

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

20 January 2016

Item: 2

Application No.:	15/03699/FULL
Location:	April Cottage Poundfield Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9RY
Proposal:	Raising of roof with addition of 3 no. front dormers and 2 no. rear dormers
Applicant:	Mr Owen
Agent:	Mr Stuart Keen - SKD Design
Parish/Ward:	Cookham Parish

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Alison Cox on 01628 796440 or at alison.cox@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The increase in height of the roofs of the bungalow, in conjunction with three front and two rear dormers, would not result in disproportionate increases to the original dwelling. The proposal would be appropriate development in the Green Belt so comply with Policies GB1, GB2 and GB4 of the Local Plan and paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 1.2 The alterations to the roof would not cause the loss of any of the spacious and verdant features within Poundfield Lane, or significantly harm views of the countryside between buildings or the interpretation of the paintings of Sir Stanley Spencer. The alterations to the existing bungalow would be of an appropriate scale to the host building and other properties within the lane. The proposals would preserve the important features of the Cookham High Street Conservation Area, so accords with Policy CA2 of the Local Plan and paragraph 131 of the NPPF and Guidance Note 4.5 of the Cookham Village Design Statement.
- 1.3 There would not be cause any significant harm to the neighbouring occupier to the South because the siting and scale of the extensions would result in an acceptable relationship. The proposal is considered to comply with Policy H14 of the Local Plan, the NPPF and Guidance Note 6.9a of the Cookham Village Design Statement.
- 1.4 The development would increase parking provision to four off-street parking spaces which exceeds the maximum provision required in the adopted Parking Standards. The proposal is considered to comply with Policy P4 of the Local Plan.

It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 9 of this report.

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- Only if the recommendation is to grant the application, by Councillor Kellaway because of the high degree of public interest and the position of Poundfield within the Cookham settlement.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 April Cottage is one of a pair of dwellings constructed in the late 1980s. The applications site is a single storey bungalow whereas the neighbouring property (Stable Cottage) is a chalet-style bungalow.
- 3.2 Poundfield Lane slopes downwards in a southerly direction with the application site being on land approximately 0.5m higher than Stable Cottage. Stable Cottage's ridge is at approximately 8m with April Cottage's being around 5.7m.

3.3 Poundfield Lane contains a mix of dwellings and the area has a rural feel being surrounded by fields and because of the un-made Poundfield Lane.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

417731	Two new dwellings	Approved December 1985
417922	Single-storey rear extension	Approved January 1986

4.1 The application proposes a number of elements comprising: roof alterations to the main ridge (by an increase of 1m) and the rear single storey extension to increase the height along with three front dormers two rear dormers. The internal size of the existing garage would be increased by the removal of a partition wall. The property would have four bedrooms and a further two additional rooms large enough to be utilised as bedrooms (a study and a play-room).

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 17 (Core planning principles), Section 7 (Requiring good design), Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt land) and section 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment).

Royal Borough Local Plan

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

	Green Belt	Conservation Area
	✓	✓
Local Plan	GB1, GB2, GB4	CA2

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

- Cookham Village Design Statement (CVDS)

More information on this document can be found at:

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

Other Local Strategies or Publications

5.4 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

•	RBWM Parking Strategy – view using link at paragraph 5.3
•	Cookham High Street Conservation Area appraisal – view using link http://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200207/conservation_and_regeneration/666/conservation_areas_and_listed_buildings/3

6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- Whether the proposal amounts to appropriate development in the Green Belt, and if not whether there are any very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Green belt by reason of its inappropriateness and any other harm caused by the proposal; and
- whether the proposal preserves or enhances Cookham High Street Conservation Area
- the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the street scene; and

- iv the living conditions of the neighbouring properties; and
- v the adequacy of parking on the site and the impact on highway safety in the area; and

Green Belt

- 6.2 Policies GB1 and GB4 allows the extension of dwellings as long as they do not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The supporting text to Policy GB4 sets out criteria on how to judge a development in order to assess whether it would constitute a disproportionate addition. As Policy GB4 explains, a disproportionate addition could occur through one large extension or through the cumulative impact of a series of small ones. The Policy makes it clear that percentage increases in floorspace are not the sole determining factor and that there are other aspects to take into account such as the history of the site and the location of the application site and the proposals.
- 6.3 The size of the original house is 233sqm. The previous extensions, the new extension and floorspace to be removed would amount to 104sqm. There would be a 45% increase in floorspace over the original size of the house.
- 6.4 Taking into account the factors of the size of the plot, the nature of the surrounding area with tree screening at the rear, the proposed development being a limited upward extension and the resulting cumulative size would not amount to a disproportionate addition in the Green Belt.
- 6.5 Policy GB2 states that permission will not be granted for new development if it would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or harm the character of the countryside because of a material increase in the scale of development on the site. The proposals would not cause any significant harm to openness of the Green Belt as set out above and this family house would not result in any material increase in scale that would harm the countryside. Guidance Note 4.4 of the Cookham Village Design Statement (CVOS) states that “The countryside of Cookham parish is highly valued and must be protected from development which detracts from its attractive appearance generally and in accordance with its status as Green Belt.” The development overall, for the reason of being considered appropriate development in the Green Belt is considered to comply with this guidance. Guidance Note 4.5 of the CVDS states that “The role of Poundfield in providing a green wedge separating The Pound from the Station Hill area and Cookham Rise, together with its provision of a setting to the historic environment and the related Stanley Spencer paintings, should be recognised. Proposals should not compromise this role.” The additions proposed would have very little effect on this green wedge. The proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt.

Cookham High Street Conservation Area

- 6.6 Policy CA2 requires that development should preserve or enhance the character of the individual conservation area. The Cookham High Street Conservation Statement references Poundfield Lane and the immediate vicinity of the applications site as “This leads up to Englefield House and associated buildings which are set within a large garden and adjacent to agricultural land” and “The large open expanse of the Moor allows views in the reverse direction to these higher points with the buildings surrounding the Moor in the foreground” and “Throughout the conservation area there are glimpse views between buildings and vegetation to the surrounding countryside and views of garden spaces and buildings in garden settings.” In addition parts of Poundfield have been painted by Sir Stanley Spencer (see paragraph 6.7 below). The alterations to the roof would not cause the loss of any of the spacious and verdant features within Poundfield Lane, or significantly harm views of the countryside between buildings. The alterations to the existing bungalow would be of an appropriate scale to the host building and other properties within the lane. In arriving at this recommendation special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, as required under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 6.7 The CVDS, in Guidance Note 4.5, references Sir Stanley Spencer paintings. Of relevance are those including a series of scenes at Englefield and a panoramic view stretching towards The

Pound. The paintings considerably pre-date the construction of April Cottage and Stable Cottages. The proposals will not harm the interpretation of the paintings by this famous artist.

The Character and Appearance of the Original Dwelling and the Street Scene

- 6.8 Policies DG1 and H14 of the Local Plan provide detailed design criteria to ensure that proposals respect the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.
- 6.9 The overall scale of the development proposed is entirely appropriate to that of the host dwelling. The design of the new roof replicates the existing. Neither the front or rear roofslopes would be overly-cluttered by the new dormer windows. The external appearance would entirely accord with the existing dwelling (and the appearance of the adjacent Stable Cottage). Although the resulting development would increase the height of the property by 1m it would still remain lower than Stable Cottage albeit by approximately 0.8m. The resulting property would be defined as a chalet-bungalow which would sympathetically respect the original building and still in keeping with the scale of other dwellings in the locale.

The Living Conditions of the Neighbouring Properties

- 6.10 Policy H14 (2) of the Local Plan states that “extensions should not cause an unacceptable loss of light or privacy to adjacent properties, or significantly affect their amenities”.
- 6.11 None of the enlargements or alterations would result in a loss of light or overshadowing. The development is sited entirely to the north of the neighbouring property of Stable Cottage so would not have any impact on light levels. In terms of privacy, although rear-facing windows are proposed such windows are commonplace in properties and would not result in any significant loss of privacy. However, a condition is recommended to withdraw the ability to insert windows in the south elevation of the ‘Master Bedroom’ extension because such windows could cause an unacceptable level of overlooking (see Condition 4). The front dormers are around 40m away from Harvest Cottage (opposite the application site) and a greater degree of overlooking Poundfield Lane where the public has a right of way. The increase in the height of the main ridge of the roof would not result in an increase in the overall mass of the bungalow in front of or to the rear of Stable Cottage so would not harm the outlook of this neighbour. The increase in the height of the roof of the single storey rear extension will be beyond the rear of the neighbouring property, however, it will be of a sufficient distance not to harm the outlook of the neighbour.

The Adequacy of Parking on the Site and the Impact on Highway Safety

- 6.12 Policies DG1, H14 and P4 all require that extensions/development should not impair highway safety or lead to an inadequate car parking provision within the curtilage of the property. The 2004 adopted Parking Strategy details properties with four or more -bedrooms should have three off-street parking spaces. There is space on the existing driveway for three cars and the application proposes increasing the internal width (by removing a dividing wall) within the existing garage, thereby creating a further parking space. There would be a total of four off-street parking spaces.

7. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

Ten occupiers were notified directly of the application.

The application was advertised in the Maidenhead Advertiser on 19th November 2015.

The planning officer posted a statutory notice advertising the application at the site on 20th November 2015.

Three letters were received supporting the application, summarised as:

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

1.	In keeping with the surrounding area	Paragraph 6.9
2.	In keeping with the Conservation Area	Paragraph 6.6 to 6.7
3.	Views from The Moor	Paragraph 6.6
4.	Scale and design of the proposals	Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.5
5.	Parking	Paragraph 6.12
6.	Appropriate scale	Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.5 and 6.9

A statement which was prepared by the applicant in response to all the neighbour objections was received on 8th December 2015 and appeared in the public domain on 11th December. The contents of the statement are acknowledged and given the same weight in the determination of the application as a consultation with a neighbour.

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

Comment		Where in the report this is considered
1.	Bulk/mass in the Green Belt	Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.5
2.	Increased traffic (business, building materials/builders, employees)	Paragraph 6.12 Whether the applicant runs a business from home is not a relevant material consideration in the determination of the application.
3.	The trees will only screen the house for part of the year	Paragraph 6.3
4.	Affect on the Conservation Area	Paragraphs 6.6 to 6.7
5.	Stanley Spencer painting(s)	Paragraph 6.7
6.	Overbearing [harm] on neighbour's amenity (bulk, mass)	Paragraphs 6.10 to 6.11
7.	Applicants should move	This is not a material consideration in the determination of a planning application.
8.	Sewers	This is not a material consideration in the determination of a planning application.
9.	Overdevelopment in terms of the number of bedrooms proposed, size of the plot and need	Paragraph 6.9. Also, the personal needs or requirements of an applicant are not a material consideration in the determination of an application.
10.	Commercial use	Paragraph 6.12 Whether the applicant runs a business from home is not relevant material consideration in the determination of the application
11.	Loss of privacy	Paragraphs 6.10 to 6.11
12.	Protection of Poundfield Lane in general	Paragraph 6.5

13.	Historical context of the application site	Paragraph 6.3
14.	Affect of the development on wildlife	The area is not designated as one which has habitats of protected species.
15.	Nothing has changed since 1986 [reference to Policy]	Paragraph 5.3
16.	Contrary to Cookham Village Design Statement	Paragraphs 6.5, 6.7, 6.11. The application does not propose the conversion of the garage (Guidance 6.9b)
17.	Neighbour consultation	The objection raised is regarding the consultation by the applicant which took place with the neighbours prior to the application being submitted. Any communications which have taken place outside of the formal neighbour consultation by the Local Planning Authority are not a material consideration in the determination of a planning application.

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Cookham Parish Council	<p>Objection. Significant concerns raised regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build and massing of the development in the context of the plot 2. Impact of changes to the property in its setting re Green Belt, Conservation Area and VDS. 3. Parking and access and egress. <p>Request that RBWM encourage applicant to reconsider the nature and scale of the proposals.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.5 Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.11 Paragraph 6.12</p> <p>Only the proposals before the Panel can be considered.</p>

8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

•	Appendix A – Proposed Site Location Plan, Floorplans, Elevations and Parking Layout
---	---

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.

9. 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 match those of the existing building unless first otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.
- 3 Prior to the substantial completion of the development a water butt of at least 120L internal capacity shall be installed to intercept rainwater draining from the roof of the building. It shall subsequently be retained.
Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding and demand for water, increase the level of sustainability of the development and to comply with Requirement 4 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document.
- 4 No window(s) shall be inserted at first floor level (including the roof slope) in the South elevation to the 'Master Bedroom' part of the extension as shown on the approved plans 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.
- 5 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.