

WINDSOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

13 September 2017

Item: 5

Application No.: 17/01943/FULL

Location: 75 Arthur Road Windsor SL4 1RT

Proposal: Raising of main ridge and construction of L-shape rear dormer

Applicant: Mr Briffa

Agent: Mr Mark Darby

Parish/Ward: Windsor Unparished/Castle Without Ward

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Haydon Richardson on 01628 796697 or at haydon.richardson@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application was initially heard by the Windsor Urban panel on 16th August 2017, where Panel resolved to defer the application for one cycle for a site visit to consider the visual impact of the proposal and impact on the character of the area.

1. ORIGINAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 Due to the increase in height of the dwelling, and the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer. The development 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 way the dormer links between the main roof and outrigger would create an awkward appearance which is considered to be poor design. It would significantly detract from the character of the host dwelling and be at odds with the roof scape of other dwellings within the immediate area. 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 Local Plan Policies DG1 and H14 and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

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. **Due to its increase in the ridge height of the dwelling, as well as the excessive bulk and poor design of the dormer, the proposed roof extensions would result in a discordant form of development which is unsympathetic to the host dwelling and would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.**

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

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

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 3. 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 A number of 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 133 Arthur Road.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 Application No.17/00728 for 'Raising of main ridge with rear dormer and second-storey extension above rear outrigger' was withdrawn on 15.06.2017, prior to its determination.
- 4.2 The application seeks planning permission to raise the ridge height of the existing dwelling by approximately 0.6m and construct an L shaped dormer with 2 Juliet balconies. The dormer would include a side elevation window servicing a bedroom and 2 front roof lights. The works would result in 2 additional bedrooms at the property.
- 4.3 The proposed L shaped, flat roof dormer extension would extend the full width of the property and onto the existing first floor outrigger, projecting 3m from the existing roof slope to the full depth of the outrigger.

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

National Planning Policy Framework

- Section 7 – Requiring Good Design
- Core Planning Principles

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

Other Local Strategies or Publications

- 5.3 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

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>

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 on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area

- 6.2 The appearance of a development is a material planning consideration and in general terms the design of a proposal should not adversely impact on the character and appearance of the wider street scene. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and is a material planning consideration in the determination of planning decisions. One of the core planning principles contained within the NPPF seeks to ensure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- 6.3 Local Plan Policy H14 advises that extensions should not have an adverse effect upon the character or appearance of the original property or any neighbouring properties, nor adversely affect the street scene in general. Policy DG1 seeks to secure a high quality standard of design.
- 6.4 The proposed dormer extension would extend above the existing first floor outrigger and would project 6.5m from the roof of the main house. The raising of the ridge height would have two effects; the ridge height of the application property would be noticeably higher (approximately 0.6) than the property immediately to the west (No. 73) and considerably higher (approximately 0.6m) than No.77 to the east. No.73 has a rear dormer but its ridgeline has remained unaltered. The ridgeline and roof slope of No.77 is unaltered. As both neighbouring ridgelines have not been altered, the ridge of the new roof will not maintain the ridge height alignment shared with the neighbouring terraced dwellings and this will be readily apparent from public areas, subsequently harming the appearance of the area. Additionally due to the considerable difference in heights between the proposed development and its two most immediate neighbours; the proposed rear dormer is likely to be visible from Arthur Road and the public carpark located to the rear of the site; impacting detrimentally upon the appearance of the street and surrounding area.
- 6.5 The proposal by reason of its increase in height of the main dwelling, and the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer extension 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 way the dormer links between the main roof and outrigger would create an awkward appearance which is considered to be poor design. It would significantly detract from the character of the host dwelling and be at odds with the roof scape of other dwellings within the immediate area. 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 aims and objectives of the NPPF.

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. Core Planning Policy 17 within the NNPF suggests that all development should result in a good level of amenity for current and future users.
- 6.7 The Juliette balconies would provide similar views to those found from the properties existing first floor rear windows, as such there they are unlikely to lead to any significant loss privacy or overlooking. The proposed dormer includes a side elevation bedroom window, which would face into the flank wall of no.73s dormer. The window would also overlook the rear patio of No.73. However as there is very little boundary treatment between No.73 and 75 Arthur Road, a low level of privacy exists between the sites and the dormer would cause no significant increase when compared with the existing situation.
- 6.8 It is considered that there would be no significant harm caused to the immediate neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight or otherwise.

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.

Impact on highway safety.

- 6.10 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.

Other Material Considerations.

- 6.11 It is noted that there are a number of dwellings further to the west and east of 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.
- 6.12 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". 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

7.1 No letters were received from the **2** neighbours directly notified of the proposal or as the result of a site notice that was place on **23/06/17**.

8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site Location Plan
- Appendix B – Proposed Plan
- Appendix C – Existing 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 Due to the increase in the ridge height of the dwelling, as well as the large scale and bulk of the dormer, the development would result in a discordant form of development which is unsympathetic to the host dwelling and would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area. 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.