



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/20/3252763

24 Lavender Avenue, Coundon, Coventry, West Midlands CV6 1DB

- 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 Mrs Claire Salt against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2020/0394, dated 27 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side extension and new porch .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling occupying a generous but prominent and elevated corner plot.
4. The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Extending your Home (Design SPG) provides specific advice in relation to extending properties, including along corner plots. Whilst the Design SPG recognises that each site is unique and proposals will be determined on their own individual merits, this is also subject to having regard to the local distinctive character of the area, including established relevant building lines in the immediate vicinity and maintaining a minimum distance of 2m between the edge of the side extension and the boundary (measured at the narrowest point).
5. The layout of the built form in the vicinity of the appeal site is generally consistent, with dwellings arranged parallel to the highway with strong, established building lines. This layout gives the streetscene a degree of uniformity and rhythm, which establishes a well-defined and consistent character and appearance to the area. Most notably, the two-storey elements of all corner dwellings at the junction which the appeal site forms part of, broadly respect the established building lines and despite incorporating small extensions, outbuildings and boundary treatments, they contribute to the generally spacious character and appearance of the junction.
6. Despite some design interventions to reduce its overall mass, the proposed two-storey side extension due to its appreciable width and a limited degree of

subordination would be a sizeable addition to the host property. Moreover, the proposed extension would intrude beyond the established relevant building line along Lavender Avenue, with a discernible section of this being less than 2m from the back of the highway. This would distort the established building line and the pattern of the layout. As a consequence of its overall siting, scale and design, which includes a side elevation with limited articulation, the proposed extension would be a particularly dominant and incongruous addition to the streetscene and would also have an erosive effect on the spacious quality of the junction. The incongruity of the proposed extension would be amplified by the prominent and elevated position of the site, particularly in views from the adjacent roads and junction.

7. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be in direct conflict with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016, the principal aim of which is to ensure that all development proposals respect and enhance their surroundings and positively contribute towards the local identity and character of an area. The proposal also fails to reflect guidance in the Council's Design SPG.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred me to other two-storey extensions in the area. The extensions to properties at Loudon Avenue and on the corner of The Scotchill and Dickens Road are close to the back of the highway. However, the former includes appreciably recessed front and side elevations and the latter incorporates considerable articulation to its side elevation.
9. Extensions to properties in Rosslyn Avenue are about 2m from the back of the boundary with the highway and also incorporate recessed front elevations. The extension at Brackenhurst Drive is substantially screened by a mature boundary hedge. Although the extension at Haynestone Road is sizeable, it incorporates a recessed front elevation and is about 2m from the back of the highway.
10. Therefore, on the available information each of these examples is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. Furthermore, each proposal is considered on its individual planning merits, including site specific circumstances, which in the case of the appeal site include its elevated position. As such, whilst these examples show that the Council takes a flexible approach to the Design SPG, they do not alter my findings on the main issue.
11. The appellant suggests that the planning permission could be made personal for use by her ageing parent. However, this would not address my concerns in respect of the main issue. The lack of objections from neighbours to the planning application is a neutral factor which does not lend support to the proposal. Matters relating to the processing of the planning application are for the Council.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal
INSPECTOR