
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/16/3157259
199 Scots Lane, Coventry, CV6 2DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Smith against the decision of the Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2016/1207, dated 3 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension to provide sleeping and washing accommodation for elderly relative.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end terrace house that occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Scots Lane and Fullers Close. It is located within a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by terraced and semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. No. 199 Scots Lane (No.199) being situated on a corner plot has even more expansive grounds, which add to the open character and appearance of the street scene.
 4. The proposal would entail the construction of a single storey pitched roof extension with a staggered design on a car hardstanding at the side of the property set behind a low boundary wall. The proposal would extend about 6.9m alongside the house and project out from the side elevation by about 3m at the front and about 2.3m at the back of the extension. The front part of the extension would be located about 0.5m from the road boundary with Fullers Close and the rear part of the extension would be located about 0.2m from the road boundary.
 5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Document: Extending your Home - a Design Guide 2003 (SPG) states that extensions on corner plots need to be considered in the context of the openness and character of the plot in relation to the surrounding area and the scale of the extension relative to the existing dwelling. In order to achieve this, the SPG states that extensions on corner plots should seek to maintain a minimum distance of 2m between the
-

edge of a side extension and the boundary (measured at the narrowest point). This is not the case in this instance.

6. The proposed extension, by virtue of its siting and design, would impact on the openness and character of the plot in relation to the surrounding area. Such positioning, on what is a characteristic open gap between No. 199 and the adjacent road, would compromise the sense of space and openness and interrupt the established rhythm of development in the area. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the extension's prominent position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Scots Lane and Fullers Close. As such I consider that the proposed extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition to the street scene.
7. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. The extensions are on different streets to the appeal site with different locational characteristics and the two storey side extensions have different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. On the basis of the limited evidence provided I am not convinced that their circumstances are compellingly similar to those of the present appeal proposal. I therefore accord them limited weight as precedents in this case.
8. I have taken into account the appellant's wishes to use the extension to accommodate their elderly relative so that the family can provide on-hand support. However, such circumstances are not a material consideration to which I can attach significant weight in making this decision and are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies BE2 and H4 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001 and the Council's SPG. These policies and guidelines, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new extensions or other alterations to residential properties demonstrate a high quality design that respects the local character and street scene of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR