



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/20/3263676

1A St Christians Road, Coventry CV3 5GW

- 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 Gareth Gartside against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2020/2007, dated 25 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension and loft conversion. The existing ridge line is to be raised to allow an adequate ceiling height within the loft conversion.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The general design of properties in the area vary between pairs of semi-detached dwellings and short runs of terraced housing with a mix of both gable and hipped roofs. A number of properties have been extended including in the form of rear dormer windows or hip to gable roof alterations. The design of properties and alterations gives the area a degree of variety. The appeal property is somewhat at variance to this comprising a detached infill dwelling with a shallow pitched roof.
4. The proposed development includes a two storey side extension, the raising of the roof height and a dormer window. The design and form of the side extension would fit in well with the design of the host property and would be in keeping with its character.
5. The proposal would increase the height of the roof and would change the roofscape. There is no doubt that this would alter the appearance of the host property, however, I find that its scale, mass and design would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the host property. The proposed change in roof form would not be overly dominant but rather it would reflect the character and appearance of dwellings in the area, which includes a number of properties with similar gable roofs.

6. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed dormer window would lack architectural subtlety being unsympathetic to the appearance of the host building. Its overall width, extending across both the host property and the proposed side extension would result in a structure that unacceptably dominates the roof. The dormer window would be an unduly large and bulky feature being unacceptably prominent. It would be noticeably wider compared to other dormer windows in the area and this variance in width would be clearly visible and an incongruous feature within the area.
7. I note the presence of other extended properties in the area. However, I have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being constructed. In any event, every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done in this case. The presence of other large extensions in the area does not justify the harm that I have identified.
8. The support of neighbours counts neither for nor against the proposal and does not overcome the harm I have identified in relation to the main issue. Whilst the appellant appears to have been in discussion with the Council regarding other options this is not a matter for me as part of this appeal and falls outside the scope of what I can consider.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (2017) which, amongst other things, seeks high quality design and development to consider local distinctiveness and the identity of the site. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending your home' which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the design and character of the existing house and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

B Thandi

INSPECTOR