
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2017

by A J Mageean BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1st September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/17/3179238
18 The Riddings, Coventry CV5 6AU

- 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 Bassnett against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2017/0771, dated 23 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is to construct a two storey side and single storey rear extension and outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Riddings is a quiet residential road containing bungalows, detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying style and character. These properties are set in reasonably sized plots which provide a mature landscape backdrop and a pleasant semi-rural setting. In this part of the single track road the setback positions of properties varies considerably with many set back some distance into their plots. However some, including the semi-detached appeal property and the bungalow opposite, are located towards the front of their plots creating a greater sense of enclosure.
4. The proposed extension would include a sizable double height side extension, which would appear to double the width of this property. I accept that the hipped roof design, similar fenestration and use of complementary materials would be in keeping with the host dwelling. However, as this property is located close to the road frontage the side extension would appear as a prominent and bulky addition to local views. Furthermore, even with a ridge height below that of the host dwelling, the sideways mass and extent of this addition would not appear subservient to this property and would unbalance the semi-detached pair.
5. The appellant's view is that the unusual orientation of this extension, angled to the north east and away from the road, would reduce its visual prominence. In this respect it would reflect the triangular shape of the plot and the space

standards set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidelines (SPG)¹. I also note that the existing garage is set back and located at an angle. Nevertheless, this significantly sized two storey addition would introduce a discordant feature into the local townscape, contrasting with the otherwise mostly consistent angle of presentation of dwellings to the road frontage.

6. The appellant also considers that the Council has taken an over-prescriptive approach in this case. Nevertheless the areas of concern identified by the Council correspond with the requirements of the Coventry Unitary Development Plan 2001 (UDP) which at saved Policies H4 and BE2 require that extensions to residential properties should respect and enhance the local character and street scene of the area. The SPG which states that extensions should be in keeping with the design and character of the existing house is also relevant. These provisions are supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requirement for high quality design which responds to local character.
7. I recognise that the appellant has sought to design a scheme which meets his family's accommodation requirements, whilst also retaining the parking area in front of the dwelling. In this respect I accept that off road parking is important along this narrow road. I also note that the occupier of No 23, opposite the appeal site, has expressed a preference for the present scheme, as opposed to one located closer to the road frontage. However these factors do not outweigh the design concerns identified.
8. I note that the Council considers the design of the proposed outbuilding to be acceptable and I have no reason to take a different view.
9. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. In these respects it would conflict with the design requirements of UDP saved Policies H4 and BE2, the SPG and the Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and as material considerations do not indicate that I should conclude other than in accordance with the Framework and the development plan taken as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

AJ Mageean

INSPECTOR

¹ Extending Your Home: A Design Guide 2003