
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/17/3171548

11 Ireton Close, Coventry CV4 9UA

- 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 Richard Jump against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2016/3135, registered by the Council 23 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed garage/store'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. 11 Ireton Close is a two storey dwelling within a terrace of four dwellings, which are of a modern design and similar in appearance. Most notable are the front elevations, which are devoid of any front additions and mainly comprise buff brick, with contrasting timber cladding, in part, at ground floor level. These features give the dwellings a degree of uniformity and rhythm, which creates a distinct streetscene and a pleasant aesthetic. There are other similar blocks within Ireton Close and the wider estate, which establish a well-defined and consistent character.
 4. The proposed extension would be located to the front of No 11, projecting forward by approximately 4m. It would have a width of approximately 3m and a pitched roof to a height of approximately 4m. Given its dimensions the proposed extension would be a substantial addition in a prominent location, which would also result in the removal of the feature cladding. Consequently, the proposal would appear incongruous and disrupt the rhythm of the design of the dwellings in respect of layout and appearance. It would severely compromise the uniform and distinct appearance of the terrace block and wider streetscene.
 5. Whilst I note the appellant is willing to utilise materials in agreement with the Council, I do consider that the use of sympathetic materials would not address the design shortcomings of the proposed extension.
-

6. I conclude, that the proposed extension would have a materially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and would be in direct conflict with Saved Policies H4 and BE2 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001. These policies seek that extensions be of a high quality of design that respects the local character and streetscene. They are consistent in this regard with the National Planning Policy Framework, which, inter alia, seeks to secure high quality design.
7. I note the appellant's reasons for pursuing the proposed development and while it is suggested that there is some support for the proposal locally, I have also noted the concerns of a neighbouring resident. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. The appellant has also referred me to other extensions to dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site. However, I have limited information in respect of these, and the photographs supplied do suggest a different character in this part of the estate. In any event, each proposal is considered on its individual merits. Therefore, the presence of other extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site does not affect my decision.
9. For the reasons set out above, I dismiss this appeal.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR