

Registration Date:	22-Feb-2018	Application No:	P/02502/007
Officer:	Michael Scott	Ward:	Langley St. Marys
Applicant:	Reema Chadha	Application Type:	Major
13 Week Date:			N/A
Agent:	Mr. Tom Achtmanis, Arni Architects Ltd Unit 4, The Barracks Workshops, Newcastle-under-Lyme, ST5 1LG		
Location:	Raymond House, 14, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW		
Proposal:	Construction of a two storey side extension. [Revised drawings received 03/04/18.]		

**Recommendation:** Delegate to Planning Manager for approval



## **P/02502/007**

### **1.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

- 1.1 This application is a householder application of a type which would normally be determined under powers of officer delegation, however, under the current constitution, as she was then a Councillor, Diana Coad, requested that the application be 'called-in' for determination by the committee.
- 1.2 Having considered the relevant policies set out below, and comments that have been received from consultees and neighbouring occupiers, and all other relevant material considerations it is recommended the application be delegated to the Planning Manager for approval subject to the list of Conditions at the end of the report and subject to there being no additional representations raising objections that have not already been considered.

### **PART A: BACKGROUND**

#### **2.0 Proposal**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing single storey double garage and the construction of a two-storey side extension measuring 6.5 wide by 4.7 metres deep and of 6.8 metres in height to eaves (8.76 metres in overall height to the ridge) in order to provide a "family" room at ground floor level and two additional bedrooms at first floor level.
- 2.2 The current proposals are amendments following the applicant's response to officers' comments to the application as originally submitted. The changes to the scheme comprised omitting the raising of the roof of the original dwelling, changes to the proposed windows in the extension to give an appearance that better matched the original dwelling, setting the front elevation of the extension back from the façade of the original building and the reduction of the scale of the two-storey side extension to ensure the extension enjoyed an acceptable relationship with the main building and to reduce the impact upon neighbours.
- 2.3 In particular, the width of the extension has been reduced from 8.43 metres to 6.5 metres, the depth reduced from 5.33 metres to 4.7 metres. The extension has been set back by 0.725 metres from the façade compared to the originally proposed 0.1 metres.

#### **3.0 Application Site**

- 3.1 The application relates to a two-storey, four-bedroom, dwellinghouse, which is attached to Pantile Lodge, 19a Pantile Row. The property fronts a paved "courtyard". Access is taken from Raymond Road between nos. 12 and 20 Raymond Road. There are two detached but "co-joined" garages to the side of the property with a link wall enclosing the house. The courtyard to the front is shared with 14a Raymond Road, which is a modern dwelling to the east. Ground levels are similar throughout the site

and between adjoining sites.

- 3.2 Raymond House is a circa mid to late 19th century dwelling, the southern part of the building is now in separate ownership but was previously 1 large detached dwelling. It is accessed from Raymond Road and is now surrounded by mid to late 20th century development.
- 3.3 Raymond House is constructed of yellow brick with a hipped slate roof and symmetrical facade with a central front porch (this is rendered and probably a later addition). There are single storey canted front bays either side of the porch with stucco cornice and 3 windows to each bay. All the windows are 1-over-1 sashes and have curved brick heads. There are five windows to the first floor.

4.0 **Site History**

P/02502/008 Lawful development certificate for a proposed loft conversion with rooflights

Approved

5.0 **Neighbour Notification**

- 5.1 17, Pantile Row, Slough, SL3 8LJ, 11, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LN, 19, Pantile Row, Slough, SL3 8LJ, 19a, Pantile Row, Slough, SL3 8LJ, 40, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 36, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 38, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 42, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 24, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 20, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 21, Pantile Row, Slough, SL3 8LJ, 12, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 15, Pantile Row, Slough, SL3 8LJ, 9a, Pantile Row, Slough, SL3 8LJ, 13, Pantile Row, Slough, SL3 8LJ, 34, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 22, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW, 14a, Raymond Road, Slough, SL3 8LW

5.2 Consultation Responses

The original consultation period expired on 23rd April 2018 and the current consultation on the latest amendments will expire on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2018. One objection was received from the occupier of 19 Pantile Row to the original form of the proposals and who has made a further objection to the amended proposals. The objector sets out that they consider the proposed extension would “completely block their outlook” and be “intrusive”. They queried the dimensions shown, as they are concerned that the proposal would lead to “overlooking”.

- 5.3 Further consultation has taken place on the latest second amendment that is due to expire shortly before the committee meeting. Any representations received will be given to Members through the Amendment Sheet and the recommendation incorporates the possibility of any last-minute postal representation being received and considered by the Planning Manager.

## **PART B: PLANNING APPRAISAL**

- 6.0      Policy Background**
- 6.1      The proposed development is considered having regard for National Planning Policy Framework, Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (2006 – 2026) Development Plan Document, December 2008, Policies H14, H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 and the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010.
- 6.2      Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Annex 1 to the National Planning Policy Framework advises that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
- The Local Planning Authority has published a self assessment of the Consistency of the Slough Local Development Plan with the National Planning Policy Framework using the PAS NPPF Checklist.
- The detailed Self Assessment undertaken identifies that the above policies are generally in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework. The policies that form the Slough Local Development Plan are to be applied in conjunction with a statement of intent with regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- It was agreed at Planning Committee in October 2012 that it was not necessary to carry out a full scale review of Slough's Development Plan at present, and that instead the parts of the current adopted Development Plan for Slough should all be republished in a single 'Composite Development Plan' for Slough. The Planning Committee endorsed the use of this Composite Local Plan for Slough in July 2013.
- 7.0      Design and Street Scene**
- 7.1      The proposed works of extension would follow the demolition of the existing garages to the side of the plot. These garages are not considered to be in keeping with the character of the host property. As such, their loss is not considered to be an issue in respect of the appearance of the site.
- 7.2      The proposal is a 6.5m wide two-storey side extension, which represents 50% of the width of the original dwelling. This satisfies the criteria set out in paragraph 2.1.5 of the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document Adopted January 2010 (RESPD).
- 7.3      The proposed scheme as now amended involves setting the front face of

the extension back 725mm behind the façade of the host property. By this means there would be a clear visual break and a distinct “shadow-line” created to accentuate the difference between original and new works.

- 7.4 The extension would be built of matching bricks with a matching slate roof. The suggested condition requires samples of the materials and for the new brickwork to match the existing in terms of the type of brick, as well as its texture, type of mortar and bond. The new window openings to the front would have arched brick headers and reconstituted stone cills to match the existing vernacular. (There are no openings on the flank or at first floor level at the rear.) A new double door with arched brick header would be formed in the rear to provide access to the private garden area.
- 7.5 In terms of the specific impact upon the visual appearance of the host property, the original plans showed the extension with 4 windows that did not match those original windows on the principal elevation in terms of cill heights, lintel heights and window dimensions, relating to the hierarchy of fenestration. Although the building is not listed, locally listed or within a Conservation Area there is still considered to be some architectural and historical interest of the application building as discussed in the following section. It is important to preserve any heritage significance by seeking to ensure that physical additions to it are respectful of its features and styling.
- 7.6 Accordingly officers have secured the addition of some amendments to the design and location of the fenestration on the frontage of the extension. The details of the windows have also been subject to amendments to ensure that the original line of windows within the host building is carried through to the extension as much as possible. This is to ensure that the design and appearance of the proposed extension better respects the original windows on the principal elevation so that the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the design and appearance of the host property and therefore is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.7 Given the property is set well away from Raymond Road itself, there would be no impact on the streetscene generally.
- 7.8 In light of the analysis above and the amendments that have received to the proposal, it is considered that the application would now comply with Policies H12, H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 and the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010
- 8.0 **Heritage**
- 8.1 In addition to the general issues of design and street scene considered above, the application building is considered by officers to have heritage significance. In accordance with the NPPF (para. 128) a Heritage Statement has been submitted by the applicant upon the suggestion of officers. This considers the historic development of the site and the architectural merit of Raymond House; it details the history of the area and assesses historic maps and the architectural development of the property. The heritage statement concludes that the property lacks

- sufficient architectural merit to be considered a 'non-designated heritage asset'.
- 8.2 However, officers have sought additional advice on the issue of heritage. Accordingly officers do not agree with the applicant's view and believe that despite the change in setting and its surroundings Raymond House is of sufficient architectural merit to be considered a 'non-designated heritage asset' for the following reasons:
- It occupies part of an older site (Langley House), and was built on site of former outbuilding, possibly stabling / coach house, to Langley House. It is not clear whether any of the rear part of Raymond House (now in separate ownership) is of same date as Raymond House or older.
  - The property is of architectural merit as a circa mid 19th century dwelling, clearly of some status locally, it was first known as Hollywood House but renamed Raymond House by 1898.
- 8.3 Given the above conclusion that the application building should rightly be described as a 'non-designated heritage asset', paragraph 135 of the NPPF is engaged. This paragraph states '*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset*'.
- 8.4 The application proposes the demolition of modern garages to the side of Raymond House and the construction of a 2-storey side extension. The demolition of the garages is welcomed and the construction of a 2-storey side extension is supported in principle even though it will change the existing balance of the house. The extension is set down in terms of its eaves and ridge height and the roof pitch and roof form matches the existing. In addition, amendments to the scheme have resulted in the extension being set back further from the existing front elevation by a suitable amount to ensure that it is seen as being subservient.
- 8.5 In order to preserve the heritage significance whilst accommodating the new extension, the use of a good quality matching brick (including matching bond, mortar colour and finish) and natural slate will be vital to ensure that the extension assimilates well with the existing property.
- 9.0 **Impact on Neighbours**
- 9.1 The proposed extension would be 4.7m deep and retain a 6.29m gap to the rear boundary. The objection referred to above stems from a property immediately to the rear at 19 Pantile Row. The objector states that their property has an 8.687m deep garden. Therefore, the separation between the two building faces would be 14.977m according to this neighbour. However, the applicant sets out that based on the Ordnance Survey this gap is 15.440m.
- 9.2 The RESPD Design Principle DP6 states that "*Extensions should not be overbearing on neighbouring properties or result in loss of outlook*". Whilst

DP7 states that “*Extensions not result in significant overshadowing, loss of sunlight or daylight*”. Furthermore, DP8 states that “*Window positions should avoid direct overlooking of neighbouring properties including gardens*”.

