
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/20/3258518

1 Strathmore Avenue, Coventry CV1 2AJ

- 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 S Lal against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2020/1173, dated 21 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 1 Strathmore Avenue, Coventry CV1 2AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2020/1173, dated 21 May 2020, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 8950-02 Rev B and 8950-03 Rev B.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed single storey extension element of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier and the effect of the two-storey element on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 1) is a semi-detached house at the end of a road of similar properties. Two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions to the house have been constructed. However, it is agreed by the main parties that they are unauthorised and the subject of enforcement action. Their merits are not before me in this appeal.
4. The proposed rear extension would be smaller than the built rear extension which is proposed to be replaced. There is an existing planning permission for a

rear extension with a depth of 3.3m, whereas this element of the appeal proposal would be 3.66m deep along the shared boundary. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidelines '*Extending your home – a design guide*' (SPG) allows rear extensions where their depth is no greater than 3.3m or where a 45-degree sightline from the neighbour's nearest habitable room window is not breached. The aim of this guidance is to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The proposed rear extension would exceed these guidelines. The SPG points out that proposals will be determined on their own individual merits, as I have done in this case.

5. I have considered the SPG guidelines alongside the siting and massing of the proposed extension and in particular, the extent of its projection along the boundary with No 1a. The extension would be clearly visible from this neighbouring house which is not extended. However, bearing in mind the potential impact of the already approved rear extension, the appeal proposal would not amount to harmful visual intrusion. Furthermore, it would be set in from the shared boundary, thereby addressing one of the concerns of the neighbour. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the height and depth of the single-storey extension would not have an unacceptably overbearing impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1a.
6. Notwithstanding all other considerations, the Council has raised no objections to the design and size of the proposed two-storey side extension element of the proposal. It notes that this extension, which is proposed to be retained, has largely been built in accordance with the appeal application drawings. Based on my own observations, I find no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion. Its concerns appear to relate to the external materials used in the extension as constructed whereas the proposed development indicates that the materials would match the existing.
7. The upper level of the two-storey extension would be rendered to match the original house. It is proposed to chemically stain its brickwork to obtain a better match with the original house. This matter can be controlled by conditions requiring the use of matching external materials and requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings in the interest of visual amenity. On this basis I conclude that the appearance of the extension would be acceptable and would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
8. Notwithstanding the numerical conflict with the SPG, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm neighbouring living conditions or visual amenities. There would therefore be no conflict with the objectives of Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Local Plan (LP) which, in summary and amongst other things, requires high quality development which respects its surroundings. I consider this to be the LP policy most relevant to this appeal.
9. For the reasons set out the appeal is allowed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR