



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/20/3244532

49 Glenmore Drive, Coventry CV6 6LZ

- 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 H S Jandu against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2019/2384, dated 19 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extension, loft conversion and garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and rear extension, loft conversion and garden store at 49 Glenmore Drive, Coventry CV6 6LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2019/2384, dated 19 September 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: 228/GD/2 revision B and 228/GD/3 revision A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect on the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions of occupiers of 47 Glenmore Drive (No 47) in respect of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is in a residential area and is a typical 2 storeys high semi-detached house with attached side garage. As it lies on the inside of a bend, the property's front and side elevations can be seen from the road.
4. The top of the extension's roof would be lower than the appeal property's ridgeline and at first floor level its front wall would be set back behind the main part of the house. Also, the front of the extension would be narrower than the existing dwelling. As such, the extension would not appear disproportionately

large when viewed directly from the front. The proposed bay window, canopy and matching materials would sympathetically reflect features on the property.

5. While the flank wall would be visible, the rear extension would be partially screened from the road by the front element, the main part of the house and the neighbouring property. The proposed dormer would be to the rear, below the ridgeline and partially screened by the side extension, so it would not be prominent. The flat roof of the dormer would contrast with the pitched roof of the rear extension but there would be limited views of these elements seen together. As such, the development would not be detrimental to the street scene by reason of its size or design.
6. For these reasons, I conclude the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area. In this regard, it would comply with policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan 2017 (LP), Coventry City Council's Extending Your Home – A Design Guide 2003 (DG) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These all aim, amongst other things, to ensure developments respect their surroundings and character of an area.

Living conditions

7. The rear elevation of No 47 faces onto its back garden although it is angled towards the appeal site boundary. By reason of its height and proximity, the side of the proposed extension would be seen over the close boarded boundary fence from No 47's rear windows.
8. The Council do not contest the appellant's claim that the proposal would comply with the DG's 45-degree sightline guidance in respect of the nearest habitable room windows. The 2 storey high extension would not project significantly beyond the back elevation of the appeal property and the roof towards the rear of the extension would slope away from the common boundary, thereby avoiding any unacceptable intrusion or overbearing effect. Furthermore, the single storey rear element of the proposal would be largely screened from No 47 ground windows by the existing fence.
9. For these reasons, I conclude the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 47 in respect of outlook. In this regard, it would comply with LP policies DE1 and H5, the DG and the Framework. These all aim, amongst other things, to ensure proposals respond to a site's context and create places with a high standard of amenity for occupiers.

Other Matters

10. The proposal includes no windows with sideward views and the proposed rear facing windows would not allow significant overlooking of other properties due to separation distances and the screening provided by boundary features. The development would not significantly increase the height or depth of the house and so would avoid an unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring properties.
11. Despite its proximity, there is no evidence before me that demonstrates the proposed garden store would harm the well-being of the nearby mature tree or any wildlife it may accommodate. Parking space would remain on the site frontage and there is no evidence to suggest that any on-road parking associated with the proposal would prejudice highway safety. There is no indication that the appeal property would be used as a house in multiple occupation. In the absence of substantive evidence to dismiss the appeal on

any of the above grounds or complaints, the concerns raised do not override or affect my conclusions on the main issues.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.
13. For the given reasons, I conclude the appeal should be allowed as set out in the formal decision above.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR