The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/19/3236953
80 Rotherham Road, Coventry CV6 4FR

- 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 K Singh against the decision of Coventry City Council.
- The application Ref HH/2019/1426, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
- The development proposed is a single storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 80 Rotherham Road, Coventry CV6 4FR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2019/1426, dated 4 June 2019, 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: Site Location Plan and Drawing Numbers 10600-01-001; 10600-01-003 and 10600-01-005.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling set within a corner plot on the junction with Rotherham Road and Blenheim Avenue. The existing dwelling is set in from the side boundary and fronts onto Rotherham Road. The surrounding area is reasonably uniform in character and appearance and the building line is well established.

4. The proposed development would introduce a single storey side extension which would extend up to the side boundary but would be set back from the existing front and rear elevations of the dwelling. It would have a shallow pitched roof and would provide an additional bedroom and shower room/WC for the property.

5. The properties either side of the Blenheim Avenue junction, the appeal property and No 78, are both set in from their side boundaries. However, the appearance of spaciousness is reduced by the existing boundary wall which has an enclosing effect. The existing side boundary to No 80 is a tall brick wall and whilst the proposed extension would be visible from the front and rear and partially above the boundary wall, it would be sufficiently modest in size and height to not appear dominant, prominent or incongruous within the street scene. It would also be sufficiently screened to avoid an unbalancing appearance in the context of No 78, which also has an enclosed side boundary consisting of a brick wall and fencing.

6. The Supplementary Planning Guidance: Extending your Home (SPG) seeks to protect spacious corner plots by avoiding infringement of any established building lines and maintaining a minimum distance of 2 metres between the edge of the side extension and the boundary, amongst other things. Whilst the proposed development would not be set a minimum of 2 metres away from the side boundary, the presence of the boundary wall already impedes the appearance of openness and consequently, when considered in the built-up context of the surroundings, I do not find this requirement to be essential in maintaining an acceptable character and appearance in this particular location.

7. The proposed extension would also sit forward of the established building line of the properties to the rear along Blenheim Avenue. However, the proposed extension would be set a significant distance from the properties to the rear and would therefore not relate strongly to these properties in visual terms, but rather to the properties along Rotherham Road.

8. Consequently, as a result of the scale and positioning of the proposed development and the existing side boundary treatment, I find that the proposed side extension would not adversely impact the openness of the plot or be harmful to the character and appearance of the surroundings. Whilst it would not meet the requirements of the SPG, the development would comply with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (2016). This seeks to ensure that development responds to the physical context of the site and respects and enhances the surroundings, positively contributing towards the local identity and character of an area. It would also comply with the provisions of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which strives to achieve well designed places.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition listing the approved plans as this provides certainty. The Council requested a condition to ensure the materials match the existing building however this is not necessary as this is already included on the approved plan No 10600-01-05. The Council have requested no additional conditions and I consider none to be necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR