

<b>Planning Committee Report</b>	
<b>Planning Ref:</b>	HH/2018/2618
<b>Site:</b>	8 Innis Road
<b>Ward:</b>	Earlsdon
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of rear extension with raised ridge line to existing dwelling.
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Andrew Watson

## SUMMARY

The property is a detached bungalow on a large plot of land, near to the end of the cul-de-sac, within the Canley Gardens Control Plan area. This is a householder application which seeks planning permission for a two storey rear extension. It would increase the size of the kitchen/dining area on the ground floor, and increase the sizes of the three bedrooms in the roofspace. The application has been recommended for approval. The application has more than five representations and all object to the submitted proposals.

Since submission the plans have been amended to reduce the height of the extension so that the rear projection is subservient to the front of the property.

## BACKGROUND

This is a resubmission of a scheme which was refused planning permission earlier this year (HH/2018/0990). The reason for refusal stated “The proposed rear extension would be contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016, the Supplementary Planning Guidance - Extending Your Home and the wider design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework by reason of its bulk, scale, mass and design which would result in the introduction of a disproportionately large extension onto what is a modest sized dwelling, which will introduce an incongruous and unsympathetic feature into the street scene, that disrupts the rhythm of development and detracts from the character of the original dwelling and the surrounding area, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene.”

## KEY FACTS

<b>Reason for report to committee:</b>	More than 5 representations have been received against the proposal
<b>Current use of site:</b>	Residential
<b>Proposed use of site:</b>	Residential

## RECOMMENDATION

Planning committee are recommended to grant planning permission subject to conditions

## REASON FOR DECISION

- The proposal is acceptable in principle.
- The proposal will not adversely impact upon highway safety.
- The proposal will not adversely impact upon the amenity of neighbours.
- The proposal accords with Policies: H5 and DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016, together with the aims of the NPPF.

## BACKGROUND

### **APPLICATION PROPOSAL**

Planning permission is sought to raise the ridge of this dormer property by approximately 1.2 metres and to erect a two-storey rear extension. It is proposed to retain the two pitched roofed dormers to the front of the property. The rear extension is proposed to increase the size of the kitchen/dining area on the ground floor, and increase the sizes of the three bedrooms in the roofspace. The existing rear box dormer windows would be replaced by a pitched roof and extend towards the rear garden by approximately 9m from the original rear wall of the dwelling.

The proposed side elevation (eastern) facing No. 6 Innis Road would have one new window at first floor serving a bedroom. The proposed (western) elevation facing towards No. 10 Innis Road would have one additional window at first floor, serving a bedroom. Roof lights are proposed on both sides facing Nos 6 and 10 Innis Road. There are eight folding glass doors proposed on the rear elevation serving the kitchen/dining area and an enclosed balcony with a glass balustrade within the roof at first floor.

Amended plans have been sought to indicate a lower roof on the rearward projection. The ridge line is now 500mm lower than that proposed to the front. This reduction is to ensure that the rear projection appears subservient to the front and reduces the bulk.

### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The property is single storey and located in a large plot, approximately 95 metres long and 13 metres wide. The property is set back from the road frontage with off street parking on the front for up to three cars. The rear garden is screened by thick hedges on the side boundaries, and mature trees to the rear. There are tennis courts and a clubhouse beyond the rear curtilage of the application site. The dwelling is flanked by single storey dwellings to the east and west.

The Canley Gardens Control Plan describes the area as “characterised by a low-density development with houses and bungalows on fairly large plots of different shapes. Roads are narrow without footways or turning areas and there is substandard visibility at junctions. The area is well planted with trees, shrubs and hedges”. The area is not a Conservation Area.

### **PLANNING HISTORY**

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

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Description of Development</b>	<b>Decision and Date</b>
HH/2018/0990	Erection of a rear extension	Refused on 17/07/2018 on grounds of being contrary to policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 and the SPG by reason of its bulk, scale, mass and design.

L/1988/1423	Loft conversion	Approved on 9/11/1988
S/1985/0455	Kitchen extension	Approved on 26/06/1985

## **POLICY**

### **National Policy Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The new NPPF published on 24 July 2018 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 new NPPF increases the focus on achieving high quality design and states that it is "fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve".

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 2018, 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 Local Plan 2016, which was adopted by Coventry City Council on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2017. Relevant policy relating to this application is:

Policy H5: Managing Existing Housing Stock  
Policy DE1: Ensuring High Quality Design

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

SPG Canley Gardens Control Plan  
SPG Extending Your Home

## **CONSULTATION**

Immediate neighbours and local councillors have been notified.

11 letters of objection, including 2 from Councillors have been received, raising the following material planning considerations:

- a) Size and design out of keeping with the character of the area;
- b) Appears to be larger than the previous scheme that was refused;
- c) Loss of light to neighbours;
- d) Loss of privacy due to rear balcony;
- e) Construction impact on the single track road;
- f) Additional strain on foul and surface water drainage systems;
- g) Lead to the increase in flooding;
- h) Obscure view of Tree Preservation Order oak tree at No. 6;
- i) Overdevelopment of the site;
- j) Would set a precedent;
- k) Does not integrate well with the host dwelling;
- l) Damage to local wildlife;
- m) The new application has been made to look worse.

Within the letters received the following non-material planning considerations were raised, these cannot be given due consideration in the planning process:

- n) Retirement bungalows are disappearing.

Any further comments received will be reported within late representations.

## **APPRAISAL**

Taking the above into account, the main issues in determining this application are:

- The impact upon the character of the area.
- The impact upon neighbouring amenity.
- Highway considerations.

### **Impact on character of the area**

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 127 states that “Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

The NPPF further states (at paragraph 130) “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used).”

Policy DE1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure high quality design and development proposals must respect and enhance their surroundings and positively contribute towards the local identity and character of an area.

Policy H5 of the Local Plan states that existing housing stock will be renovated and improved, in association with the enhancement of the surrounding residential environment and to meet local housing needs.

This is a resubmission of a scheme which was refused planning permission earlier this year. The reason for refusal stated “The proposed rear extension would be contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016, the Supplementary Planning Guidance - Extending Your Home and the wider design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework by reason of its bulk, scale, mass and design which would result in the introduction of a disproportionately large extension onto what is a modest sized dwelling, which will introduce an incongruous and unsympathetic feature into the street scene, that disrupts the rhythm of development and detracts from the character of the original dwelling and the surrounding area, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene.”

In order to overcome the previous reason for refusal the applicant has sought to re-design the extension by introducing a 1.2 metre increase in the ridge line of the existing dwelling which allows the rear projection to sit behind rather than appearing higher than the existing dwelling. The rear extension includes a hip to reduce the bulk and has been reduced in height by 500mm since the original submission. Whilst there is an increase in the ridge and a rearward projection, given the staggered siting of the properties and the depth of No. 6 it is considered that the extension would no longer appear as a dominant and unsympathetic feature.

It is acknowledged that the altered and extended dwelling will be larger than the adjacent properties, however the street scene consists of various styles of property all of an individual character. The staggered siting of the dwellings assists with the assimilation of the increased roof into the street scene and the depth of the rear extension. Materials are proposed to be controlled by condition to ensure a high quality finish is achieved.

The submitted proposal is considered to overcome the previous reason for refusal, it does not result in an overdevelopment of the site and meets the requirements of policies DC1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016, together with the aims of the NPPF.

### **Impact on residential amenity**

The SPG *Extending Your Home* states that windows will not be permitted on side elevations of extensions at the rear where overlooking into a neighbouring property would result. There is one window in each side of the upper floor elevations and each is to provide light to a bedroom. The window facing No. 6 would overlook a blank wall and the flat roof of a single storey rear extension. The window in the side elevation facing No. 10 will overlook the front garden to No.10 and not directly overlook any other window. The first floor windows do not directly face any other windows. On the ground floor, the side elevation facing towards No. 10 is screened by a thick hedge (approximately 2 metres tall), and on the side elevation facing towards no. 6 there are high level windows above eye level.

The SPG also states that generally a two storey rear extension which infringes a 45-degree sightline from the middle of the window to a habitable room on the neighbour's property will be refused. For the rear facing windows at Nos. 6 and 10, the proposal meets this requirement.

The SPG also states that that to reduce a tunnelling effect on the views from a neighbouring property it may be necessary to set rear extensions off the boundary by at

least 1m. The proposal meets this requirement on both sides of the property. The one ground floor habitable room window at No. 6, which looks towards the application property, is a study window approximately half way along its side elevation. It currently faces a window on the property. Whilst there is no policy as regards any loss of light to side facing windows, a 25 degree vertical sightline can be used. The proposal would not infringe such a measure.

As regards the proposed rear enclosed balcony with glass balustrade, the balcony is enclosed with side walls, it is in effect a Juliette balcony, and affords no more overlooking of neighbouring gardens than the existing bedroom windows.

The proposal accords with the SPG and would not have any significant impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

### **Highway considerations**

Policy AC3 of the Local Plan acknowledges that the provision of car parking can influence occurrences of inappropriate on-street parking which can block access routes for emergency, refuse and delivery vehicles, block footways preventing access for pedestrians, reduce visibility at junctions and impact negatively on the street scene. Proposals for the provision of car parking associated with new development will be assessed on the basis of parking standards set out in Appendix 5. The car parking standards also include requirements for the provision of electric car charging and cycle parking infrastructure.

Concern has been expressed by objectors as to the potential disruption during construction. Innis Road is substandard, a single-lane carriageway without footpaths or turning areas, similar to Bates Road, Nightingale Lane and The Riddings. The proposed extension does not result in an increase in the number of bedrooms that are available at this dwelling, which currently stands at three. Two off-street car parking spaces are available. No garage is available at the property. As a result of the proposed changes the off-street car parking area and turning space will remain available within the site.

Sufficient parking space is being maintained within the curtilage to the front of the dwelling. No objections have been raised by highways. The plot is considered to be large enough for parking and operations to take place on-site without resulting in an impact on highway safety.

The proposal would not result in any significant impact with regard to highway safety concerns.

### **Other Considerations**

Concern has been raised regarding the additional strain on the drainage and flooding from the development. The site is situated within Flood Zone 1, which is the area of lowest risk from flooding. On this basis no additional information to cover this aspect is required as part of the submission. No objections have been raised by the drainage team.

The tree protected by the Tree Preservation Order at no. 6 Innis Road is not affected by the proposed and this tree is to remain. Overall the development would not fully obscure views of the protected from the street scene or surrounding area.

## **Equality implications**

There are no known equality implications arising directly from this development.

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposal is considered to meet the guidance set out in the SPG. The development is not considered to cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties, would not be overbearing and dominant within the street scene. The development is in accordance with Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Development Plan 2016, SPG, together with the aims of the NPPF.

## **CONDITIONS AND REASONS**

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 13/11/17-02 Rev E.

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

3. Unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand the external walling materials to be used on the extension shall match those used on the existing dwelling in terms of their appearance and the roof shall be covered with grey slate, as specified on the drawings and within the application form.

**Reason:** *To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance of the development in the interests of the amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016.*