

Planning Committee Report	
Planning Ref:	HH/2017/0707
Site:	88 and 90 Owenford Road
Ward:	Radford
Applicant:	Mrs Nagra
Proposal:	Two storey rear extensions at Nos.88 and 90 and two storey side extension at No.90
Case Officer:	Nigel Smith

SUMMARY

The application proposes to erect two storey rear extensions to Nos.88 and 90 Owenford Road and also a two storey side extension at No.90.

KEY FACTS

Reason for report to committee:	Called in by Cllr Mal Mutton as she considers the proposal to fit in with the character of the area – deferred by Planning Committee on 13 July to allow negotiations on matters of design and ecology and bring back to 31 August committee
Current use of site:	Dwellings

RECOMMENDATION

Planning committee are recommended to refuse planning permission due to harm which would be caused to the character of the area

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal fails to accord with the SPG drawn up in accordance with Policy BE2 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001 due to the proximity of the proposed side/rear extension at No.90 to Capmartin Road.

BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

Members will recall that this application was considered by Planning Committee on 13th July. At that meeting it was resolved that determination of the application should be deferred in order to allow time for negotiations on matters of design and ecology to achieve a scheme that meets the development plan policies. Delegated authority was granted in the event that an acceptable scheme was designed. However, if in the event that an acceptable scheme is not designed the resolution was to bring the application to 31st August Committee for determination.

Since the meeting on 13th July, a bat survey has been submitted and it has been confirmed that there would be no harm to ecology arising from the development therefore the previous reason for refusal has been resolved and is no longer required.

Various other changes have been made to the design of the proposed extensions. These are considered in turn below:

(i) The previously proposed dormer window at 88 and mansard style roof at 90 have been completely changed to provide three identically sized hipped roofs with small areas of flat roof in between. With regard to roof extensions and alterations the SPG states “each site is unique and proposals will be determined on their own individual merits having regard to the local distinctive character of the area and the principles below. Proposals must be sympathetic and complimentary to their surroundings.’

Whilst flat roofs are not normally permitted on two storey extensions, in this case the flat sections would be relatively small and would be positioned in between conventional pitched roofs and would not be obtrusive or dominant in the streetscene. Officers are satisfied that the proposed rear roof design would result in an acceptable design solution and as such overcomes previous concerns in this regard.

(ii) The roof over the proposed two storey side extension has been amended from a gable design to a hipped design in order to match the existing roof and that on the other end of the terrace. The SPG states “ Many areas are characterised by hipped roofs and the alterations of these to a gable can have a significant harmful effect on the streetscene as a whole. Where the character of an area consists of predominantly hipped roof designs, the conversion of an existing hipped roof into a gable end will not be permitted.” On the basis of the change this element is also considered to be acceptable as it overcomes previous concerns.

(iii) The proposed side extension has also been set back 400mm from the front elevation of the existing property and has a lower roof line and no bay windows, thus making it subservient to the existing terrace. The SPG states that in order to retain a good design, bonding and subservience of an extension, set backs at ground and 1st floor may be required. This overcomes previous concerns that the extension would visually unbalance the terrace, which has a very strong and consistent rhythm of development with a regular pattern of doors and bay windows.

No changes have been made in respect of the inset of the proposed side extension at least 2m from the pavement on Capmartin Road. The SPG states that extensions on

corner plots “should not infringe any established building lines and shall maintain a minimum of 2m between the edge of the side extension and the edge of the plot (as measured at the narrowest point).” The proposed extension would come to within 1m of the edge of the plot and as such it does not accord with the SPG. In addition, the SPG states “extensions of corner properties that wrap around two elevations of a property i.e. the side and the front, or the side and the back, can result in an incongruous design that affects the openness of a plot.” In this instance, it is considered imperative that any side extension be sited at least 2m away from the edge of the plot as all four houses at this road junction are positioned a considerable distance away from the edge of their plots (at least 5m) and the junction has a feeling of openness, which was clearly the intention of the original architects for the estate. If the extension were allowed to extend up to 1m from the pavement, due to the scale of the extension it would appear incongruous in the streetscene and would be detrimental to the character of the this area.

A proposal for a single storey extension at the application site (90 Owenford Road) in 2002 was amended from being 1m from the edge of the plot to at least 2m following advice from Officers. Furthermore, an application for a side extension at 68 Owenford Road (R/2008/1822) was refused in 2008 as it would erode the openness of the corner of Owenford Road and Outermarch Road, which is the next junction along Owenford Road in a westerly direction. An application for a side extension coming to within 1.6m of the pavement at 67 Owenford Road was granted in 1999. However, this was prior to the existing development plan and adoption of the SPG.

Therefore, whilst some issues have been resolved the proposal still fails to comply with the SPG and it is considered that the proposal will result in significant harm to the character of both the host dwellings and the area due to their scale, mass and design, contrary to Policies BE2 and H4.

The previous report is appended below for your information:

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

The proposal comprises part two storey and part single storey extensions at the rear of 88 and 90 Owenford Road. The ground floor extension would be 6m deep across both houses with the 1st floor extension measuring 2m deep at No.88 and extending to 4m deep at No.90. There would also be a flat roof dormer at No.88 with a shallow mono pitch roof covering the 1st floor extension and tying into the proposed dormer. No.90 would have a mansard style roof to the rear which would be flat on top with sloping sides and a rear gable. No.90 would also have a two storey side extension extending to within 1m of the pavement adjacent to Capmartin Road. This extension would be flush with the front of the existing house and would include a two storey bay and a side gabled roof. The side extension would also extend to the rear to wrap around the existing property.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site comprises two terraced dwellings at the end of a row to the south of Owenford Road at its junction with Capmartin Road. The terrace is typical of such interwar development, with prominent two storey height bay windows set in a regular rhythm on the front elevations. The terrace has hipped roofs at either end. No.90 has a partial single and part two storey rear extension adjacent to No.88, as well as a single storey conservatory. No.86 (which adjoins No.88) has a brick faced single storey rear extension of approximately 3m depth.

PLANNING HISTORY

There have been a number of historic planning applications on this site; the following are the most recent/relevant:

Application Number	Description of Development	Decision and Date
R/2002/0337	Single storey side extension to No.90. An original proposal to build to within 1m of the side boundary was reduced following a request from the Case Officer	Granted 24.7.2002
L/1999/1122	Two storey rear extension to No.90	Granted 8.11.1999

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:

OS4 – Creating a more sustainable city
BE2 – Principles of urban design
H4 – Residential extensions

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:

H5 – Managing existing housing stock

Supplementary Planning Guidance/ Documents (SPG/ SPD):

SPG 'Extending Your Home'

CONSULTATION

No Objections subject to conditions received from Drainage (CCC)

Ecology have recommended that a pre-determinative bat survey is undertaken as there appears to be potential access points in the roof and there are bat records nearby.

Immediate neighbours and local councillors have been notified.

No representations from neighbours were received. Cllr Mal Mutton has written in support of the application and states that she does not agree that the extension would harm the character of the area and that it is good to encourage large families to stay in older established residential areas.

Any further comments received will be reported within late representations.

APPRAISAL

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

Design

The SPG states that extensions on corner plots should not infringe any established building lines and shall maintain a minimum of 2m between the edge of the side extension and the edge of the plot (as measured at the narrowest point). It goes on to state that two storey wrap around extensions will not normally be permitted. The section relating to roof extensions explains that a dormer window will only be acceptable on a roof slope that is not prominent when viewed from a street, public footpath or open space. The rear extension section provides that single storey extensions shall not extend more than 3.3m beyond the nearest habitable room window of a neighbouring house, or infringe a 45 degree sightline from the centre of the affected window, whichever gives the greater depth. With regard to two storey extensions it stipulates that these must not breach the 45 degree sightline from the centre of the nearest affected window.

In this case the proposed two storey side extension would come to within 1m of the pavement adjacent to Capmartin Road as well as breaching the building line along this Road. No.92 Owenford Road (on the other side of the junction with Capmartin Road) does not have a side extension and respects the building line of Capmartin Road. This gives the junction an open feel above the 1.8m high boundary walls which protect privacy within rear gardens of these corner plots. As such, the proposal would contravene the guidance within the SPG and would result in harm to the openness of the junction and therefore the character of the area.

Furthermore, the proposed side extension would introduce a gable roof on to this end of the terrace, whereas both ends currently have hipped roofs. The terrace has a symmetrical appearance both in terms of roofline and the regular interruption of full height bay windows and paired entrance doors between. The proposal would disrupt this rhythm by introducing another full height bay stack. It is considered that the side extension would appear incongruous in the streetscene for these reasons and would cause further harm to the character of the area as a result.

Whilst it may be acceptable to add a two storey side extension to No.90, it is considered that any extension would need to be set back from the front elevation by at least 1m and be set in from the boundary with Capmartin Road by at least 2m and have a hipped roof.

Turning to the proposed rear extensions, the design and scale of the 2nd floors and roofs is of serious concern. The provision of a flat roofed dormer window and shallow sloped roof at No.88 would ordinarily be seriously incongruous and contrary to the character of the host house and wider area, given its prominent location in the Capmartin Road streetscene and lack of similar examples. However, this is dwarfed by the sheer enormity and scale of the proposed roof extension at No.90. The use of a mansard style roof on No.90 would be starkly different to any roofs in the area. The design and size of the roof would completely dominate the existing house and would be completely uncharacteristic. Suffice to say that the extensions would result in significant harm to both the character of the existing properties as well as the wider area, contrary to Policies BE2 and H4 as well as guidance within the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Although the extensions would be large, they would comply with the SPG in relation to the impact upon neighbouring properties. The only direct neighbour is No.86 and the proposed 1st floor extension at No.88 would not infringe a 45 degree line from the nearest bedroom window. Furthermore, the proposed 6m deep ground floor extension at No.88 would not extend more than 3.3m further than the existing single storey extension at No.86. No windows would directly face this property. Therefore the impact upon the outlook, light and privacy would not be significant.

Other considerations

Due to the presence of potential access points for bats in the roof space and the fact that there are nearby records, ecology recommend a pre-determinative bat survey. If one is not submitted before the committee meeting an additional reason for refusal shall be recommended.

Conclusion

The proposed extension shall result in significant harm to the character of both the host dwellings and the area due to their scale, mass and design, contrary to Policies BE2 and H4.

REASON FOR REFUSAL

The proposed two storey side/rear extension to 90 Owenford Road would be contrary to Policy H4 and the 'Extending Your Home' Supplementary Planning Guidelines drawn up in accordance with Policy BE2 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001, as well as guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, as it would result in harm to the character of the area due to its proximity to Capmartin Road.

[Proposed Block Plan & Location Plan](#)

[Existing & Proposed Ground Floor Plans](#)

[Existing & Proposed 1st Floor Plans](#)

[Existing & Proposed Attic Floor Plans](#)

[Existing & Proposed Front Elevations](#)

[Existing & Proposed Rear Elevations](#)

[Existing & Proposed Side Elevations Facing No 92](#)

[Existing & Proposed Side Elevations Facing No 88](#)