councillor Rankin has called the application for determination by the Panel in the public interest.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The application property is a mid terrace Victorian dwelling with a traditional outrigger element to the rear extending over two stories. The whole row of terraced dwellings appears to have been built at various stages, as the ridge heights of groups of houses vary along the road. However, the dwellings within the immediate area of the application property have ridge heights which are all at the same level.
- 3.2 A number of the properties have made alterations to the rear at ground and first floor levels and the neighbouring property no. 135 Arthur Road has a dormer on the main, rear facing roof, which was deemed to be permitted development under application ref. 13/01425/CPD.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 Planning permission was granted ref.13/01264 for the repair and refurbishment of an existing rear extension in June 2013.
- 4.2 The proposal seeks to raise the ridge height of the existing dwelling by approximately 0.4m, together with the construction of an 'L' shaped dormer extension, with rear and side facing windows and 2 front roof lights. The proposal would create 2 additional bedrooms at the property.
- 4.3 The proposed 'L' shaped, flat roof dormer extension would extend to the full width of the enlarged main roof and then project over the existing first floor outrigger, projecting 6.4m from

the existing roof slope to almost the full depth of the outrigger. A set of French doors with associated Juliet balcony is to be inserted in the main dormer, with a side and rear facing window being inserted in the outrigger dormer.

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Royal Borough Local Plan

5.1 The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated policies are:

	Within settlement area	High risk of flooding	Parking
Local Plan	DG1, H14	F1	P4

5.2 Supplementary planning documents adopted by the Council relevant to the proposal are:

- Interpretation of Policy F1 – Areas liable to flooding

More information on this document can be found at:

http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/pp_supplementary_planning.htm

The application has also been assessed against and is considered to comply with the Council's 'Sustainable Design and Construction' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which can be viewed at: https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/pp_sustainable_design_and_construction_spd.htm

Other Local Strategies or Publications

5.3 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

- RBWM Parking Strategy – view using link at paragraph 5.2

6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area in general;
- ii impact on highway safety;
- iii impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, and
- iv area liable to flood.

Impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area in general.

6.2 The current proposal seeks to raise the ridge height of the dwelling by approximately 0.4m above the ridge height of the other dwellings in the immediate area and add a full height 'L' shaped dormer to the main and outrigger roofs.

6.3 The proposed dormer extension would extend to almost the full width of the main roof and then extend over the first floor outrigger to the rear of the dwelling projecting 6.4m from the existing main roof slope. The raising of the ridge height would have two effects. Firstly, the ridge height of the application property would sit noticeably higher than the adjacent dwellings and, secondly as the current roof slope angle is to be maintained, the ridge of the new roof will not maintain its alignment with the other terraced dwellings along Arthur Road. This will be readily apparent in public viewpoints from Arthur Road. In addition due to the difference in ridge heights either side of the application site, a considerable part of the top of the dormer over the outrigger will be seen in the street views which would create a noticeable increase in bulk and scale at the roof level.

- 6.4 Taking the above into account it is considered that the proposal by reason of the increase in ridge height and the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer extension that the proposal as a whole would appear visually discordant and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the area and detrimental upon the appearance of the row of terraces. The application site is clearly visible from public vantage points and the proposed dormer extension would fail to integrate with and respect the appearance of the original dwelling. The development would be contrary to policies Local Plan Policies DG1 and H14 and with the policies of the NPPF.

Impact on highway safety.

- 6.5 In accordance with the adopted parking standards in Appendix 7 of the Local Plan as amended by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Parking Strategy, May 2004, it is necessary for 4 bedroom dwellings to provide 3 parking spaces. It is recognised that there would be a shortfall in parking provision in accordance with the adopted Parking Strategy, 2004 as a result of this proposal, however, there are parking restrictions along Arthur Road and given its close proximity to Windsor Town Centre, no objections are raised.

Impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

- 6.6 Policy H14 requires that extensions should not result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy to neighbouring properties or significantly affect their amenities by being visually intrusive or overbearing. It is noted that the proposal does not comply with the Councils light guidelines with regard to the nearest window within the dormer at no. 135 Arthur Road. However, the window serves a bathroom and as a bathroom is not considered to be a habitable room, the guidelines should not be applied to that particular window. The other window in the dormer at no.135 which, provides light and outlook to a habitable room is far enough away to ensure that there would not be any significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbour. There are no other windows at ground and first floor of no. 135 Arthur Road that would be significantly affected as, they are either within its outrigger or, are rear facing where the impact of the proposal would not be significantly different to that which currently exists due to its own outrigger.
- 6.7 Number 131 has an extension at ground floor level which has infilled the return between the boundary with the application property and its original outrigger. This extension has no side facing windows and the rear facing windows would not be significantly impacted by the proposal due to their position within the rear wall and the separation distance with the side facing dormer. The rear facing first floor window at no. 131 would not be significantly impacted due to the separations distance and the orientation of the dwellings with the rear being north facing.
- 6.8 Taking the above into account it is considered that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of amenity of the neighbouring dwellings.

Area liable to flood.

- 6.9 The site lies within an area liable to flood, Flood Zone 3 (high risk) where Policy F1 limits the increase in ground covered area of extensions throughout the lifetime of a property to 30sqm. In this case the proposal relates to development all of which is above ground level and therefore, will not result in an increase in an increase in ground covered area of the site and as such the proposal is considered to comply with Policy F1 of the Local Plan.

Other Material Considerations.

- 6.10 It is noted that there are a number of dwellings further to the west along Arthur Road with large box dormers to the rear; however, it would appear that the majority of these dormers have been erected under the dwellings' permitted development rights. The exception to this is nos. 35 and 65 Arthur Road which were granted full permission.
- 6.11 Number 65 was granted permission for a dormer within the main roof space in 2011; however, this application did not include the raising of the ridge height of the dwelling and was of such a

scale that it would have constituted permitted development. In addition to this, it is flanked on either side by dormers of a similar size and design.

6.12 Numbers 35, 29 and 27 were granted permission by the Windsor Urban Development Control Panel at various times during 2015. The extensions as currently proposed under this application, are of the same scale, bulk and mass as that approved at nos. 27, 29 and 35. However, where the current proposal is, there are no other 'L' shaped dormers within this immediate part of Arthur Road. But notwithstanding this, each planning application should be treated on its own merits.

6.13 In addition in a recent appeal decision with regard to the erection of a large dormer on a similar style property in Alexander Road, Windsor, the Inspector concluded that "In reaching my decision, I have given careful consideration to the existence of other roof extensions within the area. However, in my opinion, many of these extensions have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I am not persuaded that they should act as a precedent for the appeal proposal. In addition, I accept that the proposed dormer would not be readily visible from public viewpoints because of the screening effect of the two storey rear projecting section of the appeal property. However, the fact that a development cannot be seen is not (in my opinion) a reason in itself for granting planning permission".

7. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

8 neighbouring properties were directly notified directly of the application and a site notice was posted on the 13 January 2017.

One letter was received relating to the application, summarised as:

Comment	Officer response
I live at no. 131 Arthur Road and have no objection to the planning proposal as long as it doesn't hinder my property having a similar loft conversion at a later date.	This is not relevant to the determination of this planning application. Each application needs to be determined on its own merits.

8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Existing Elevations Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans.
- Appendix B - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations.
- Appendix C - Site Location Plan.

Documents associated with the application can be viewed at <http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/pam/search.jsp> by entering the application number shown at the top of this report without the suffix letters.

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. The Case Officer has sought solutions to these issues where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, in accordance with NPFF.

In this case the issues have not been resolved.

9. REASONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL IF PERMISSION IS NOT GRANTED

- 1 The proposed increase in the ridge height of the main roof and the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer extensions, together with its overall poor design and its bland appearance, would appear visually discordant and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the original house and detrimental upon the appearance of the row of the wider terraced properties. The proposals would harm the character and appearance of this part of Windsor. The development would be contrary to The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 1999 (Incorporating Alterations 2003) Policies DG1 and H14 and Core Planning Principle 4 and paragraphs 56, 58, 60 and 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework.