
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/19/3229221

5 Rosegreen Close, Coventry CV3 5QA

- 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 Shah Alom against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2019/0373, dated 13 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on (i) the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Rosegreen Close, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The dwelling comprises one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings located in a suburban area. It forms part of a wider development located on the corner of Black Prince Avenue and William Bristow Road. The design of the pair is somewhat unorthodox on account of the mono-pitch roof and tall vertically aligned windows. Immediately to the north is an avenue of more conventional semi-detached properties with pitched roofs and directly to the south is what appears to be a communal residential block with an eclectic and unusual array of projecting elements resulting in a complex building line and roof arrangement. In style and appearance the semi-detached pair including the appeal site is more aligned to the block immediately to the south than the conventional housing to the north.
4. The proposed first floor extension would project forward of the main two storey front elevation of the dwelling. However, due to the fact that the dwelling is set back behind the adjacent dwellings on Rosegreen Close and at a lower ground level, I do not consider that the proposal would form an incongruous or over dominant feature purely on account of its scale.
5. Whilst the development would alter the symmetry and balance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, due to their positioning they are primarily read in the

context of the adjacent communal block on the corner of Black Prince Avenue and William Bristow Road. As described above, this adjacent development has a number of projecting features which are similar to the development proposed. Therefore, whilst the development would remove some of the symmetry from the pair of semi-detached dwellings, the forward projection would not look out of place in the context of the surrounding development.

6. The Council has raised concern with respect to the design of the chamfered element of the proposal which has been designed to reduce the impact of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3. Whilst this element is set back from the main front elevation of the proposed development, it would have a design and roof structure that would not be characteristic of the dwelling or the surrounding area. The resulting design would appear contrived and the splayed walls and roofline would form an awkward and incongruous feature that would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.
7. In conclusion, I do not consider that the positioning or scale of the proposed development would cause harm to character and appearance, for the reasons I have outlined. However, I do consider that the chamfered element of the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area and would therefore conflict with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 (LP), which seeks to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Living conditions

8. As noted above, the development has been designed to minimise the impact that would arise upon the occupiers of No 3, through the inclusion of the chamfered element at first floor level. This element would significantly reduce the bulk of the development at its point closest to the nearest window in the front elevation of No 3 and I consider that this would provide adequate relief to ensure that no harm would arise to the outlook from the adjacent dwelling or to the living conditions of its occupiers in general.
9. I conclude therefore that the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3 and accordingly I consider that it would meet with the objectives of the Extending Your House Supplementary Planning Guidance. I note that the Council has referred to Policy DE1 of the LP in its reason for refusal, but this policy does not include consideration of living conditions.

Other matters

10. The appellant has drawn attention to other policies in the LP relating to the securing of a mix of housing (H4) and the management of existing housing stock (H5). However, I do not consider that these policies provide support for the development in a manner which would outweigh the harm to character and appearance that I have identified. The appellant also considers that the Council has introduced its concern regarding living conditions as a new consideration, but it is clear from the decision notice that this forms part of the Council's reasons for refusal.
11. The appellant refers to a recent development in close proximity to the site on The Park Paling which has been completed and which I viewed during my site

visit. However, that dwelling is a detached property with a more conventional roof form and proportions and the layout of houses in the immediately surrounding area is not the same as the situation at the appeal site. Consequently, the development in question is not comparable to the appeal development, and I have determined the appeal upon its own merits.

Conclusion

12. Although I find no harm to living conditions, I do find significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and consequent conflict with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR