



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/20/3252202

19 Hargrave Close, Coventry CV3 2XS

- 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 and Mrs Giddy against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2020/0098, dated 6 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a 2 storey detached dwelling with attached garage that has been converted into a habitable room. The property is located on a prominent corner plot fronting onto a turning head with garden boundary parallel to Hargrave Close. The rear and side of the property is visible in long distance views along Hargrave Close.
4. It is acknowledged that the principle of a side and rear extension to the property is acceptable and the proposed side extension would be located on the side of the property away from the road and would be proportional to the main dwelling in terms of height and setback. Nevertheless, the proposed extension to the rear of the property would be clearly visible from the road, a point acknowledged by the appellant.
5. The rear extension would add notable visible depth to the side elevation. This combined with multiple gable roofs as part of the design would create a busy incongruous addition that would not complement the host dwelling or the wider character and appearance of the area. The fact that the extension would not protrude beyond the existing side elevation and the height of the additional roofs would be lower than the main roof would do little to mitigate the harm.
6. Whilst the road may only serve a limited number of properties, this does not make the development acceptable. Nor would the fact that the extension would be viewed from an angle within the road. Whilst the boundary treatment to the side of the property would obscure views of the obtrusive ground floor

windows, it would only provide some level of screening to the overall development. The long term presence of the vegetation cannot be guaranteed. The fact that the property is not listed or located in a Conservation Area does not make the poor design acceptable.

7. The appellant has made reference to other extensions to support the proposal. I do not know the circumstances in which they were granted planning permission. In any event, they are in different locations, orientated differently and are of different design and therefore not directly comparable. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment has been based on the information before me.
8. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with the part of Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Local Plan (Local Plan) which requires all development proposals to respect and enhance their surroundings and positively contribute towards local identity and character of an area. It would also conflict with Policy H5 of the Local Plan which requires existing housing stock to be renovated and improved in association with the enhancement of the surrounding residential environment.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified and taking into account all other matters raised, including a lack of objection from neighbours, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR