
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Tuesday, 29 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/21/3271690
127 Maidavale Crescent, Coventry CV3 6GE

- 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 Singh against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref: HH/2020/2792, dated 7 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a semi-detached dwelling. A common feature of the surrounding area is the presence of similarly proportioned buildings with pitched roofs. Most extensions of dwellings in the surrounding area maintain the form of the original dwelling. The appeal site is near to Frobisher Road, which slopes in an upwards direction.
4. The proposed development includes a flat roof extension to the rear of the building. This would appear incongruous given that it would be different from the prevailing character of pitched roofs that are a feature of the appeal site and common within the vicinity. This effect would be exacerbated by the palette of materials, which contrast with those used on the existing house and the overall footprint of the rear extension.
5. In addition, the use of render occurs infrequently in the surrounding area and is generally in small quantities for architectural detailing. In result, the use of large amounts of render within the proposed development would result in it being discordant.
6. Furthermore, the form of the proposed rear extension would be readily apparent when viewed from the surrounding area. In particular, the proposal would be viewable from the rear gardens and rear elevation windows of the surrounding dwellings.
7. Whilst the appeal site is not adjacent to Frobisher Road, the topography of this street and height of the development is such that the proposal would be readily

viewable across the neighbouring gardens. Although there are some boundary treatments, the screening effect would be relatively small and would not overcome the previously identified adverse effects. Therefore, the proposed development would be strident and would erode the character of the surrounding area.

8. The proposed development includes the provision of dormer windows. However, such windows are present, and constructed to varying designs, at several dwellings in the surrounding area. Therefore, this element of the development would not be incongruous and would not erode the character and appearance of the surrounding area. However, this does not outweigh my previous concerns.
9. My attention has been drawn to a two-storey side extension at the neighbouring dwelling. I do not have the full information regarding the planning circumstances of this, which lessens the weight that I can attribute to it. Nonetheless, this extension has a different design and form than the proposal before me. Furthermore, owing to the pattern of development elsewhere in Maidavale Crescent, this extension is not as prominent in the surrounding area as the appeal scheme would be.
10. Therefore, the extension does not have the same effects as the scheme before me. In result, the existing extension does not overcome my previous concerns in respect of the proposed rear extension.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Local Plan (2017) and the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2003). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that development proposals must respect and enhance their surroundings; and ensure that extensions are in keeping with the design and character of the existing house and of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

12. Whilst the proposed development would not result in adverse effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the highway system, these are only some of all the issues that must be considered. In result, they do not overcome, or outweigh, my previous conclusions.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The scheme would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR