
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: 16 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/19/3236661
54 Rosslyn Avenue, Coventry CV6 1GN

- 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 Mark Alder against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2019/0262, dated 1 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as extending loft conversion to rear and converting flat to pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extending loft conversion to rear and converting flat to pitched roof at 54 Rosslyn Avenue, Coventry CV6 1GN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2019/0262, dated 1 February 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 Scale 1:1250, Site Plan Scale 1:500, Drawing Numbers 7001/D and 7001/E.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. The declaration date on the planning application form states 1 February 2019 however the date on Part C of the Appeal Form states 16 May 2019. I have used the date from the original application form in the above heading.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling with associated driveway and rear garden. It is set within a predominantly residential area. To the rear of the appeal site are playing fields and the site is in proximity to, but is not located within, the Green Belt.
6. The proposal would extend the existing loft conversion, involving the extension of the current rear dormer and the construction of a pitched roof above the existing flat roofed, two-storey side extension. The Council have not raised concerns over the addition of the pitched roof over the existing extension and I have little evidence before me that would lead me to conclude differently in relation to this element of the proposal.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Extending Your Home (SPG) identifies that a dormer should only be placed on a roof slope that is not prominent from a street, public footpath or open space and that large flat roofed dormers will be refused. It also highlights minimum distances from the eaves and side boundaries of the property which should be met.
8. The proposed dormer extension would result in it occupying much of the rear roof plane and it would have a flat roofed design. I acknowledge that this would not comply with the guidance within the SPG, however I have had regard to the presence of the existing dormer which is also a flat roofed. This has established the design and to require another type of roof style would be unreasonable given what exists on the property. Furthermore, the existing dormer already occupies the majority of the current rear roof slope and to extend the pitched roof without the continuation of the dormer would have an unbalancing effect by leaving the existing dormer offset within the roof. Whilst I accept that dormers are not characteristic of the surroundings, the property already has a substantial dormer and I find that no additional harm would arise as a result of its extension.
9. The existing dormer is almost completely screened from the public realm to the front of the dwelling and the proposed pitched roof over the current flat roofed extension would ensure that the extended dormer would not be visible from Rosslyn Avenue. The enlarged dormer would be visible from neighbouring gardens and also from the playing fields to the rear. However, although large, the proposed dormer would remain in keeping with the overall design and appearance of the host dwelling and as such would not appear incongruous or visually harmful from these areas.
10. I find that, given the scale of the existing dormer, the proposed roof extension and extended dormer would not result in the unbalancing of the host dwelling over and above its current appearance or appear over dominant.
11. Accordingly, whilst the proposed development would not comply with the requirements of the SPG, I find that as a result of the existing dormer, the positioning of the proposal and the improvements that would be made to the existing side extension through the replacement of the flat roof, the proposal would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policies DE1 and GB1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan. Collectively these seek to ensure that development proposals respect and enhance their surroundings, respond to the physical context of the site and

have regard to the opportunities to enhance the local built environment through enhanced design, amongst other things.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition listing the approved plans as this provides certainty. The Council have requested a condition requiring the external materials used to match the existing dwelling however this is not necessary as this is detailed on the approved plan 7001/D.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR