
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2017

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/16/3162550

38 Upper Precinct, Coventry CV1 1DE

- 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 Charlotte Mather of JD plc against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref FUL/2016/2086, dated 15 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a new Shopfront glazing/entrance and signage to be installed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new Shopfront glazing/entrance at 38 Upper Precinct, Coventry CV1 1DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref FUL/2016/2086, dated 15 August 2016 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has been described as a new shopfront glazing/entrance and signage. Given that the signage does not require planning permission (and is also the subject of an advertisement consent appeal¹) I have deleted this aspect from the description of development.
3. In addition to the above, at my site visit I saw the development had already been carried out and the premises was open for trading. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the Upper Precinct shopping area which I understand was built between 1948 and 1956. The area comprises of a pedestrianised shopping area with shops at ground floor level with retail and other uses on the upper floors. The Council have indicated that the Precinct has been added to the Historic Environment Record and therefore the site must be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

¹ APP/U4610/Z/16/3162551

6. From the evidence before me, the Councils objection to the development relates to the over-cladding of the Horton Stone pilasters with black diabond. It is claimed that this would significantly alter the appearance of a substantial part of the Precinct.
7. In this respect, it is acknowledged that over time changes have occurred to this area. I understand that prior to the development being carried out there were two columns which had been over-clad, but these may not have benefitted from planning permission. From the pre-development photo submitted with the appeal, one of these covered pilasters was on the former Bank premises. At my site visit I saw another clad pilaster at River Island.
8. To my mind the over-cladding of the pilasters in the appeal development, including the re-covering of the former Bank pilaster, would not have any adverse impact on the character or appearance of the Precinct or the significance of this non-designated heritage asset. This is particularly the case as the covered pilasters are within a larger shop front for one unit as opposed to a boundary between retail units.
9. For the above reasons, the shopfront glazing/entrance would not give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the Precinct or the wider area. Consequently the development would accord with Policies BE2 and CC13 of the City of Coventry Development Plan (2001) which amongst other matters seeks to protect and enhance the townscape character.

Conditions

10. Given that the development has already been carried out, it is not necessary to impose any planning conditions, including one relating to the approved plans.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR