

WINDSOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

21 June 2017

Item: 3

Application No.:	17/00861/FULL
Location:	75 St Andrews Crescent Windsor SL4 4EP
Proposal:	Hip to gable extensions to front and rear to accommodate loft conversion to form habitable accommodation and two storey rear extension.
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Poole
Agent:	Mr P N Robson
Parish/Ward:	Windsor Unparished/Clewer South Ward

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Josey Short on 01628 683960 or at josey.short@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

1.1

It is recommended the Panel authorises the Head of Planning:

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | To grant planning permission on the satisfactory completion of an undertaking to secure the infrastructure in Section 7 of this report and with the conditions listed in Section 10 of this report. |
|----|--|

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- At the request of Councillor Wilson if it is recommended for approval.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The application site is located on the north east side of St Andrews Crescent, close of the junction with Bell View, within the developed area of Windsor. The site comprises a detached white rough render bungalow with a detached single garage to the side/rear which is accessed via the tarmac drive to the side of the dwelling. The dwelling has a tarmacked drive to the front with two vehicular access points. There is a grassed garden to the rear which is bounded by 2 metre close boarded fencing. There is a steady decline in land levels towards the rear, with steps to access the rear door of the dwelling.
- 3.2 The street scene of St Andrews Road is characterised by detached bungalows of a similar architectural style. It is noted that the street scene displays many examples of bungalows which have been extended by hip to gable extensions and two storey rear extensions. Additionally, it is noted that the main stretch of St Andrews Avenue contains examples of bungalows which have been extended in a similar way with 3 dormer windows to each side elevation. Mindful of this, it is considered that the street scene of St Andrews Avenue is varied.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 The application seeks planning permission for hip to gable extensions to front and rear to accommodate loft conversion incorporating a side dormer window and two storey rear extension.
- 4.2 The proposed works would create a gable ended roof to the front and rear of the existing dwellinghouse. However, the front hip to gable extension would leave part of the existing front

hip. The loft conversion would also incorporate a dormer to the south east side elevation of the dwellinghouse. The proposed two storey rear extension would have a depth of 3 metres.

4.3 No relevant planning permission.

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework Sections

Royal Borough Local Plan

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

Within settlement area	Highways and Parking	Trees	Aircraft noise
DG1, H10, H11	P4, T5	N6	NAP2

These policies can be found at

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

Other Local Strategies or Publications

5.3 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

- RBWM Townscape Assessment – view at:
- RBWM Parking Strategy – view at:

More information on these documents 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 are:

- Visual impact and impact on locality
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Parking provision
- Trees and landscaping
- Further Community Comments

Visual Impact

6.2 The appearance of a development is a material planning consideration and the National Planning Policy Framework, Section 7 (Requiring Good Design) and Local Plan Policy DG1, advises that all development should seek to achieve a high quality of design that improves the character and quality of an area. Given the nature of the proposed works and the location, the proposal would be visible when viewed from the street scene of St Andrews Crescent.

6.3 The existing depth of dwelling would be extended to the rear by 3 metres with a two storey extension, however the front and side elevations alongside the roof height of the existing dwelling would all be maintained as a result of the proposed works. The design of the front hip to gable extension would maintain a partial hip to the front of the dwelling, resulting in the front gable being in set 0.75 metres from the front eaves. This design feature is common within the street scene of St Andrews Avenue with two examples which can be seen at the two immediate neighbouring dwellings to the North West; Nos. 71 and 73. The proposed side dormer window

would be set back 7 metres from the principal elevation of the dwelling and would appear subordinate in scale. Mindful of this, it is considered that it would not have an overbearing impact on the mass and bulk of the roofscape of the dwelling. In addition to this, it is noted that the street scene displays many examples of bungalows which have been extended to the rear. Additionally, it is noted that the material pallet of the proposed works would mirror that of the existing dwelling. Mindful of this, the proposal is considered to respect the appearance and design of the host dwelling and the appearance and character of the street scene would not be harmed.

Neighbour Amenity

- 6.4 Appendix 12 of the Councils Local Plan provides a guidance note on 'House Extensions' and details that single storey extensions should not extend beyond a line drawn at 45 degrees from the centre point of the nearest habitable window of the nearest habitable rooms of an adjoining property (as drawn on a plan). The proposed two storey rear extension would not breach the 45 degree angle when measured from the centre point of the habitable windows within the rear elevation of No. 73 due to the existing two storey rear extension at this property and as such it is considered that the extension would not have a detrimental impact on the daylight that these windows currently receive.
- 6.5 It is noted that the side elevation of No. 73 also includes an existing window which serves a bedroom. A bedroom is a habitable room and the aforementioned window is the primary window serving this room. Mindful of this, it would be necessary to carry out a further test to assess the light which this window would receive as a result of the proposed works as per the BRE tests. Taking a 25 degree angle from the centre point of the height of this window was carried out in order to assess the impact which the proposed extension may have. The existing dwelling does not breach this angle at its highest point. Given that the proposed works would not increase the height of the existing dwelling. It is noted that the proposed works would not increase the height of the dwelling, nor would they decrease the gap of 5 metres between the host dwelling and No. 73 and as such this angle would also not be breached by the proposed works. In addition to this, the visible sky angle from this window as a result of the proposed works would exceed 65 degrees which suggests that the window currently and as a result of the proposed works would receive reasonable results in regards to daylight. In addition to this, it is noted that the orientation of the site locates south to the front of the dwellings however the existing single storey side extension at No. 73 and the 2 metre close boarded fencing on the shared boundary with the host dwelling impact the level of south light which currently enters the aforementioned window. Mindful of this, it is noted that the neighbouring bedroom window currently only receives easterly daylight in the mornings and any light this window receives is currently impacted by the existing dwelling, boundary treatment and single storey side extension. Whilst the increase in mass to the rear of the site may have an impact on this, given the existing light it receives, it is considered that it would not be justifiable to refuse this application on that basis given the current light this window receives. In addition to this, whilst it is noted that the objections of the neighbouring dwellings requested a BRE compliant study, given the little light this window currently receives it is considered that it would not be reasonable to condition that such information is provided.
- 6.6 Neighbouring dwelling to the south east, No. 32 Bell View is located at the junction of St Andrews Crescent and Bell View. The dwelling of which is constructed at an angle and as such the rear elevation of the dwelling is orientated south west. With this in mind, the positioning of this neighbouring property is juxtaposed to that of the host dwelling. It is also noted that the dwelling of this neighbouring site is positioned approximately 9 metres from the host dwelling at its closest point. Mindful of the above and the orientation of the site, it is considered that the resultant dwelling would not have an adverse impact on the sunlight and daylight this property currently receives.
- 6.7 The proposed works would create a new first floor windows within the first floor of the front and rear elevations, 2 rooflights to the north west side elevations and 2 new windows at ground floor and a dormer window to the south east side elevation. The proposed first floor window to the front elevation would front the highway and the front elevations of other properties on the adjacent side of St Andrews Crescent, and thus it is considered this window would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy to these neighbouring dwellings. The new first floor window to the rear elevation

would front the rear boundary of the site which also forms the side/rear boundary of No. 30 Bell View. Concern has been raised for the overlooking and loss of privacy to this neighbour caused by the aforementioned window. However, given that the window would face the rear element of this garden, it is considered that it would not result in a loss of privacy or an unacceptable level of overlooking. The two rooflights to the north west side roofslope would be positioned at a high level within the room they would serve and consequently it is considered that they would not result in overlooking to the north west.

- 6.8 Concern has also been raised for the new windows proposed to the south east elevation at ground and first floor level. The side dormer within the south east elevation would serve a bathroom. As such, it would be reasonable to condition that this window is obscurely glazed and non opening below 1.7 metres of the internal floor height, in the event of planning permission being granted. Mindful of this, it is considered that this window would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy. The works would incorporate two new windows within the side elevation which would serve a bathroom (which is proposed to be obscurely glazed) and a study. Particular concern has been raised for these windows resulting in a loss of privacy due to the change in land levels providing views over the existing 2 metre boundary treatment. The dashed line on the side elevations indicate the internal floor height of the rooms. Having measured the lowest point of the land next to the window, although the window may be visible over the existing boundary treatment, this would only be at 1.7 metres and above of the internal floor height. Mindful of this it is considered that this window would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy. It is also worth noting that the applicant, could in principle insert a window such as this could be inserted within this location without any planning permission using the provisions of permitted development under Class A of the General Permitted Development Order. Mindful of this, it is considered that it would not be justifiable to warrant a refusal on this basis.

Parking Provision

- 6.9 The proposed works would create an additional bedroom at the dwellinghouse resulting in a 3 bedroom property which would require off street parking for 2 vehicles. The existing dwelling has a tarmac drive to the front and north west side of the dwelling which provide off street parking for up to 3 vehicles. Mindful of this, it is considered that the existing parking at the site would provide sufficient space on the site to accommodate the car parking for the resulting dwelling in compliance 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.
- 6.10 With the above taken into account, whilst the concerns regarding parking and highway implications have been taken into account, in this instance it is considered that the proposed development would not have any detrimental implications.

Trees and Landscaping

- 6.11 The proposed works would not have any tree or landscaping implications. Whilst it is noted that concern has been raised for the loss of trees and shrubs at the site as a result of the proposed works, there are no trees at the site which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Additionally, having conducted a site visit, it is considered that there are no trees or shrubs at the site which are of amenity value. Mindful of this, no concern is raised for the loss of these trees or shrubs in this instance.

Further Community Comments

- 6.12 It is noted that the initial description of the application incorrectly described the proposed works. However, this has since been rectified with neighbours re notified for 21 days and a revised site notice put up at the site on 25th April 2017.

