



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/20/3244748
164 - 166 Broad Street, Coventry CV6 5BG

- 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 Yusef Raja against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2019/2361, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host properties and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to two adjoining mid terrace dwellings. The dwellings are set back from the road and have a simple rendered appearance. There is a noticeable step down between the two properties. The area is largely made up of terraced dwellings and commercial and community uses.
4. A number of dwellings in the area have front canopies and modest forward extensions which creates a sense of variety, although generally they are contained to the width of individual properties and maintain individual entrance doors.
5. I acknowledge the front garden is sizable and that the many differing canopies and forward extensions in the area give it a sense of variety. However, the proposed development, extending across both frontages with its uniform height would be unduly prominent and appearing as an incongruous feature. The proposal would unduly dominate the front of the dwellings significantly disrupting their appearance and that of the terrace.
6. The proposed development by virtue of its scale, width, massing and single entrance would not be consistent with the simple appearance of the houses and would unbalance them when viewed from the street. The width of the proposed development would not be in keeping with other porches, canopies and forward extensions in the area, which largely tend to maintain the individual appearance of properties. Whilst there is no doubt that the proposal would add

further variety, this would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

7. I note the information provided in relation to other buildings in the area. However, I find that their context is not comparative to the appeal property. I have also not been made aware of the individual circumstances behind them being built. In any case, I have considered the appeal on its own merits and give this aspect of the appellant's case limited weight.
8. Consequently, the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host properties and the area contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (2017) which requires all development, amongst other things, to respect and enhance their surroundings, positively contribute to local identity and character and improve existing housing in association with the enhancement of the surrounding residential environment.
9. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out in supplementary guidance 'Extending your home – a design guide' (2003) and the design aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's comments including that the proposal would improve the houses by providing additional storage space, keep outside dirt and odour contained, energy efficiency and additional security. However, these matters do not overcome the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR