

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2nd February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/16/3162758

5 Armorial Road, Coventry CV3 8GH

- 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 Mrs Mark Cullinane against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2016/2173, dated 30 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2016
 - The development proposed is the remodelling of an existing dwelling to include a 2 storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the remodelling of an existing dwelling to include a 2 storey side and rear extension at 5 Armorial Road, Coventry CV3 8GH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2016/2173, dated 30 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 11/02/16-01 Rev A; 11/02/16-02 Rev G and 11/02/16-03 Rev A.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Although the applicant was Mr Cullinane the appeal was submitted in the name of Mrs Mark Cullinane. This appears to be a typographical error.

Main issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling situated on a corner plot at the junction of Leamington Road and Armorial Road. The area surrounding the
-

property is predominantly residential comprising mainly detached dwellings. By reason of the grass verge, low level means of enclosure and the siting of the dwellings further into their plots, there is a more open and spacious character and appearance associated with the streetscene along Leamington Road when compared to Armorial Road. This spaciousness is accentuated by open areas around the junction of Leamington Road with both Daventry Road and Armorial Road

5. The proposed development includes alterations which would result in a detached dwelling with a larger footprint and higher roof ridge level when compared to the existing property. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Extending Your Home – a Design Guide* (SPG) includes general guidance concerning alterations to dwellings situated on corner plots. However, the SPG recognises that each site is unique and proposals should be determined on their own individual merits having regard to, amongst other matters, the openness and character of the plot in relation to the surrounding area and the siting criteria for side extensions.
6. In this case, the appeal scheme includes a side extension which would be less than half the width of the host property. Further, a 2-metre minimum distance would be maintained between Armorial Road and the proposed side extension. The side elevation would be sited closer to the footway than the dwellings fronting the south site of Armorial Road. However, and as noted by the Council, the separation distance associated with the retained rear garden between the enlarged property and 7 Armorial Road would maintain a spacious character for the streetscene along this road. In making this assessment the existing brick wall adjacent to the footway has been considered. Accordingly, the proposed development would not conflict with the SPG's siting criteria for side extensions on corner plots.
7. On its own, the rear extension would be noticeable from Armorial Road above the boundary wall. However, this element of the appeal scheme would not project materially further into the garden than the rear elevations of the adjacent properties fronting Leamington Road.
8. As claimed by the appellant, the proposed increase in the height of the property would not result in a roof that would be any taller than those of the other dwellings fronting Leamington Road. The proposed increase in the bulk and width of the property would not result in a scale of development that would either be unacceptably out of character within the neighbouring dwellings or result in the loss of the open and spacious appearance of the streetscene along Leamington Road. The rhythm of the detached residential properties of varying sizes and designs fronting Leamington Road would be maintained. The resulting property would still retain the characteristics of being sited away from the footway to the rear of an open front garden enclosed by a low level means of enclosure.
9. Although the appeal scheme includes an extension wrapping around the side and rear of the property, the enlarged dwelling would still fit comfortably within its plot rather than result in a cramped form of development. The appeal scheme would not conflict with the SPG concerning the potential for wrap-around extensions resulting in an incongruous or unsympathetic design that adversely affects the openness of a corner plot or the area around the junction.

By reason of massing, siting and design, the appeal scheme would not result in an overly dominant or discordant feature within either streetscene. The assimilation of the development into the streetscene along both roads would be assisted by the use of matching external materials which could be the subject of a condition.

10. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such, it would not conflict with Policies H4 and BE2 of the City of Coventry Unitary Development Plan and the guidance contained in the SPG. Amongst other matters these policies promote high quality urban design and require extensions or other alterations to residential properties to respect the local character and streetscene of an area. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions in the event that this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt a condition is necessary for the development to be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings. A condition is also necessary for matching external materials to be used for the reasons already provided. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR