

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

4 September 2019

Item: 6

Application No.:	19/00948/FULL
Location:	Wheatsheaf Parade St Lukes Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2QH
Proposal:	Erection of a new building comprising of 3 no. flats with associated bin storage and cycle shelter following demolition of existing garages. Two storey extension adjacent to 5 Wheatsheaf Parade to provide 2no. flats. Re-positioning of existing vehicular access.
Applicant:	
Agent:	Mr Nick Kirby
Parish/Ward:	Old Windsor Parish/Old Windsor Ward

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Adam Jackson on 01628 796660 or at adam.jackson@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 It has not been demonstrated that there are no suitable and available sites for the development outside of the flood zone or in an area of lower flood risk. The proposed development therefore fails the sequential test. In addition the proposed development would reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store water, would impact on the free flow of flood water and would increase the risk of flooding to neighbouring properties. No suitable flood mitigation has been proposed which addresses this. The development would also increase the number of people and properties within the flood plain without a proper safe or low hazard escape route being available from the site in flood conditions. The Environment Agency have commented on the application and have raised concerns that the effects of climate change have not been taken into account and the full range of potential flood events has not been considered. This is due to the submitted flood risk assessment using draft data and not the officially supplied data (Product 4 Lower Thames 2009 model). The proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 155, 157, 158 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy F1 of the Local Plan and policy NR1 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.
- 1.2 The proposed development is of a scale and form which appears cramped and cluttered, and which is out of keeping with the surrounding properties and is dominating within the street scene. The design of the flats are also not considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, in particular the block of flats to the eastern side of the site which has a bulky mansard roof and dormer windows. This roof design is at odds with the simple and modestly designed hipped and gable ended roofs of the surrounding properties. The proposed development fails to comply with policies DG1, H10 and H11 of the Local Plan, paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP2 and SP3 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.
- 1.3 The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of existing residents and would provide the future occupiers of the flats with an acceptable standard of amenity.

- 1.4 The proposed development would provide sufficient car parking for the users of the flats. It is proposed to re-locate the existing access to the west, however sufficient visibility will be retained and it is not considered that the additional traffic generated by the development would negatively impact on highway safety. It is noted that cars park to the rear of Wheatsheaf Parade and that deliveries are also made to this area for the shops, however there are no formal rights for parking or deliveries in this area, and as such the applicant cannot be required to retain this space for these uses. There is a delivery bay to the front of Wheatsheaf Parade on the opposite side of the Road which can accommodate deliveries to Wheatsheaf Parade.

It is recommended the Panel refuses planning permission for the following summarised reasons (the full reasons are identified in Section 13 of this report):	
1.	The applicant has failed to demonstrate the development cannot be located elsewhere, in an area of lower flood risk. The proposal therefore fails the sequential test which aims to steer development away from the areas of highest risk. The proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 155, 157 and 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2.	The application site is located within Flood Zone 3, which is an areas considered to be at high risk from flooding. The proposed development would increase the ground covered area on site and would significantly reduce the ability of the flood plain to store water. The development would also impact on the free flow of flood water, resulting in an increased risk of flooding for neighbouring properties. Additionally the proposed development would introduce new people and properties into an area of flood risk, and it has not been demonstrated that a safe or low hazard escape route is available from the site in flood conditions. The proposal fails to comply with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy F1 of the RBWM Local Plan, and policy NR1 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.
3.	The proposed development is of a scale and form of development which appears cramped and cluttered and which is out of keeping with the surrounding properties and is dominating within the street scene. The design of eastern most block of flats is also not considered to be in keeping with the surrounding properties and the character of the area as it introduces a bulky mansard style roof form with dormer windows, and is at odds with the simple and modest hipped and gable ended roofs of the surrounding properties. The proposed development fails to comply with policies DG1, H10 and H11 of the Local Plan, paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP2 and SP3 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- At the request of Councillor Beer due to considerable local concerns about overdevelopment of 6 flats on this confined site and confusing changes to access to existing flats and fish and chip shop.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

3.1 The application site is the area to the side and rear of Wheatsheaf Parade, St Lukes. Old Windsor. The site houses an existing garage block which is to be demolished and is also used as an informal parking and delivery area for the shops within the parade. The site area is approximately 700sqm. The application site is within Flood Zone 3.

4. KEY CONSTRAINTS

4.1 The key constraints on the site are:

- Flooding

5. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The proposal is for the creation of 5 flats across 2 blocks. Overall there will be 5 x 1 bedroom flats. The block to the rear of the existing parade of shops which will house 3 of the proposed flats has a footprint of approximately 112sqm and a height of 8.5m. The building is three storeys tall with the second floor being within the mansard style roof and the ground floor being used as an undercroft parking area. The other block will be to the side of and attached to Wheatsheaf Parade. This block has a footprint of approximately 100sqm and a height of 7.5m. This building is 2 stories tall and sits slightly higher than the existing Wheatsheaf Parade. A garage is provided within part of the ground floor. Both blocks are proposed to be finished in brick. Cycle and refuse storage will be provided to the north of the site and the existing access along the southern boundary will be altered and utilised for vehicle access.

5.2 There is no relevant planning history for this site.

6. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Adopted Royal Borough Local Plan (2003)

6.1 The main Development Plan policies applying to the site are:

Issue	Adopted Local Plan Policy
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	DG1, H10, H11
Highways	P4, T5
Flooding	F1
Acceptable impact on listed building	LB2

These policies can be found at

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

7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework Sections (NPPF) (2019)

Section 4- Decision-making

Section 9- Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 12- Achieving well-designed places

Section 13- Protecting Green Belt land

Section 14- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 16- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Borough Local Plan: Submission Version

Issue	Local Plan Policy
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	SP2, SP3
Sustainable Transport	IF2
Flooding	NR1
Historic Environment	HE1

- 7.1 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 Submission Document was published in June 2017. Public consultation ran from 30 June to 27 September 2017. Following this process the Council prepared a report summarising the issues raised in the representations and setting out its response to them. This report, together with all the representations received during the representation period, the plan and its supporting documents have now been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. The Submission Version of the Borough Local Plan does not form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough. However, by publishing and submitting the Borough Local Plan for independent examination the Council has formally confirmed its intention to adopt the submission version. As the Council considers the emerging Borough Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations significant weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Therefore, the weight afforded to each policy at this stage will differ depending on the level and type of representation to that policy. This is addressed in more detail in the assessment below.

This document can be found at:

https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/201026/borough_local_plan/1351/submission/1

Supplementary Planning Documents

- RBWM Interpretation of Policy F1

Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other Strategies or publications material to the proposal are:

- RBWM Townscape Assessment
- RBWM Parking Strategy

More information on these documents can be found at:

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

8. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

17 occupiers were notified directly of the application.

The planning officer posted a notice advertising the application at the site on 16th April 2019

6 letters were received objecting to the application, summarised as:

Comment		Where in the report this is considered
1.	Comments were made regarding the ownership of the garages and whether the applicant legally has the right to build on the whole site.	N/A – The applicant has signed the relevant land ownership certificates and has served notice on those who have a land ownership interest.
2.	Comments were made with regards to the existing use of the area for parking and deliveries in connection with the shops and how the development will impact upon this.	Paragraph 9.17
3.	Comments were made with regards to the impact of the flats on the light to the existing shops and flats as well as overlooking of residential properties.	Paragraph 9.13
4.	Comments have been made about the scale of the flats and the overpowering impact this will have on the street scene.	Paragraphs 9.9 and 9.10
5.	Comments have been made that there will not be enough parking for the flats.	Paragraph 9.15
6.	Comments have been made that the development will create dangers for pedestrians due to the increase in vehicle movements.	Paragraph 9.16
7.	Comments have been made with regards to the disturbances that will occur during construction such as noise, odour and traffic.	N/A - The impacts of the development are unlikely to be so severe so as to cause a statutory nuisance.
8.	Comments have been made that the development would result in an overcrowding of the site.	Paragraphs 9.9 and 9.10
9.	Comments have been made with regards to the lack of outdoor amenity space for the future occupiers of the flats.	Paragraph 9.14
10.	Comments have been made that the development will obscure the shops and thereby reduce passing trade and that delivery vehicles will stop people from being able to park or stop outside the shops.	N/A – This is not a material planning consideration.

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
-----------	---------	--

Environment Agency	Objects as the flood risk assessment does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in the national planning practice guidance. In particular the flood risk assessment fails to consider how a range of flooding events will affect people and property and fails to take into account the impacts of climate change.	Paragraphs 9.2 – 9.7
--------------------	--	----------------------

Consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Parish Council	<p>Members had a very strong objection to this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered to be an overdevelopment of the site • Overbearing for a rural village location • Out of keeping with the neighbouring properties • Inadequate parking as visitors not catered for • Loss of shopper parking • The staircase on the block next to the fish and chip shop exists outside of the site boundary • Moving the access closer to the 90 degree corner will put other road users and pedestrians at risk • Negative impacts on businesses • Insufficient amenity space for any of the properties • Not person friendly • Negative environmental impacts as a result of being in between two catering establishments. • Noise from establishments late at night • Frequent carbon dioxide build up from traffic backed up on Straight Road will negatively impact on the quality of life for the future occupiers. • Fails to taking into account policies of the emerging Old Windsor neighbourhood plan. • The development will exacerbate existing flooding and groundwater issues. • The proposal would remove access for long established pattern of deliveries to the rear of the existing businesses. • Will adversely impact existing traffic issues if delivery vehicles have to wait for space. 	<p>Flooding issues are considered in paragraphs 9.2 – 9.7.</p> <p>Design and character issues are considered in paragraphs 9.8 – 9.12.</p> <p>Residential amenity is considered in paragraphs 9.13 and 9.14</p> <p>Parking and highway safety issues are considered in paragraphs 9.15 – 9.18</p>

Highways	No objections subject to conditions relating to access and visibility, parking provision, construction management details, cycle store provision and refuse store provision.	Paragraphs 9.15 – 9.18
Environmental protection	No objections subject to conditions relating to aircraft noise and construction working and delivery/collection hours.	
Conservation	No objection	

9. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

9.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i The impact on flooding
- ii The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- iii The impact on residential amenity
- iv The impact on parking and highway safety

The impact on flooding

9.2 The application site is within Flood Zone 3 (1 in 100) which is an area considered to be at high risk from flooding. Policy F1 of the RBWM Local Plan sets out that within areas liable to flood development in excess of 30sqm will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the development would not: impede the flow of flood water, reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store water, or increase the number of people or properties at risk from flooding. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out in paragraph 163 that applications within flood zones 2 and 3 should be supported by a site specific flood risk which should demonstrate that the development will be safe from flooding and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.

9.3 It is also necessary for the sequential test to be applied and paragraph 158 of the NPPF sets out that the sequential test should steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding. In order to pass the sequential test the applicant must demonstrate that there are no suitable and available sites for the development in an area of lower flood risk. Paragraph 159 sets out that if it is not possible for development to be located in zones with a lower risk of flooding, the exceptions test can be applied. The exceptions test requires developers to demonstrate that their development provides wider sustainability benefits which outweigh the flood risk, and that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking into account the vulnerability of its users.

Sequential Test

9.4 The applicant has undertaken the sequential test in support of their application, however it has only undertaken a search of sites within Old Windsor rather than across the whole Borough. The applicant in support of this approach has referred to two decisions made by RBWM where a narrowed search area was accepted as well as two appeal decision from outside of the Borough. As set out in National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG), it is for the Local Planning Authority to consider the extent to which sequential test consideration have been satisfied, and as such any decisions made by other Local Planning Authorities are not relevant to this application. With regards to the decisions that were made by RBWM, one of these relates to the Hindu Society in Maidenhead and as such is not directly comparable to this scheme and the other was

made in 2014. The Local Planning Authority are consistent in requiring applicants to carry out a search across all areas of the Borough when undertaking the sequential test as there is a need for housing across the whole Borough. Notwithstanding the above, of the sites that have been assessed, they have either been ruled out due to being within Flood Zone 3 or due to the size of the site not being suitable for the proposed development and these are considered to be acceptable reasons for discounting sites. As the sequential test has not been passed it is not necessary for the exceptions test to be considered.

Impact on the flood plain

- 9.5 The proposed development has a ground covered area (GCA) of 200sqm. This includes the proposed bin store and cycle store, but does not include the northern part of the undercroft parking area (spaces P4, P5 and P6) on the eastern block of flats as this area is completely open on two sides. The remainder of the undercroft parking area is included within the GCA calculations for this site as this is enclosed on 3 sides and would therefore likely impede the free flow of flood water. The interpretation of policy F1 supplementary planning document sets out that car ports which are completely open on at least 2 sides will not be included as contributing to the GCA and this approach has been applied here. Openings are proposed in the rear wall to try and allow flood water to flow through the undercroft parking area, however this is then impeded by fencing (as shown on drawing PL 07 Revision B). In any case openings such as these tend to get blocked by flood debris or have domestic paraphernalia stored in front of them, thereby reducing their effectiveness. Taking into account the above and taking into account the loss of the existing garage block on site, the overall increase in GCA is 80sqm. As the increase in GCA is in excess of 30sqm it is necessary for flood mitigation to be provided. The Environment Agency have set out in their comments that the preferred approach would be level for level compensation due to voids, stilts or undercroft parking tending to become blocked over time by debris and domestic effects, however this requires land on the edge of the floodplain and above the 1% annual exceedance probability (1 in 100) flood level, plus an appropriate allowance for climate change to be achievable. It is not considered that the application adequately demonstrates how the increase in GCA will be mitigated for. The Environment Agency have also raised concerns that the model data used is the 2019 draft model and not the officially supplied date (Product 4 Lower Thames 2009 model) and that the impacts of climate change and other residual risks of flooding have been properly taken into account.

Safe access/escape

- 9.6 It has also not been demonstrated that the development would be provided with safe access and escape routes during flood conditions as required by paragraph 163 of the NPPF. The FRA recommends that residents sign up to the Environment Agency flood warning service, however this is not considered acceptable as people do not always heed the flood warnings or do not leave their properties in time. A flood evacuation route has been shown, however this has been plotted using the draft data which the Environment Agency have advised should not be used and full details of flood levels and flood water velocities along the route have not been provided.
- 9.7 In conclusion, it has not been demonstrated that there are no suitable and available sites for the proposed development within an area of lower flood risk. As such the sequential test is failed. In addition, the proposed development would reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store water, would impact on the free flow of flood water and would put neighbouring sites and properties at greater risk of flooding. The proposed development would also introduce 5 new flats, and therefore new residents,

into an area liable to flood with no safe or low hazard escape route available should the site flood. The proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 155, 157, 158 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy F1 of the Local Plan and policy NR1 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.

The impact on the character and appearance of the area

- 9.8 Policy DG1 of the Local Plan is consistent with the principles of the NPPF and requires good design. Part of good design is ensuring that new buildings are compatible with the established street façade and would not harm the character of the area. This is also supported by policy H11 of the Local Plan which aims to ensure that the scale and density of new developments are in keeping with the character of the area. Policy H10 also requires new residential development to display high standards of design.
- 9.9 The proposed development includes two separate blocks of flats with a combined footprint of approximately 212sqm. In addition a dedicated bin store and cycle store are to be provided and these have a combined footprint of approximately 35sqm. The increase in built form compared to the existing garages on site, which have a footprint of approximately 120sqm is therefore significant. The block of flats which replaces the existing garage block is 5.5m taller than the existing garages. Both blocks of flats are also built right up to and are full height along the site boundaries to the south and east. The block of flats attached to the Wheatsheaf parade in particular would appear very dominant within the street scene due to its position on the corner of the site and infilling of an existing open corner. This block of flats would be prominent from both St Lukes and St Peters Road. The site will also likely continue to be used for the storage of bins in association with the Wheatsheaf parade shops and there will be a general increase in activity on the site as a result of the additional residents/users. The above factors will lead to a form of development which appears cramped, cluttered and which is out of keeping with the surrounding properties and the character of the area. Surrounding properties are modestly sized semi-detached and terraced properties, and where development is of a larger scale, such as the Wheatsheaf Parade and the Toby Carvery to the rear, it is set within larger and more spacious plots.
- 9.10 The design of the flats are not considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The block of flats to the east of the site, which replaces the existing garage block, in particular is out of keeping with the surrounding properties due to the bulky mansard roof and dormer windows which are at odds with the simple and modestly designed hipped and gable ended roofs of the surrounding properties.
- 9.11 Opposite the site to the South East is number 38 St Lukes Road which is a grade II listed building. Comments have been received from the Council's Conservation team who consider that the proposal in its current form misses an opportunity to improve the setting of the designated heritage asset, however it is accepted that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on its setting either.
- 9.12 In conclusion the proposed development represents a cramped and dominant form of development which is out of keeping with the surrounding properties and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development fails to comply with policies DG1, H10 and H11 of the Local Plan, paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP2 and SP3 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.

The impact on residential amenity

- 9.13 Paragraph 127 of the NPPF requires that places promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. There are 5 existing flats on site above the shopping parade which have rear windows facing towards where the eastern most block of flats will be. At its closest point the new flats will be within approximately 4.5m, however at this point the proposed block of flats is lower due to the roof terrace. At full height, the closest the new flats will be to the existing flats is approximately 9m. A daylight study has been submitted which shows that at no point would the new block of flats intercept a 25 degree line taken from the rear windows of the existing flats and would not therefore cause a material loss of light. All other residential properties are set far away from the proposed development to prevent a loss of amenity.
- 9.14 Each of the proposed flats will provide an internal space which is comparable with the standards set out in the national technical housing standards. In addition each flat will be provided with a balcony and the 3 flats within the block to the east of the site will be provided with a communal roof terrace area as well. There is no private outdoor garden space to be provided, however given the provision of the balconies and terraces, the likely users of the flats (not families), and the proximity of the recreation ground, this is considered acceptable. In conclusion the proposed development would not materially impact upon the amenity of existing residents and would provide future residents with an acceptable standard of amenity.

The impact on parking and highway safety

- 9.15 The site currently houses a garage block, however the garages are not linked to any particular property and are used mostly for storage. As such the loss of the garages is not objected to. The proposal for 5 x 1 bedroom flats generates a requirement for 5 car parking spaces under the Borough's current parking standards. The proposal meets these standards by providing 1 garage, 1 surface parking space and 6 under croft parking spaces. The size of each space complies with the Borough's standards.
- 9.16 The existing access is to be re-positioned approximately 5.8m further to the west to accommodate the new block of flats. The re-located access will retain sufficient visibility in both directions. The additional vehicle movements in and out of the site are not considered to pose a highway safety risk.
- 9.17 It is noted that cars park to the rear of the shops and that deliveries are often made to the shops from this area as well. However, the residents of Wheatsheaf parade do not have formal parking rights on this site, nor do the shop owners have formal rights to receive deliveries in this area. A designated loading bay is available on the opposite side of the road to Wheatsheaf Parade, which will allow for deliveries to be made to the shops should it not be possible for delivery lorries to access the existing delivery area.
- 9.18 The development proposes 6 Sheffield stands within a cycle store, however the cycle store does not appear to be secure. Should the application be approved details of an updated cycle store would be required. A designated refuse store is also provided and this is considered acceptable.

Other Material Considerations

Housing Land Supply

- 9.19 Paragraphs 10 and 11 of the NPPF set out that there will be a presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. The latter paragraph states that:

For decision-taking this means: approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.*

9.20 Footnote 7 of the NPPF (2019) clarifies that:

'out-of-date policies include, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer..).'

9.21 The BLPSV is not yet adopted planning policy and the Council's adopted Local Plan is more than five years old. Therefore, for the purposes of decision making, currently the starting point for calculating the 5 year housing land supply (5hyr hls) is the 'standard method' as set out in the NPPF (2019).

9.22 The LPA therefore accepts, for the purpose of this application and in the context of paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019), including footnote 7, the presumption of approving the development commonly known as the 'tilted balance' could be applied. However in this instance given the conflict with flooding policy which provides a clear reason for refusing the proposed development, footnote 6 the 'tilted balance' is not engaged.

Borough Local Plan weighting

9.23 Significant weight is to be afforded to the relevant Borough Local Plan Submission Version policies in this case.

10. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

10.1 Whilst acknowledging that this proposal for 5 units would make a small contribution towards the LPA meeting their 5yr housing land supply the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the flood plain and would increase the number of people and properties at risk from flooding. Furthermore it has not been demonstrated that the development would pass the sequential test. The proposal therefore clearly fails to comply with paragraphs 155, 157, 158 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy F1 of the RBWM Local Plan, and policy NR1 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan. In addition harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area due to the scale and cramped nature of the development, in conflict with policies DG1, H10 and H11 of the Local Plan, paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP2 and SP3 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.

10.2 It is also worth highlighting that paragraphs 1 and 12 of the NPPF (2019) are clear in stating that planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development remains contrary to the Development

Plan and it is not considered that the NPPF (2019), as a material consideration, demonstrates that in this instance planning permission should be granted.

11. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

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

12. REASONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL IF PERMISSION IS NOT GRANTED

- 1 The applicant has failed to demonstrate the development cannot be located elsewhere, in an area of lower flood risk. The proposal therefore fails the sequential test which aims to steer development away from the areas of highest risk. The proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 155, 157 and 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The application site is located within Flood Zone 3, which is an areas considered to be at high risk from flooding. The proposed development would increase the ground covered area on site and would significantly reduce the ability of the flood plain to store water. The development would also impact on the free flow of flood water, resulting in an increased risk of flooding for neighbouring properties. Additionally the proposed development would introduce new people and properties into an area of flood risk, and it has not been demonstrated that a safe or low hazard escape route is available from the site in flood conditions. The proposal fails to comply with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy F1 of the RBWM Local Plan, and policy NR1 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.
- 3 The proposed development is of a scale and form of development which appears cramped and cluttered and which is out of keeping with the surrounding properties and is dominating within the street scene. The design of eastern most block of flats is also not considered to be in keeping with the surrounding properties and the character of the area as it introduces a bulky mansard style roof form with dormer windows, and is at odds with the simple and modest hipped and gable ended roofs of the surrounding properties. The proposed development fails to comply with policies DG1, H10 and H11 of the Local Plan, paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies SP2 and SP3 of the submission version of the emerging Borough Local Plan.