

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

**MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL**

8 June 2016

Item: 5

<b>Application No.:</b>	16/00765/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Queensgate House 14 - 18 Cookham Road Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change of use from B1 (Offices) to C3 (Residential), addition of mansard roof to provide 3 x 1 bed and 3 x 2 bed flats
<b>Applicant:</b>	Wycrest Ltd
<b>Agent:</b>	Miss Natasha Gandhi
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Oldfield Ward

**If you have a question about this report, please contact:** Antonia Liu on 01628 796697 or at [antonia.liu@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:antonia.liu@rbwm.gov.uk)

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The loss of approximately 122 square metres of office floor space is not considered to unduly reduce the quantity and quality of office space with the Borough. Furthermore, the provision of additional residential units is considered to meet a key objective of Maidenhead Area Action Plan policy MTC12 and Local Plan policy H6, which encourages the provision of additional residential accommodation within towns, and would outweigh any harm as a result of the loss of office floor space.
- 1.2 The scheme has been amended and the proposed mansard roof is considered sufficiently proportionate and harmonious with the host, so as not to detract from its original character and street scene. It is considered that the site is capable of accommodating the additional dwellings, and the proposal would not be out of keeping with the higher density levels within the locality.
- 1.3 The access arrangements and visibility are considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and 25 car parking spaces are required and provided for the proposed and existing development.
- 1.4 It is unlikely that the proposal would result in an unreasonable level of noise and disturbance, loss of privacy, or be visually overbearing which is significantly over and above the existing situation to warrant refusal.

**It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Section 10 of this report.**

**2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION**

- The Council's Constitution does not give the Borough Planning Manager delegated powers to determine the application in the way recommended; such decisions can only be made by the Panel.

**3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

- 3.1 The site is located within Maidenhead settlement and comprises of a Georgian style terraced building on Cookham Road, which is 3 storeys in height plus semi-basement. There are currently 8 flats in no. 14 and no. 16 Queensgate House, while no. 18 is occupied by 8 office suites. To the rear are 23 existing car parking spaces and amenity space.

**4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

Ref.	Description	Decision and Date
08/02712/FULL	Change of use of garden floor to complimentary	Approved – 23.12.2008

	medical services.	
06/01198/FULL	Four storey rear extension to rear of no. 18 to form additional B1, mansard roof across no. 14-18 comprising of B1 and 2 x 1-bed flats and 2 x 2-bed flats.	Refused – 07.07.2006. Appeal Dismissed – 06.02.2007.
05/02542/FULL	Change of use of basement, ground, first and second floor from B1 to 4 x 2-bed flats.	Approved – 27.03.2006.
05/00978/COU	Change of use and conversion from offices B1 to 6 x 1-bed flats and 2 x 2-bed flats with associated parking.	Approved – 10.06.2005.

- 4.1 The proposal is for a change of use from B1 (offices) to C3 (residential) and a new mansard roof to provide 3 x 1-bed and 3 x 2-bed flats. The proposal retains the basement office in no. 18 Queensgate House and converts the remaining offices into 3 x 1-bed flats. The new mansard roof would provide additional 3 x 2-bed flats.

## 5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

- 5.1 National Planning Policy Framework, Section 6 and 7

### Royal Borough Local Plan

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

	Within settlement area	Listed Building	Highways/Parking issues
Local Plan	DG1, H6, H8, H10, H11	LB2	T5, T7, P4
Maidenhead Area Action Plan (MAAP)	MTC 4, MTC10, MTC12		

### Other Local Strategies or Publications

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

- RBWM Parking Strategy - view at: [http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web\\_pp\\_supplementary\\_planning.htm](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm)

## 6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- Principle of Development;
- Character and Appearance;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Impact on Neighbours;
- Other Material Considerations;

### Principle of Development

- 6.2 MAAP policy MTC10 recognises that offices are an important town centre use and states that development proposals that result in the net reduction in office space will only be acceptable where this loss would not unduly reduce the quantity and quality of office floorspace or would be

outweighed by other Area Action Plan objectives through the proposed development. This proposal would result the loss of 6 office suites, measuring approximately 122 square metres of office floorspace in total. This quantity is considered to be minimal and would not unduly reduce the quantity and quality of office space with the Borough. Furthermore, the additional residential units would meet the a key objective of MAAP policy MTC12 and Local Plan policy H6, which encourages the provision of additional residential accommodation within towns, and would outweigh any harm as a result of the loss of office floor space. Subject to compliance with the relevant policies and other material considerations there are no objections in principle.

### **Character and Appearance**

- 6.3 A mansard roof was previously refused under 06/01198/FULL as it was considered to be out of character with the existing building and detrimental to its appearance and that of the area in general. Mansard roofs are not uncommon on Georgian style buildings and there are no objections in principle to the mansard. The scheme has been amended so that the roof is set back from the front facade of the property behind the parapet by 0.7m and the angle of the mansard roof is shallower by approximately 10 degrees thereby reducing bulk and mass. The proposed dormers have been reduced in size and lowered, thereby reducing their visual prominence. The party wall upstands on the north and south elevation have also been reduced in scale and the shape altered so that they follow the line of the mansard roof. A band coursing has been added to the bottom of the party wall upstands, continuing the existing band around the building, which breaks up and adds visual interest of what would otherwise be a blank brick wall and visually integrates the roof extension with the existing building. Overall, the mansard roof is considered to be sufficiently proportionate and harmonious with the host, so as not to detract from its original character. Acceptable materials can be secured by condition 2.
- 6.4 It is noted that the existing building has a uniformity with the immediate neighbour to the north at Queensgate Lodge. Local concerns have been raised over the erosion of this uniformity with the addition of a new roof at the application site. However, it is considered that difference does not necessarily equates to harm and given that the site is detached and for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.3 the proposal is not considered unduly harmful to the character of Queensgate Lodge or the streetscene.
- 6.5 Concerns have also been raised on over-development of the site, but at 140 dwellings per hectare the proposed density would be at the same as Queensgate Lodge and at a lower density than the housing development directly opposite the site at Kidwells Close, which is approximately 400 dwellings per hectare. It is considered that the site is capable of accommodating the additional dwellings, and the proposal would not be out of keeping with the higher density levels within the locality.
- 6.6 The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Local Plan policy DG1 and H10, and MAAP policy MTC4.

### **Highway Safety and Parking**

- 6.7 The proposed development is likely to lead to a reduction in daily vehicle movements in comparison to existing office use and so there are no significant concerns over impact on local highway infrastructure.
- 6.8 There are no changes proposed to the existing access, which can achieve visibility splays in excess of our current requirement being 2.4m x 43m to the left and right.
- 6.9 The existing car park to the rear of the site consists of approximately 23 car parking spaces. As set out in the Council's current Adopted Parking Strategy the proposed and existing development would require 25 spaces overall. The site is deemed to be within a sustainable location being within a short walk to Maidenhead town centre which has many transport links such as a frequent bus services and Maidenhead train station which has links to Reading and London. Therefore in this case the maximum parking standard for an area of good accessibility has been applied. A parking layout has been submitted which demonstrates 25 spaces can be accommodated within the existing car parking area, and this can be secured by condition 5.

- 6.10 The proposed cycle store is sufficient in size to accommodate a minimum of 6 cycle spaces, which is acceptable and can be secured by condition 3. The existing refuse store which currently serves the site is to be extended to accommodate the additional flats, which is also acceptable and can be secured by condition 4.

