

Planning Committee Report	
Planning Ref:	PL/2023/0000155/HHA
Site:	1 Trensale Avenue, Coventry, CV6 1AS
Ward:	Sherbourne
Proposal:	Two storey side and rear extension
Case Officer:	Jessica Mantle

SUMMARY

The application seeks permission for a two-storey side and rear extension to a semi-detached two-storey gable ended dwelling located on a prominent corner plot. The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact in regard to neighbour amenity, ecology, biodiversity and parking however, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable and contrary to the Coventry Local Plan in terms of its design and impact to the character and appearance of the street scene.

BACKGROUND

There are a number of planning applications relating to the application site dating back to 1983. There have been previous applications for householder side and rear extensions, some of which have been refused. Most notably is application reference R/2004/0735 which was for a similar two storey side and rear extension which was refused consent by the Council due to its design impacts and later dismissed at appeal. The previous application reference HH/2022/1684, relating to the site for a two-storey side and rear extension was also refused consent. The site has also been subject to several full planning applications for the erection of a new dwelling, the first of which was refused consent and the ensuing applications were withdrawn.

KEY FACTS

Reason for report to committee:	Cllr Gavin Lloyd requests the application be heard by planning committee on the basis that the proposal is fitting or close to in fitting with current street scene and supports the housing needs policy by providing a family home of good size.
Current use of site:	Residential dwelling
Proposed use of site:	Residential dwelling

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Committee are recommended to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out within this report.

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 together with the aims of the NPPF paragraphs 134 by reason of its poor design and detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the street scene.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a gable ended semi-detached dwelling located on the Northern corner plot, at the junction of Trensale Avenue and Evenlode Crescent. The dwelling has pebble dash render to its external elevations and a paved frontage. A tall boundary fence encloses the rear and side garden with a row of tall trees along the side boundary. The adjoining semi has extended to the rear at 2-storey, adjacent to the shared boundary of the application site. The immediate street scene is comprised of mainly similar 2 storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings, forming regimented building lines along Trensale Avenue and Evenlode Crescent.

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

The application proposal is for a two-storey side and rear extension. The proposed side extension would be located on land forming the side garden between the existing side elevation and the footpath of Evenlode Crescent. The side extension would be two storey with a pitched roof and a pitched dormer window inserted into the roof slope at first floor and a bay window at ground floor fronting Trensale Avenue. The side extension would be set back approximately 3.2m from the main front elevation with a lower ridge line, a gable end to the side and a hipped roof to the rear. The side extension would extend approximately 10.7m towards the rear, adjoining the rear extensions to form a wraparound at ground and first floor. The proposed rear extension would have a hipped roof at first floor and the ground floor which projects slightly further to the rear would have a small mono pitch.

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
S/1983/1168	Kitchen/bedroom extension	Approved 12/01/1983
R/2004/0735 Appeal: APP/U4610/A/05/1171693	Two storey side and rear extension	Refused 05/10/2004. Appeal Dismissed 15/06/2005
R/2004/2624	Two storey rear extension	Approved 22/12/2004
FUL/2019/1574	Erection of a new dwelling	Refused 19/08/2019
FUL/2021/1948	Erection of 1no. dwelling	Withdrawn
HH/2021/3591	Erection of one dwelling (Resubmission of FUL/2021/1948)	Withdrawn
HH/2022/1684	Two storey side and rear extension	Refused 17/10/2022

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 GE3: Biodiversity, Geological, Landscape and Archaeological Conservation

Policy DE1 Ensuring High Quality Design

Policy AC3: Demand Management

Supplementary Planning Guidance/ Documents (SPG/ SPD):

SPD Coventry Connected

SPG Extending your home – a design guide

CONSULTATION

Statutory

None

Non-statutory

No objections subject to conditions/contributions have been received from:

- Ecology

Neighbour consultation

Immediate neighbours and local councillors have been notified.

1 representation has been received from Ward Cllr Gavin Lloyd requesting the application to be heard at planning committee.

Any further comments received will be reported within 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, highway considerations and the impact to ecology and biodiversity.

Principle of development

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

The application site is located in a residential area where it is considered sustainable, acceptable, and common to extend homes. However, it is important to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the design and character of the existing house and of the surrounding area and there will be no harmful impact on residential amenity. Materials, colours, textures and local distinctiveness should all be considered within the context of the local area in order to ensure a high-quality urban environment, in accordance with policies DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance for Extending Your Home, unless relevant planning considerations indicate otherwise, including whether or not a proposal will cause:

- Loss of light;
- Overlooking and loss of privacy;
- Over-development of a site;
- Visual intrusion; and
- Adverse impact on the street scene and character of the area

Impact on visual amenity

Policy DE1 of the Coventry 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.

The site occupies a generous corner plot which aligns with the regimented building lines along both Trensale Avenue and Evenlode Crescent. The openness of the corner plot is considered to make a significant positive contribution to the character of the street scene. The SPG Extending your home states that, *“extensions to 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. Two storey wrap around extensions will not normally be permitted and will normally need to be separated into distinct side and rear extensions.”* The proposal would introduce a large bulky addition which wraps around the side and rear elevation, with conflicting roof designs of both hipped and gable ends, which would appear incongruous and would erode the openness of the corner plot, contrary to the SPG.

The SPG also states that the extensions should, *“not infringe any established relevant building lines in the immediate vicinity”* and should *“maintain a minimum distance of 2m between the edge of the side extension and the boundary (measured at the narrowest point)”*. The proposal would provide the 2m gap to the side boundary at the narrowest point as required by the SPG however, the siting of the proposed extension would significantly breach the regimented building line along Evenlode Crescent and

would therefore be considered unduly prominent and detrimental to the character of the area contrary to the SPG.

The proposals are extensive and would result in an over-large and incongruous addition to this two-bedroom dwelling. The additions provide a ground floor cinema room, double-bedroom, kitchen/utility area together with two further double bedrooms at first floor. It is also noted that the extension includes its own separate staircase.

Semi-detached dwellings are designed as a pair to mirror each other's architectural features and proportions. Whilst a suitably designed and subservient side extension to one side of a semi-detached pair may not necessarily be considered to result in unbalancing, in this case it is noted that the adjoining neighbour at number 3 Trensale Avenue would not have sufficient space to the side to extend in a similar way and therefore this proposal would permanently upset the balance of the pair. Furthermore, the introduction of the dormer window into the first floor and a second bay at ground floor of the front elevation introduces new prominent features which compete with the existing features on the original dwelling and would result in further unbalancing to the semi-detached pair. The cumulative impact of the works would significantly alter the character of the dwelling and would appear incongruous for the above-mentioned reasons. Although there is existing planting along the side boundary which may soften the appearance of the proposed extensions, it is not possible to condition this soft landscaping to remain in perpetuity and therefore this cannot be relied upon to justify the proposal. In any event, the partial screening of the extension is not a reason to allow a very poorly designed extension.

Consideration has been given to the neighbouring side extensions to corner plots in the immediate area, such as 36 and 38 Redesdale Avenue and 59 Batsford Road. In these cases, the sites either have no planning history or permission was granted before the current design SPG was adopted and therefore these are considered to carry limited weight as a material consideration in the assessment of this proposal.

An application for a similar 2 storey side extension was submitted with application R/2004/0735 and was refused on 05/10/2004 for similar concerns. The subsequent appeal APP/U4610/A/05/1171693 was dismissed on 15/06/2005. The inspector notes in paragraph 3 of the appeal decision that 1 Trensale Avenue occupies a comparatively generous corner plot of which the openness makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the prominent junction within the estate. In paragraph 4 the inspector notes the well-established building line along both sides of Evenlode Crescent and notes that the proposal would have a similar set back of 2m from the side boundary, but this would project forward of the line fronting the Crescent and considered that the proposal would intrude into its setting. Similarly, in paragraph 5 the inspector found that none of the side extensions to other corner plots in the vicinity to be directly comparable. The inspector concludes by stating that the development would be highly visible, substantially reducing the openness of the exposed corner and that it would be seen as an unduly prominent and intrusive feature which would have a significant adverse impact on the street scene.

Although the application proposal is of different design to the dismissed proposal for application R/2004/0735, it is similar in terms of its siting on the corner plot and the fact that it significantly breaches the established building line and substantially reduces

the openness of the corner plot. The assessment and consideration of the merits of this proposal are therefore considered to be consistent with previous decisions taken with regard to side extensions on this particular site.

The NPPF paragraph 134 stated that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

The proposal is not considered to be of good design and fails to reflect local design policies. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan, the SPG Extending Your Home and the advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on residential amenity

The proposal would not breach the 45-degree line to neighbouring habitable room windows, in accordance with the SPG. The proposal would not introduce new first-floor side facing windows which would directly overlook the adjoining semi. The side facing windows would overlook the adjacent road and the proposal is therefore not considered to adversely impact neighbour privacy. The proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact to neighbour amenity and is in accordance with this aspect of the SPG Extending Your Home.

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. Parking provision should accord with the maximum standard expressed in Appendix 5 of the Coventry Local Plan unless it has been clearly demonstrated that the site is in a highly accessible location where transport, by means other than the private car is a realistic alternative. In that respect lower levels of provision may be considered acceptable where the site is in close proximity to the City Centre, a train station, a high-quality rapid transport route or other public transport interchange and where there is a package of measures (proportionate to the scale of development) to enable sustainable means of transport. Any variation from the maximum standard must be fully justified by proportionate evidence.

The SPG Extending your home states that, *“Extensions should not reduce the effective garaging/parking provision at the dwelling to less than a standard off-road parking space at least 4.8m long. The highway conditions in the locality should also be recognised.”*

Appendix 5 of the Coventry Local Plan requires a minimum of 2 parking spaces for a 2 or more-bedroom house located in an 'outer city' location. The proposed side and rear extension would not affect any existing parking arrangements, nor would it increase the demand for on street parking. The proposal is therefore not considered

adversely impact the highway network in accordance with Policy AC3 and Appendix 5 of the Coventry Local Plan and the SPG Extending Your Home.

Ecology and biodiversity

Policy GE3 sets out that development proposals will be expected to ensure that they:

- a. lead to a net gain of biodiversity, where appropriate, by means of an approved ecological assessment of existing site features and development impacts;
- b. protect or enhance biodiversity assets and secure their long-term management and maintenance;
- c. avoid negative impacts on existing biodiversity;
- d. preserve species which are legally protected, in decline, are rare within Coventry or which are covered by national, regional or local Biodiversity Action Plans.

The proposed extensions would impact the existing roof of the dwelling and Ecology responded to the consultation and raised no concerns with regard to bats or other protected species but request that a bat scoping self-certification be provided. The submitted Bat Scoping Self-Certification indicates that the roof exterior is in reasonably good condition, and this is observed at the time of the site visit. The proposal is not considered to have a reasonable likelihood of having a significant impact to bats as a protected species.

Ecology note that the proposal would result in the removal of trees adjacent to the proposed side extension, resulting in a loss of biodiversity and recommend that this should be offset, and that clearance of the trees should follow protected species guidance. If the proposal were to be recommended for approval, these matters could be dealt with via a suitably worded condition and informatives. The proposal is considered to comply with policy GE3 of the Coventry Local Plan.

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

Any benefits of the proposal are outweighed by the harm identified to the character of the area and the proposal is recommended for refusal for the following reason:

The proposed two-storey side and rear extension, by reason of its mass, siting, design and substantial infringement on the uniform and established building line, would result in the introduction of an overly large, unduly prominent and incongruous feature into the street scene, unbalancing the architectural symmetry of the semi-detached pair and affecting the open character of this site and the visual amenity of the street scene in the locality. The proposal is not considered to be of good design and fails to reflect local design principles within sections 2 and 3 of the SPG Extending Your Home . The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan, the SPG Extending Your Home and the advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

CONDITIONS / REASONS

1.

The proposed two-storey side and rear extension, by reason of its mass, siting, design and substantial infringement on the uniform and established building line, would result in the introduction of an overly large, unduly prominent and incongruous feature into the street scene, unbalancing the architectural symmetry of the semi-detached pair and affecting the open character of this site and the visual amenity of the street scene in the locality. The proposal is not considered to be of good design and fails to reflect local design principles within sections 2 and 3 of the SPG Extending Your Home. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan, the SPG Extending Your Home and the advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.