

WINDSOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

11 November 2015

Item: 2

Application No.:	15/02452/FULL
Location:	29 Arthur Road Windsor SL4 1RS
Proposal:	Raising of existing roof ridge line, rear dormer roof extension and 2 No. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Clausen
Agent:	Mr Peter Rees
Parish/Ward:	Castle Without Ward

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Brian Benzie on 01628 796323 or at brian.benzie@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application was deferred at the Panel meeting of the 14th October for the Panel to view the site.
- 1.2 The increase in the main ridge height 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. 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.

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 and excessive mass and bulk of the dormer window and its poor design would result in a discordant form of development which is unsympathetic to the host dwelling and the area in general. |
|----|--|

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- The Director of Development and Regeneration considers it appropriate that the Panel determines the application.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The application property is a mid terrace Victorian dwelling with a traditional outrigger element to the rear extending over two stories. The terrace appears to have been built in various stages as the ridge heights of groups of houses vary along the road. The application property is at the end of a run of houses where the ridge height according to the submitted plans is 7.8m. A number of the properties have made alterations to the rear at ground and first floor levels.
- 3.2 Whilst the fronts of the properties remain largely unchanged, a number of the nearby properties, further to the west of the application property, have made alterations to their roofs in the form of dormer extensions. However, with the exception of no.35 Arthur Road, as these dwellings are within a group of dwellings where the ridge height is greater than the application property, it was unnecessary to raise the ridge height to accommodate the dormers and it would appear that the majority of the dormers have been constructed under the dwellings permitted development rights.
- 3.3 The property (no. 27) to the east of the application property has a considerably lower ridge height than no.29 (7.8m) at a height of 7.2 m and this is noticeable within the street scene especially when viewed from the Windsor Dials roundabout area.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 There have not been any previous applications at the site.
- 4.2 The proposal seeks to raise the ridge height of the existing dwelling by approximately 0.5m together with the construction of an L shaped dormer extension with rear facing windows and 2 front roof lights. The proposal would create additional bedroom space.
- 4.3 The proposed L shaped, flat roof dormer extension would extend to the full width of the enlarged roof and wrap around the existing first floor outrigger, projecting 3.8m from the existing roof slope to the full depth of the outrigger. One window is to be inserted in each of the rear facing elevations of the dormers and one within the side elevation of the outrigger extension.

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

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

The application has also been assessed against and is considered to comply with the Council's 'Sustainable Design and Construction' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which can be viewed at: https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/pp_sustainable_design_and_construction_spd.htm

Other Local Strategies or Publications

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

- 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 upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area in general.

- 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. Paragraph 59 of the NPPF concentrates on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new buildings in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

- 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 current proposal seeks to raise the ridge height of the dwelling by approximately 0.5m above the ridge height of the other dwellings to the west and will be similar in height to the roof extensions recently granted and built at no. 35 Arthur Road. An application for the raising of the roof and two dormers has recently been granted at the adjoining property no. 27 Arthur Road; however, this permission has not been implemented.
- 6.5 The proposed dormer extension would wrap around the existing first floor outrigger to the rear of the dwelling and would project 3.8m from the existing roof slope. The raising of the ridge height would have two effects; the ridge height of the application property would be noticeably higher (approximately 0.5m) than the dwellings immediately to the west (nos. 31 and 33) and considerably higher than the property to the east no.27 (approximately 1.1m); and as the current roof slope angle is to be maintained, the ridge of the new roof will not maintain its alignment with the other terraced dwellings along Arthur Road and this will be readily apparent from public areas. In addition due to the considerable difference in heights between the ridge line of no. 27 (as existing) and the top of the dormer over the outrigger, a large part of box dormer will be seen in the street views.
- 6.6 The proposal by reason of its increase in height, 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 window links between the main roof and the rear extension 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 highway safety.

- 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.

Impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

- 6.8 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. If the application had been recommended for approval, a condition restricting this window to be obscure glass would have been attached.

Area liable to flood.

- 6.9 The site lies within an area liable to flood, Flood Zone 3 (high risk) therefore the proposal ought to satisfy the requirements of Local Plan Policy F1. In this case the proposed development relates to the construction of a first floor extension and loft conversion and as such Policy F1 is not applicable in this case.

Other Material Considerations.

- 6.10 It is noted that there are a number of dwellings further to the west along 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. The exception to this is nos. 35 and 65 Arthur Road which were granted full permission.
- 6.11 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 and was of such a scale that it would have constituted permitted development. In addition to this it is flanked on either side by dormers of a similar size and design.
- 6.12 Numbers 35 and 27 was granted permission by the Windsor Urban Development Control Panel in January and July 2015 respectively and the extension at no.35 is nearing completion. The extensions as currently proposed under this application, are of the same scale, bulk and mass as that approved at no. 27 and 35. Each planning application should be treated on its own merits where in this case there is a material difference in circumstance between the approvals at nos. 27 and 35 and that now proposed, which is considered to warrant objecting to the now proposed extension.

7. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

2 neighbouring properties were directly notified directly of the application and a site notice was posted on the 21 August 2015.

No letters were received supporting or objecting to the application as a result of the direct notifications or the posting of the site notice.

8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A – Existing Elevations
- Appendix B – Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans
- Appendix C – Site Location 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 NPPF.

In this case the issues have not been successfully resolved.

9. REASONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL IF PERMISSION IS NOT GRANTED

- 1 The proposal by reason of the increase in the ridge height, the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer extension when taken together with its overall poor design and its bland appearance would appear visually discordant and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the area and detrimental upon the appearance of the row of terraces. 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 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 1999 (Incorporating Alterations 2003) Policies DG1 and H14 and with the aims and core principle objectives of the NPPF.