

<b>Planning Committee Report</b>	
<b>Planning Ref:</b>	FUL/2017/0991
<b>Site:</b>	1 Aldrin Way, Coventry
<b>Ward:</b>	Wainbody
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mrs Annie Zhang
<b>Proposal:</b>	Single storey rear extension
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Liam D'Onofrio

### **SUMMARY**

The application proposes a single storey rear extension.

### **KEY FACTS**

<b>Reason for report to committee:</b>	Cllr Sawdon has requested that the application be determined by Planning Committee on the grounds that it is overdevelopment and out of character with the area.
<b>Rear extension size:</b>	4 metres deep by 12 metres wide and 2.3 metres high.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Planning committee are recommended to Grant planning permission, subject to conditions

### **REASON FOR DECISION**

- The proposal provides an acceptable design solution that will not be prominent within the streetscene.
- The proposal will not adversely impact upon the amenity of neighbours.
- The proposal will not adversely impact upon highway safety.
- The proposal accords with Policies: BE2 and H4 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001, together with the aims of the NPPF.

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **APPLICATION PROPOSAL**

Planning permission is sought for a single storey, flat roof rear extension, which will project 4 metres into the rear garden and will be 12 metres wide and 2.3m high.

The plans originally showed a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) with six bedrooms, which is permitted development. As the applicant is not seeking permission for a HMO use the reference to bedrooms has been removed from plan, as these rooms could be used for any domestic use. This application relates to the rear extension only.

#### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application site relates to a detached bungalow located on the northern side of the highway. The property occupies a corner plot with the side gable fronting onto Bransford Avenue. Surrounding properties are of a similar age and style providing a mix of two-storey dwellinghouses and bungalows. The property is within a predominantly residential area.

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

FUL/2017/0518 Change of use to HMO with 8 bedrooms (sui generis) and erection of single storey rear and side extension and proposed new roof over garage area: Refused on 13/04/17 for the following reason:

*The proposal is contrary to Policies OS6 and H6 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001 and the aims and objectives of the NPPF 2012 in that the conversion of the single family dwellinghouse to an eight bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would result in an over-development of the plot resulting in a detrimental impact upon the amenities and quiet enjoyment that adjoining neighbours may reasonably be expected to enjoy.*

HH/2017/1022 – concurrent application for rear extension and garage conversion with ridged roof over.

## **POLICY**

### **National Policy Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF published in March 2012 sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It sets out the Government's requirements for the planning system only to the extent that is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so. The NPPF promotes sustainable development and good design is recognised as a key aspect of this.

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 2014, this adds further context to the NPPF and it is intended that the two documents are read together.

### **Local Policy Guidance**

The current local policy is provided within the Coventry Development Plan 2001 (CDP) relevant policy relating to this application is:

Policy H4 – Residential extensions

Policy BE2 - The principles of urban design

### **Emerging Policy Guidance**

The Draft Local Plan 2016 to 2031 has been submitted to the Inspectorate, examination hearings and consultation on modifications has concluded and the Inspectors report is currently awaited. Whilst the policies do not hold significant weight at this time, they will gain weight as the local plan continues through the process. Policies within the draft local plan that are relevant include:

Policy DE1 – Ensuring High Quality Design

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance/ Documents (SPG/ SPD):**

SPG Extending Your Home

## **CONSULTATION**

No Objections received from:

County Ecology.

Highways (CCC).

Environmental Protection (CCC).

Immediate neighbours and local councillors have been notified.

Councillor Sawdon has objected to the scheme on the grounds that it is overdevelopment and out of character with the area.

Four letters of objection have been received; however none of these raise material comments in relation to the proposed extensions.

Non-material planning considerations are raised; however these cannot be given due consideration in the planning process:

- a) The area is becoming a satellite to Warwick University.
- b) There is a shortage of family homes/converted homes cannot realistically return to a single family use.
- c) Room sizes are unfit for purpose/ there are no separate WC facilities for guests.
- d) Providing six bedrooms is overdevelopment of the site.
- e) Concerns of litter, noise and disturbance.
- f) Approval of the scheme will create a domino effect.
- g) There are restrictive covenants.
- h) The scheme is a commercial development for financial gain.
- i) A moratorium is suggested on similar schemes to protect the residential family character of the suburb.
- j) No site notice has been erected.

Any further comments received will be reported within late representations.

### **APPRAISAL**

The main issues in determining this application are design, impact upon neighbouring amenity and highway safety.

#### ***Design***

An extension is proposed across the width of the rear elevation of the property. The scheme proposes a flat roof design, however flat roof elements are characteristic of many of the dwellings within the locality. The rear extension will be unobtrusive within the streetscene and is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed extension is not therefore considered to harm the character of the dwellinghouse or the visual amenity of the streetscene.

It is noted that the proposed extension is the same as previously proposed under FUL/2017/0518, although the width is 3.9 metres less as it does not extend behind the garage. The previous application was not refused on design grounds and by virtue of not being included within the refusal reasons the extensions were therefore deemed acceptable.

#### ***Impact on neighbouring amenity***

The proposed extension will not breach the 45-degree sightline as measured from the adjoining property and does not conflict with separation distances. The extension is not therefore considered to create any significant loss of light, outlook or amenity to the occupiers of surrounding properties.

The previous application was not refused on neighbour amenity grounds in terms of built form and by virtue of not being included within the refusal reasons the extension was therefore deemed acceptable.

### **Highway considerations**

The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the scheme in terms of highway safety.

### **Other considerations**

Officers are mindful of the concerns raised by local residents relating to the use of the property as a HMO. As stated above the proposed floor plan initially showed six bedrooms; however these have been removed from plan, as the intended House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) use does not form part of this Householder planning application. For clarification there is a permitted change between dwellinghouses (C3 Use Class) and HMOs (C4 Use Class), which relate to small, shared dwellinghouses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. Notwithstanding concerns raised by local residents the HMO use does not require planning permission and does not form part of the consideration of this planning application.

As stated above the rear extension proposed is largely the same as that included on the application refused by Members at the April planning committee. The concerns raised at that time and the reason for refusal related to the number of people proposed to be living in the property. The size, location and design of the extension was not cited as reasons for refusal and therefore were deemed to be acceptable.

Ecology has raised no objection to the scheme, subject to a protected species note.

Whilst not a material planning consideration in this instance a concern has been raised that a site notice has not been displayed. The legislation doesn't require a site notice to be displayed on all applications. Where all adjoining neighbours can be and have been notified the statutory requirements have been met.

### **Conclusion**

The application is considered acceptable in design terms and will not affect neighbouring amenity or highway safety. The reason for Coventry City Council granting planning permission is because the development is in accordance with: Policies BE2 and H4 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001, SPG, together with the aims of the NPPF.

### **CONDITIONS:/REASON**

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this permission.

**Reason:** *To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.*

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents: Drg No.03A.

**Reason:** *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

3. No facing materials shall be used other than materials similar in appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building.

**Reason:** *To ensure that the proposed development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy BE2 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001.*

[Existing & proposed plans](#)