

Planning Committee Report	
Planning Ref:	HH/2022/0568
Site:	75 St Ives Road, Coventry, CV2 5FY
Ward:	Wyken
Proposal:	Erection of rear extension, two storey side extension and dormer window (Retrospective)
Case Officer:	Richard Edgington

SUMMARY

The application seeks consent for the erection of a two-storey side extension, together with the erection of a new porch, canopy to the front and installation of two dormer windows to the rear elevation. The application is retrospective, a two-storey side extension has previously been granted and works to the dwelling have taken place. However, the development was not carried out in accordance with the approved plans, this application therefore seeks to regularise the works.

BACKGROUND

The site benefits from being a double plot and historically had a double garage to the side of the dwelling. Planning application HH/2017/2979 granted consent for a first-floor side extension above the garage, together with the conversion of the loft and associated dormer windows. Separately, a large outbuilding was also constructed, this obtained consent under planning application HH/2020/2780.

The development, as previously approved, was considered to accord with the adopted Householder Design Guidance and was deemed acceptable. However, since the extensions have been constructed there are a number of discrepancies as to what obtained consent, and what approval was granted. The site has been subject to enforcement cases. As a result, there have been multiple applications submitted, which can be seen in the 'relevant planning history'. These applications to regularise the works have all been withdrawn following discussions with officers which would have resulted in planning permission being refused under delegated powers.

This application is being considered by planning committee at the request of Councillor Faye Abbott. It is usual practice for Ward Councillors to indicate the material planning reasons why they want an application to come before Planning Committee. It should be noted that Councillor Abbott has not expressed a view either supporting or objecting to the proposals.

KEY FACTS

Reason for report to committee:	The application is being considered by planning committee at the request of Cllr Faye Abbott.
Current use of site:	Residential
Proposed use of site:	Residential

RECOMMENDATION

Planning committee are recommended to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at the end of this report.

REASON FOR DECISION

- The proposal is contrary to Policies DE1 and the adopted Householder Design Guidance, together with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

The application as seeks consent for the erection of a two-storey side extension, together with the installation of two dormer windows, a porch and front canopy and front wall boundary treatment. All of these works are retrospective. Planning permission was granted for a first-floor side extension and loft conversion in 2018. The works carried out do not accord with the approved planning permission and more specifically the application seeks retention of the extensions as constructed: -

1. Rear Dormers (installed in replacement of two of the previously approved rooflights).
2. Side Extension Setback and Ridge (Which has been reduced from the 1m required by the SPD to about 0.35-0.4m (approx. one breeze block length).
3. Front Porch (installed not in accordance with the approved plans and spans wider, higher and with double doors).
4. Front Canopy (installed, although was not approved on the previous plans).
5. Front Wall (which is an addition which did not form part of the previous approval).

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a semi-detached dwelling situated within a residential area. St Ives Road lies to the north east of the city centre and has a mixed character in a linear layout, to the southern end of St Ives Road there are primarily semi-detached, rendered dwellings whilst to the north there is a greater variety of dwellings in terms of architectural style, inclusive of a row of terraces adjacent to the application site.

The site itself occupies a generously proportioned 'double plot'. Formerly the dwelling benefitted from an attached double garage to the side with a pitched roof, all of which finished in a dashed render. Consent was obtained in 2017 for the erection of a side extension for additional living accommodation to be built above the extension, together with a loft conversion and erection of a single storey rear extension. It is noted that the rear garden contains a full width rendered outbuilding.

The works have not been carried out in accordance with the approved planning permission. As existing the extensions have been implemented, and additions have been added from the previous consent, inclusive of a front wall, a new porch and canopy to the front elevation, double front doors and two rear dormer windows. The extensions to the side have not been implemented as previously approved. As such this application seeks consent for the works in their entirety.

In terms of site constraints, it should be noted that within this locality there are no overarching site constraints which are relevant in the determination of this application.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Reference	Proposal description	Decision and date
L/1994/0872	Single storey extension, alterations to garage, new porch, new pitched roof, and new gas flu at rear	Approved 21.07.1994
HH/2017/2979	Proposed First Floor Side Extension and Loft Conversion.	Approved 18.01.2018

HH/2020/1744	Retrospective permission for erection of front porch, rear dormer, and dwarf wall	Withdrawn 29.10.2020
HH/2020/2780	Erection of single storey outbuilding extension (Retrospective)	Approved 29.01.2021
HH/2020/2828	Erection of a first-floor side extension, front porch, boundary wall and loft conversion with 2no. rear dormer windows (retrospective)	Withdrawn 02.02.2021
HH/2021/3232	Erection of two storey side extension and rear dormers (Retrospective)	Withdrawn 26.01.2022

POLICY

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF 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 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) 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 6th December 2017. Relevant policy relating to this application is:

Policy DS3: Sustainable Development Policy
Policy H5: Managing Existing Housing Stock
Policy DE1 Ensuring High Quality Design
Policy AC3: Demand Management

Supplementary Planning Guidance/ Documents (SPG/ SPD):

Householder Design Guidance SPD

CONSULTATION

Urban Design: Objection

Neighbour/Third Party Representations: Immediate neighbours and local councillors have been notified. No comments have been received to date, should any comments/consultation responses be submitted, these will be circulated as part of any late representations.

APPRAISAL

The main issues in determining this application are principle of development, the impact upon the character of the area, the impact upon neighbouring amenity and highway considerations.

Principle of Development

Policy H5 of the adopted Coventry City Council Local Plan (2016) states that, where appropriate, the existing housing stock will be renovated and improved, in association with the enhancement of the surrounding residential environment to meet local needs. This is consistent with Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) which seeks to ensure development proposals exhibit a positive character and are well designed in terms of quality and appearance. The principle of residential extensions to this residential dwelling is therefore considered acceptable subject to other relevant material planning considerations which are discussed within the succeeding sections of this report.

Impact on Visual Amenity/Character of the Area

Section 12 of the NPPF, specifically paragraph 126 states in part that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 are consistent in this respect, which seeks to ensure that development complement or enhances the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials, and architectural features.

In this instance it should be noted that the application site has previously obtained planning permission for a first-floor side extension, above the double garage, this was consented along with the loft conversion, together with the installation of rooflights.

The extensions and alterations have been built out, albeit not in accordance with the approved plans. The extension has been built larger, reducing the setback from the front elevation, and raising the ridge of the extension. In addition to the extension not being constructed in accordance with the approved plans, two rendered finish dormer windows have been added to the rear roof slope, a canopy extension to the front elevation has been added (where the first-floor extension protrudes beyond what was previously approved) and a large entrance porch with double doors has been added in place of the original porch. The application also denotes a wall which is anticipated to be proposed to have a rendered finish.

Taking the elevations in turn, when considering the rear elevation, there are noted to be significant extensions in the form of the single storey rear, and two storey side extension. The applicants have however included two dormers to the roof, one in the original area and one within the side extension element. These dormers each have one small obscurely glazed window and are constructed of differing sizes. When viewed on site, these dormer windows appear visually obtrusive and incongruous with little uniformity of design merit. The proposals represent an irregular and contrived finish which appears to be the result of the prioritisation of the internal areas within the roof space. These dormer windows are not finished in matching roof materials and one is not within the original roof space and would not therefore even constitute permitted development. Urban Design have been consulted and in their consultation response state that; 'The execution of design in this regard is however poor, with an overly solid form and proposed use of the same facing material to that of the main body of the house, visually separating this roof element into being understood more similarly to an additional building storey'. It is recommended that the application be refused in part due to the visual impact of these dormer windows.

When considering the front elevation, the porch is now a significantly prominent and incongruous feature which bears little resemblance to the character and design of the streetscene. This again falls outside of permitted development rights by virtue of the height and width which protrudes to the side of the original main elevation of the dwelling. In conjunction with the porch feature is a canopy of the overhang, which is a result of a larger first floor extension. Cumulatively these features appear bulky, out of keeping and again of a contrived nature which marks a notable departure from the previously approved plans.

Furthermore, the front elevation is also altered by the re-alignment of the side extension windows, absence of a setback and increase in the ridge height of the previously approved scheme. All of these changes result in a starkly different scheme having been implemented. When considering the proposed scheme as submitted, the development fails to accord with the adopted Residential Design Guide.

The application has been subject to investigation by our Planning Enforcement Team. Officers have been seeking modifications to the unauthorised development to address our concerns since 2020. To date there has been little evidence to suggest that the applicant is prepared to make the modifications and also appears reluctant to accept a refusal under delegated authority and test the matter at appeal.

It is therefore recommended that the application be refused as the extensions are of poor design and contrary to the principles set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidance Extending Your Home a Design Guide.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy H5 requires new development to be designed and positioned so it does not adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, this is consistent with Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021). In this instance the proposed development does not seek to add additional bulk and massing to an extent which would significantly alter the light or visual impact upon neighbouring occupiers. Whilst it is noted that there are side elevational windows within the extension these windows are secondary and obscurely glazed as opposed to being sole sources of light. The application therefore accords with the aforementioned policies and is therefore acceptable in this regard.

Highway Considerations

The application seeks consent for extensions which result in an additional three bedrooms being provided within the building. Whilst this is a notable increase in the accommodation overall, the site does make provision for two parking spaces within the driveway, in addition to a garage. In any case there is not an increase in the parking requirement for the site as a result of the proposed extension, the application is therefore not contrary to Policy AC3 of the Coventry Local Plan (2016).

A concern with the highway arrangement is however the height of the front wall, which is in excess of 1m, with higher pillars either side of the driveway. As submitted and built it is considered that this arrangement is considered unacceptable due to the detrimental impact upon highway safety. However, had the application been considered acceptable in all other respects then a condition could have been appended to the decision to ensure that a suitable visibility splay be provided to overcome this issue.

Equality Implications

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states: -

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers have taken this into account and given due regard to this statutory duty, and the matters specified in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in the determination of this application.

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

Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the development as proposed, by virtue of the additional scale, bulk, and massing together with the incongruous design fails to accord with the relevant policies of the Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance, and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused for the reasons indicated.

CONDITIONS:/REASON

1. By virtue of the scale, massing and visual appearance of the dormer windows, it is considered that the additions represent incongruous and unsympathetic features to the roofscape which is detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DE1 of the adopted Coventry Local Plan 2016 and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
2. Due to the incongruous and overtly large and modern front porch, the proposal significantly alters the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. Consequently, the development appears out of keeping within the street scene and therefore fails to accord with Policy DE1 of the adopted Coventry Local Plan (2016) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
3. By virtue of the insufficient setback of the side extension, the development is considered to have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and street scene, with a dominant extension which upsets the balance of the pair of semi detached dwellings, contrary to the adopted Householder Design Guide SPG, Policy DE1 of the adopted Coventry Local Plan (2016) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

