

WINDSOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

16 August 2017

Item: 7

Application No.:	17/01867/FULL
Location:	77 Arthur Road Windsor SL4 1RT
Proposal:	Proposed second floor rear extension, raising of existing roof with loft conversion and new velux window to front of dwelling.
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Shields
Agent:	Mr Richard Fenn
Parish/Ward:	Windsor Unparished/Castle Without 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 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 of the dwelling and the excessive addition of mass and bulk of the rear extension in combination with its poor design would result in a discordant form of development which is unsympathetic to the host dwelling and the character of the area in general. Consequently, the extension would fail to comply with policies DG1 and H14 of the Councils Local Plan along side section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. |
|----|---|

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- At the request of Councillor Rankin should the application be recommended for refusal.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

3.1 The application relates to a mid terrace Victorian dwelling situated on the north side of Arthur Road. The exterior of the building is a mixture of brick and render; the windows are upvc. The development site is also located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 in its entirety. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey terraces finished in brick and render, most of which have two storey outriggers with mono pitched roofs.

3.2 Properties within the area have undergone numerous forms of development; ground and first floor rear extensions are not uncommon in the area. In recent years dormers similar to that which is proposed have been granted planning permission at 27, 29, 35 and 53 Arthur Road.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 The application seeks planning permission to raise the ridgeline of the existing property and construct a second floor rear extension with Juliette balcony; the proposed works form part of a loft conversion which would provide 2 new bedrooms. One rooflight would be installed in the dwellings front roof slope.

- 4.2 The proposed, flat roof dormer extension would extend to the full width of the enlarged roof and wrap around the existing first floor outrigger, projecting 3.7m from the existing roof slope to the full depth of the outrigger.

Ref.	Description	Decision and Date
12/02038/FULL	Single storey rear extension.	Conditional Permission – 30.08.2012

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Royal Borough Local Plan

- 5.1 The main strategic 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

These policies can be found at:

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

- 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:

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

Borough Local Plan: Submission Version

Issue	Local Plan Policy
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	SP3

The NPPF sets out that decision-makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation. The Borough Local Plan Proposed Submission Document was published in June 2017. Public consultation runs from 30 June to 26 August 2017 with the intention to submit the Plan to the Planning Inspectorate in October 2017. In this context, the Borough Local Plan: Submission Version is a material consideration, but limited weight is afforded to this document at this time.

This document can be found at:

<http://rbwm.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s14392/Appendix%20A%20-%20Borough%20Local%20Plan%20Submission%20Version.pdf>

Other Local Strategies or Publications

5.3 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

- RBWM Landscape Character Assessment – view using link at paragraph 5.2
- RBWM Parking Strategy – view using link at paragraph 5.2

6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i Impact on floodzone location
- ii Visual impact on the host dwelling and the locality in general.
- iii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iv Impact on highway safety and parking provision

Issue 1 – Flooding

6.2 Local Plan Policy F1 of the Adopted Local Plan is applied to all development within areas liable to flooding. The policy indicates that new residential development or non-residential development, including extensions in excess of 30m² will not be permitted “unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Borough Council that the proposal would not of itself, or cumulatively in conjunction with other development: 1) impede the flow of flood water; or 2) reduce the capacity of the floodplain to store flood water; or 3) increase the number of people or properties at risk from flooding”. The Policy states that ‘for a household, the GCA would include the additions to the property that have been completed since 26th September 1978 (as per paragraph 2.4.7 of the Adopted Local Plan) which required express planning permission including any detached garage(s) together with any outbuildings that are non-floodable’. In this case the proposed development relates to the construction of a first and second floor extension. As such, the ground covered area at the site would not be increased and therefore Policy F1 is not relevant.

Issue 2 – Visual Impact

6.3 The application seeks planning permission to raise the ridgeline of the existing property and construct a second floor rear extension with Juliette balcony; the proposed works form part of a loft conversion which would provide 2 new bedrooms. One rooflight would be installed in the dwellings front roof slope. The ridge height of the dwelling would be raised by approximately 0.4m above the ridge height of the immediate neighbours (No.75 and No.79) and would be of similar height and size to the roof extensions recently granted and built at nos. 53 and 35 Arthur Road. It is

noted that similar proposals have been granted at no's 27 and 29 Arthur Road; however these permissions have not been implemented.

- 6.4 The street scene of Arthur Road is characterised by uniform rows of terraced, Victorian dwellings. The row of terraces to the north side of the road, which is where the application site is located, front straight onto the public footpath. From the public realm, the altered ridge heights of other dwellings can be clearly viewed. Several examples of increased ridge heights can be viewed from the public realms which serve alterations to the roof space of these dwellings. The proposed increase would be 0.4 metres which would be visible from the street scene and appear inconsistent in the context of the attached neighbouring dwellings to the east and west. Although it is noted that there are some examples of increased ridge heights, these are not within the immediate vicinity of the application site and as such it is considered that they would not set a precedent in this instance. The locality of the application site and the immediate dwellings to both sides of it do not have altered ridge height. Consequently it is considered that the increase in ridge height would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the locality and as such would be contrary to policies DG1 and H14 of the Councils Local Plan.
- 6.5 The creation of a second floor extension to this dwelling would appear unsympathetic to both the host dwelling and the immediate neighbouring dwellings by virtue of their mid terrace, 2 storey Victorian designs. It is considered that due to the scale, mass and bulk of the proposed works, the resultant dwelling would appear visually discordant and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the area and detrimental upon the appearance of the row of terraces. Consequently is considered to be poor design. It would significantly detract from the character of the host dwelling and would be at odds with the roof scape of other dwellings within the immediate area. The application site is clearly visible from public vantage points, including from the public car park which the site backs onto. Mindful of the above, it is considered that, the proposed extension would fail to integrate with and respect the appearance of the original dwelling, and would harm the character of the area. The development would be contrary to policies Local Plan Policies DG1 and H14 and with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

Issue 3 – Neighbour Amenity

- 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 not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking upon the amenities of neighbouring dwellings given that it would only incorporate rear facing windows which would face the public car park to the rear of the site. By virtue of the addition of scale, mass and bulk of the proposed extension, it is considered that it would be clearly visible from both attached neighbouring dwellings. However it is not considered that it would appear unduly overbearing to neighbouring dwellings.

Issue 4 – Highway Safety and Parking Provision

- 6.7 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 in this regard.

Issue 5 – Other Material Considerations

- 6.8 It is noted that there are a number of dwellings to both the east and west of the development site with rear box dormers, however it is likely that the majority of these dormers were erected under permitted development rights. The exception to this is 65 Arthur Road which was granted full permission.
- 6.9 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. In addition to this it is flanked on either side by dormers of a similar size and design.
- 6.10 It should be noted that 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”*. Taking into consideration the Inspector’s decision it is considered that the existence of other poorly designed and unsympathetic dormers should not make a similarly poor proposal acceptable.

7. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

Three occupiers were notified directly of the application.
The planning officer posted a [site](#) notice advertising the application at the site on 12th July 2017

No letters were received supporting or objecting to the application.

8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan
- Appendix B - Existing plans
- Appendix C - Proposed plans
- Appendix D - Site photos

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. 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 NPPF.

In this case the issues have been successfully/unsuccessfully resolved.

9. REASONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL IF PERMISSION IS NOT GRANTED

- 1 The increase in ridge height of the dwelling, and the excessive addition of mass and bulk of the rear extension in combination with its poor design would result in a discordant form of development which is unsympathetic to the host dwelling and the character of the area in general. Consequently, the development fails to comply with policies DG1 and H14 of the Councils Local Plan along side section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.