### **Impact on Neighbours**

- 6.11 Concerns have been raised over noise and disturbance as a result of the proposal both from the construction period and from the residential use in particular for users of the health clinic. Informative 1 which relates to dust, smoke and hours of construction are recommended. Given the types of activities associated with residential use in comparison with offices, and as offices are more likely to operate similar hours to the health clinic while the activity from a residential use is more likely to be concentrated in the evening and weekends, it is unlikely that the proposal would result in an unreasonable level of noise and disturbance which is significantly over and above the existing situation to warrant refusal.
- 6.12 In terms of privacy, the proposed dormer windows would introduce new views but these are not considered to materially add or differ from existing views. Concerns have been raised over loss of privacy for users of the health clinic with an increase in foot traffic utilising the path that runs adjacent to the north elevation of the building leading to the carpark at the rear. There are two windows serving the health clinic on the north elevation serving the clinic, which the path passes. However, the path to the car park is already in existence and while there may be an intensification of use with additional dwellings it is not considered that the resultant footfall would result in material increase to the existing situation to warrant refusal.
- 6.13 Due to the set back of the mansard roof from the rear elevation by approximately 1m at the base, with a pitch sloping away, it is not considered that the proposed roof extension would result in an unreasonable overbearing effect to users of amenity space to the rear.
- 6.14 The concern that the proposal would result in harm to the local economy due to potential loss of business from clients of the health clinic utilising other local services is given limited weight as this is not evidenced and the contribution to the local economy is likely to be minimal.

### **Other Material Considerations**

#### Housing Mix

- 6.15 There are no objections to the provision of one and two bedroom units. Local Plan policy H8 states that the Council will particularly favour proposal which include dwellings for small households and the location is considered to be sustainable and appropriate for this housing mix.

#### Standard of Accommodation for Future Occupiers

- 6.16 Internal rooms are considered to be sufficient in size to function for the use they are intended, and habitable rooms benefit from natural light and ventilation. There is limited space provided around the building that could be used for amenity space for the occupiers of the flats, however the flats are located within an urban locality in close proximity to open space and the town centre and no objections are raised to this.

#### 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 applications for new homes should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of 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 five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

- 6.18 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 that the socio-economic benefits of the additional dwelling(s) would also weigh in favour of the development.

## 7. ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

- 7.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regulations) which came in force on the 6 April 2015, allows the Council to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects in the borough to support and fund new infrastructure that the Council and local communities may require. Planning obligations may still be sought to mitigate local impact if they are still necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms if directly related to the development and if fairly related to the scale and kind of the development. National planning policy advice contained within the NPPG makes it very clear that site specific contributions should only be sought where this can be justified with reference to underpinning evidence on infrastructure planning. In this case, it is considered that planning obligations are not required.

## 8. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

### Comments from interested parties

42 occupiers were notified directly of the application, and the planning officer posted a statutory notice advertising the application at the site on 17 March 2016.

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

Comment	Where in the report this is considered
1. Noise and disturbance, in particular from dust from construction and smell from additional households cooking/washing/smoking etc. to users of the health clinic and local residents.	Para. 6.11.
2. Loss of parking and increase in parking pressure for health clinic and existing residents.	Para. 6.9.
3. Loss of privacy for users of health clinic as unknown people from different backgrounds will move into the residential accommodation, and increase in footfall for path leading to car park which passes windows to the health clinic.	Who will occupy the residential accommodation is not a material planning consideration.  Para. 6.12.
4. Loss of business for the clinic would result in harm to retail footfall as clients of the clinic shop/eat etc. in Maidenhead, harming the local economy.	Para. 6.14.
5. Conflict with terms of lease with health clinic.	Not a material planning issue.
6. Over development / intensification of the site.	Para. 6.5.
7. The new roof would appear over-dominant and visually overbearing to gardens and car park to the rear.	Para. 6.13.
8. Harm to streetscene with increase height and change to elevations, eroding uniformity with Queensgate Lodge.	Para. 6.3 – 6.4.
9. Disputes that the site is located within Maidenhead Town Centre, close to services and public transport, and therefore sustainable development.	The site lies within the designated Maidenhead

		Town Centre as shown in the MAAP.
--	--	-----------------------------------

### Other consultees and organisations

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Environmental Protection	No objection to the proposal.	Noted.
Local Highway Authority	<p>The existing vehicle access can achieve visibility splays in excess of our current requirement being 2.4m x 43m to the left and right.</p> <p>The site as a whole will need to provide 25 car parking spaces (as set out by the Local Authorities current standards). Drawing no, 2283_PL105 shows 24 car parking spaces will be provided and from scaling the drawing all of the car parking spaces scale to our current standards. If parking space 9 is slightly moved south one more additional space can be provided at 2.7m x 4.8m. The applicant will be required to amend drawing no, 2283_PL105, showing the site can achieve 25 car parking spaces before the plan can be approved by condition.</p> <p>With referring to drawing number 2283_PL107 the proposed cycle store is a sufficient size to accommodate a minimum of 6 cycle spaces. This is accepted.</p> <p>The existing refuse store which currently serves the site is to be extended to accommodate the additional 3 flats. This is accepted.</p> <p>The proposed development is likely to lead to a reduction in daily vehicle movements although an increased level of activity is likely to occur during evenings and at weekends.</p>	Para. 6.7 – 6.10.

## 9. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A – Site Location Plan
- Appendix B – Proposed Elevations
- Appendix C – Proposed Floor Plans

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 been successfully resolved.

## 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. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used on the external

surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved 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 Policy DG1

3. No part of the development shall be occupied until covered and secure cycle parking facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing. These facilities shall thereafter be kept available for the parking of cycles in association with the development at all times.  
Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate cycle parking facilities in order to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T7, DG1.
4. No part of the development shall be occupied until the refuse bin storage area and recycling facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing. These facilities shall be kept available for use in association with the development at all times.  
Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate facilities that allow it to be serviced in a manner which would not adversely affect the free flow of traffic and highway safety and to ensure the sustainability of the development. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5, DG1.
5. No part of the development shall be occupied until vehicle parking space has been provided in accordance with the approved drawing. The space approved shall be retained for parking in association with the development.  
Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety. Relevant Policies - Local Plan P4, DG1.
6. Prior to the commencement of any works of demolition or construction a management plan showing how demolition and construction traffic, (including cranes), materials storage, facilities for operatives and vehicle parking and manoeuvring will be accommodated during the works period shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented as approved and maintained for the duration of the works or as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5.
7. 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.

### **Informatives**

1. Dust: The applicant and contractor should take all practicable steps to minimise dust deposition, which is a major cause of nuisance to residents living near to construction and demolition sites. The applicant and their contractor should ensure that all loose materials are covered up or damped down by a suitable water device, to ensure that all cutting/breaking is appropriately damped down, to ensure that the haul route is paved or tarmac before works commence, is regularly swept and damped down, and to ensure the site is appropriately screened to prevent dust nuisance to neighbouring properties. The applicant is advised to follow guidance with respect to dust control: London working group on Air Pollution Planning and the Environment (APPLE): London Code of Practice, Part 1: The Control of Dust from Construction; and the Building Research Establishment: Control of dust from construction and demolition activities.  
Smoke: The Royal Borough receives a large number of complaints relating to construction burning activities. The applicant should be aware that any burning that gives rise to a smoke nuisance is actionable under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Further that any burning that gives rise to dark smoke is considered an offence under the Clean Air Act 1993. It is the Environmental Protection Team policy that there should be no fires on construction or demolition sites. All construction and demolition waste should be taken off site for disposal. The only exceptions relate to knotweed and in some cases infected timber where burning may be considered the best practicable environmental option. In these rare cases we would expect the

contractor to inform the Environmental Protection Team before burning on 01628 683538 and follow good practice.

Hours: The applicant should be aware the permitted hours of construction working in the Authority are as follows: Monday-Friday 08.00-18.00 Saturday 08.00-13.00 No working on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays

2. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Berkshire Act 1986, Part II, Clause 9, which enables the Highway Authority to recover the costs of repairing damage to the footway or grass verge arising during building operations.
3. The attention of the applicant is drawn to Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980 which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic.
4. Any incidental works affecting the adjoining highway shall be approved by, and a licence obtained from the Streetcare Services Manager at Tinkers Lane Depot Tinkers Lane Windsor SL4 4LR tel: 01628 796801 at least 4 weeks before any development is due to commence.
5. No builder's materials, plant or vehicles related to the implementation of the development should be parked/stored on the public highway so as to cause an obstruction at any time.