- 9.3 Also of relevance, is policy EX18 of the RESPD that states that “*A minimum distance of 15 metres shall be maintained between a primary elevation of an existing house and the flank wall of a proposed two storey side extension*”. The extension is relatively large for a domestic extension and will inevitably have some impact upon the amenity of this neighbour to the rear in terms of the outlook from this property. However, the roof is hipped and will slope away from the boundary. Notwithstanding any uncertainty over the exact separation distance between the rear wall of the neighbours property and the rear wall of the proposed extension, it would lie approximately 15 metres away from the nearest neighbours’ property and on this basis it is considered that the impact on their outlook would amount to insufficient harm to warrant refusal.
- 9.4 The proposed extension has no rear facing first floor windows and accordingly there would be no overlooking issues for the adjacent occupiers. A condition is suggested preventing the insertion of any further windows on the rear elevation.
- 9.5 The proposed extension would lie to the north of the nearest residential properties with a reasonable gap of 15 metres and there would be no sunlighting issues and no significant daylighting issues.
- 9.6 Given the above, the proposal would comply with Policies H12, H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 and the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010.

#### **10.0 Amenity Space**

- 10.1 EX48 of the RESPD requires a minimum garden depth of 15 m (or 100 sq.m.) for a residential property with four or more bedrooms. The property currently has some 106 sq m of private amenity space which is at most 11 metres deep.
- 10.2 The proposed scheme would have 102 sq m of private amenity space which would be at most 11 metres deep. As such, the proposals raise no issues.

#### **11.0 Car Parking**

- 11.1 EX40 of the RESPD requires a minimum of 3 car parking spaces for a residential property with four or more bedrooms. The applicant shows four parking spaces in the courtyard and parking is there sufficient for the enlarged dwelling.

#### **12.0 PART C: RECOMMENDATION**

- 12.1 Having considered the relevant policies set out below, and comments that have been received from consultees and neighbouring occupiers, and all other relevant material considerations it is recommended the application be delegated to the Planning Manager for approval subject to the list of Conditions at the end of the report and subject to there being no additional representations raising objections that have not already been considered.

#### **PART D: LIST OF CONDITIONS**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.

**REASON** To prevent the accumulation of planning permissions, and to enable the Council to review the suitability of the development in the light of altered circumstances and to comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby approved shall be implemented only in accordance with the following plans and drawings hereby approved by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) Drawing No. 6197[P]000 Rev. C, Dated 15-02-2018, Recd On. 18/07/2018
- (b) Drawing No. 6197[P]001, Dated 15-02-2018, Recd On. 16/02/2018
- (c) Drawing No. 6197[P]002 Rev. B, Dated 03-04-2018, Recd On. 20/07/2018
- (d) Drawing No. 6197[P]003, Dated 15-02-2018, Recd On. 16/02/2018
- (e) Drawing No. 6197[P]004, Dated 15-02-2018, Recd On. 16/02/2018
- (f) Drawing No. 6197[P]005 Rev. D, Dated 15-02-2018, Recd On. 18/07/2018
- (f) Drawing No. 6197[P]006 Rev. D, Dated 15-02-2018, Recd On. 18/07/2018
- (g) Drawing No. 6197[P]007, Dated 18-04-2018, Recd On. 20/07/2018

**REASON** To ensure that the site is developed in accordance with the submitted application and to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenity of the area and to comply with the Policies in the Development Plan.

3. All new external work shall be carried out in materials that match as closely as possible the colour, texture and design of the existing building at the date of this permission. In particular, the brickwork shall be constructed using a quality matching brick, a sample of which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall be constructed using a matching bond, mortar colour and finish. The roof shall be finished using natural slates, a sample of which shall have first been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The window detailing in terms of the window recess and arched lintels shall precisely match those of the existing windows on the front elevation of the existing dwelling.

**REASON** To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development so

as not to prejudice the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy EN1 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any Order or Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order), no window(s), other than those hereby approved, shall be formed in the flank elevation or at first floor level at the rear of the development without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

**REASON** To minimise any loss of privacy to occupiers of adjoining residential properties.

#### **INFORMATIVE**

1. It is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development does improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area for the reasons given in this notice and it is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.