- 6.13 Concern has been made about the plans not showing dimensions and as such it being unclear how big the proposed development is. It is noted that all drawings submitted are to scale, as specified within the title box of the drawings and as such it is considered that it is clear to see the scale of the development proposed. Whilst it is noted that the side elevations were both titled 'left hand side elevation', a set of amended drawings rectifying this have since been received on 7th June 2017 and uploaded to public access. Reference is also made to drawing no. 92/PR/PL02 which relates to a different site however appears to be a submitted drawing as part of this application. It is noted that the aforementioned drawing was in fact uploaded to this application as a clerical error and has since been rectified.
- 6.14 Reference has been made to the noise pollution generated as a result of the proposed development within the letters of objection. Whilst this concern has been taken into account, it is considered that the level of noise generated as a result of the proposed works would not be any more than that which is expected of a residential development within a built up area.
- 6.15 Concern has been raised about the impact the proposed development would have on the existing garage of No. 32 Bell View in terms of ground stability due to the close proximity of the two structures. Whilst this concern is taken into account, given that the proposed works would all fall within the curtilage of the application site, it is noted that this would not form a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application as it would be a civil matter.
- 6.16 Similarly to this, the impact the proposed works would have on the existing drainage system that serve the area would not form a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application. However, this aspect would be addressed within the Building Regulation stage.

Other Material Considerations

Housing Land Supply

- 6.17 Paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) set out that there will be a presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that sustainable development, and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 6.18 It is acknowledged that this scheme would make a contribution to the Borough's housing stock. However, it is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the socio-economic benefits of the additional dwellings would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse impacts arising from the scheme proposed, contrary to the adopted local and neighbourhood plan policies, all of which are essentially consistent with the NPPF, and to the development plan as a whole.
- 6.19 It is acknowledged that this scheme would make a contribution to the Borough's housing stock and it is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the socio-economic benefits of the additional dwelling(s) would also weigh in favour of the development.

7. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 7.1 The proposal is CIL liable but would attract an exemption if the applicant claims a self-build exemption. In the absence of a self-build exemption the CIL liability, based upon the chargeable residential floor area (£240/£100 per sq.m) would be £x
- 7.2 In line with the Council's Charging Schedule the proposed development would now be CIL liable. The applicant has submitted the required forms including the assumption of liability for payment on the net increase in gross internal floor space. The required CIL payment for the proposed development would be £x on the basis of a net increase of x sq.m. No further action is required until prior to commencement of the development if the proposal is subsequently approved.

- 7.3 The application proposes a new residential development and therefore would be liable for a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution. Based on the submitted information, the tariff payable for this development would be £x

8. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

Five occupiers were notified directly of the application.

The planning officer posted a statutory notice advertising the application at the site on 25th April 2017 however the application was not advertised in the Maidenhead & Windsor Advertiser on as there was no statutory requirement to do so in this instance.

Letters were received objecting to the application from three neighbouring dwellings, summarised as:

Comment	Where in the report this is considered
1 The description refers to a single storey rear extension and not a two storey rear extension	Paragraph 6.12
2 The plans submitted do not show any dimensions and as such do not show the scale of the proposed development. Additionally it is noted that the elevations are not accurately labelled as both are titled 'left hand side elevation'. Drawing no. 92/PR/PL02 relates to a different address and not that of the application site.	Paragraph 6.13
3 Proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site which in turn would have an overbearing impact on the surrounding neighbouring dwellings and consequently would obscure existing views.	Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3
4 The resultant dwelling would be out of character with the other properties within the crescent	Paragraph 6.3
5 The resultant dwelling would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy to the surrounding neighbouring dwellings – particular concern raised for the high level ground floor windows and the side dormer.	Paragraphs 6.7 and 6.8
6 The works would result in a loss of light to the neighbouring properties and the gardens of them as the proposal would cause overshadowing – particular concern is raised for the habitable rooms of No. 73 and it is requested that a BRE compliant daylight and sunlight assessment is carried out to consider this	Paragraphs 6.5 and 6.6
7 Increase in property size would have an adverse impact on parking within the road. Concern is raised with regard to suggestion that highways are soon to be changing the road markings on St Andrews Crescent	Paragraph 6.9
8 Increase in property size would in turn create an increased level of noise pollution	Paragraph 6.14
9 Concern raised for the impact the proposed works would have on the existing detached garage of No. 32 Bell View in terms of ground stability	Paragraph 6.15
10 Proposed development would lead to a greater impact on the existing drainage system and associated problems with it.	Paragraph 6.16
11 Development would result in rain water run off into neighbouring properties as existing trees and shrubs would be removed to achieve the development.	Paragraph 6.11
12 Overbearing structure would have an adverse impact on the Human Rights of the neighbouring dwellings.	Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3

9. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan and site layout
- Appendix B – plan and elevation drawings
- Appendix C -
- Appendix D -
-
-

10. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development shall be in accordance with those specified in the application unless any different materials are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.

- 3 The first floor window(s) in the south east dormer elevation(s) of the extension shall be of a permanently fixed, non-opening design, with the exception of an opening toplight that is a minimum of 1.7m above the finished internal floor level, and fitted with obscure glass and the window shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. Relevant Policies - Local Plan H14.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.