



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/17/3174979
63 Mayflower Drive, Coventry CV2 5NL

- 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 Ms Lorraine Corfield against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2017/0496, dated 22 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 63 Mayflower Drive, Coventry CV2 5NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2017/0496, dated 22 February 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing plans/elevations and proposed plans/elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 63) is a modern end-terrace two storey dwelling located on the corner of Mayflower Drive and Allerton Close. Mayflower Drive is a spine road, with a number of short cul-de-sacs accessed off it. Some of the entrances to these cul-de-sacs are flanked by dwellings, which front Mayflower Drive. The gaps between the side elevations of these dwellings and the highway boundary vary in width between 1m and 3m approximately. Although, the majority near the appeal site are approximately 1-2m in width and enclosed by fencing.

4. Due to its corner position the side gable of No 63 faces onto the entrance to Allerton Close. The gap between the existing side gable and boundary with the highway is approximately 3m at the front and narrows to approximately 2.3m at the rear due to the taper of the side boundary. The garden land to the side of the dwelling is enclosed by an existing fence, approximately 2m in height close to the boundary with the highway.
5. On the other side of the entrance to Allerton Close is 61 Mayflower Drive (No 61). The gap between the side elevation of this property and the highway boundary is approximately 1m. The land to the side of this property is also enclosed with a boundary fence and partly covered with a canopy.
6. The Council is of the view that No 63 is in a prominent location within the streetscene and the loss of its side garden area, as a consequence of the proposed extension would have an erosive effect on the openness of the surrounding area.
7. The dwellings nearby are generally arranged in terraces or pairs parallel to the highway. However, the block, which the appeal site forms part of, is set behind a triangular shaped pavement area, facing Mayflower Drive. Although, No 63 is closer to the highway relative to other dwellings in the block and its side gable is visible when travelling west to east along Mayflower Drive, it is not particularly prominent within the streetscene, due to being located amongst other dwellings. However, the triangular shaped pavement area combined, with the front gardens of the block of dwellings, along with an irregular shaped area of incidental open space on the opposite side of the road, gives this particular location a sense of openness, which would be unaffected by the proposed extension.
8. The proposed two storey side extension would follow the design, form and height of the existing dwelling. As such, it would be in keeping with the appearance of No 63.
9. In respect of the loss of the side garden, this is already enclosed. As such, the proposed extension would not have any significant effect on openness. I accept that the overall size and mass of the dwelling would be increased. Notwithstanding this, because of the modest maximum width of the extension at approximately 2.5m, and the presence of some ornamental planting along the frontage of No 63, this change would not be significantly appreciable, particularly when viewed standing in front of the appeal site.
10. As a consequence of the proposed extension, the side gable of No 63 would be closer to Allerton Close. However, the profile of the proposed side gable, with the exception of a small ground floor projection, would not be too dissimilar to the existing profile. In addition, the boundary fence is to be retained. Consequently, when viewed from along Mayflower Drive and Allerton Close the proposed gable would not create any significant change to the streetscene.
11. I have also taken into consideration the Council's 'Extending your home-a design guide' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). In relation to advice for extensions to dwellings on corner plots the SPG sets out three requirements, which are: that the width of the extension is less than half the width of the original dwellinghouse; does not infringe any established relevant building lines in the immediate vicinity; and maintains a minimum distance of 2m between the edge of the side extension and the boundary. The proposed extension

accords with the first two requirements. However, the proposal would not maintain a 2m gap between the side gable and side boundary. I understand this requirement is to retain open areas adjacent to corner plots. I also note that the SPG states that each site is unique and proposals will be determined on their own individual merits having regard to the local distinctive character of the area. In this particular case the area to the side of the dwelling is already enclosed. Furthermore, the majority of properties nearby, which flank cul-de-sacs, have a less than 2m separation between side gables and highway boundaries. Consequently, I do not consider that maintaining a 2m gap safeguards the openness of this particular site or is in keeping with the character of the wider area.

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development is of an acceptable design and proportionate in scale to No 63 and therefore would not result in any harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, I find no conflict with the design aims of Policies H4 and BE 2 of the Coventry Development Plan 2001 or the Council's 'Extending your home-a design guide' SPG.
13. The Council has expressed concern that if allowed this proposal would set a precedent for a similar proposal at No 61, which would further reduce the openness of the area. Irrespective of this possibility I have considered this appeal on the merits of the proposal.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have also specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the extension would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I allow this appeal.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR