



---

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 July 2021 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

**Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16 August 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/D/21/3274135**

**2 Trewint Close, Exhall, Coventry CV7 9FG**

- 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 Joseph Coen against the decision of Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 037754, dated 4 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

## Preliminary Matter

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. The comments which have been received have been taken into consideration in my assessment of this case.

## Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

## Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No 2 is an end terrace dwelling that has been built perpendicular to the Tregorrick Road. Trewint Close is a side road built off Tregorrick Road and the dwellings along Tregorrick Road face the road and generally follow a consistent building line. The flank walls of the end terrace dwellings off Trewint Close have been built forward of the building line along Tregorrick Road but being set back from this road contributes to its open character and appearance.
6. The proposed extension would be constructed in very close proximity to the boundary with the highway. Its height and design would result in an intrusive feature in the street scene which would harmfully erode the open

characteristics of the locality and the uniform layout that the host dwelling exhibits with the property opposite in Trewint Close. Consequently, the proposal would be an alien form of development which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

7. It is noted that other dwellings that were built perpendicular to the road have been extended. Nevertheless, I have not been provided with the Officer's reports or decision notices for those applications. As such, I am unaware of the context within which those decisions were made. Additionally, the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted 2020) was adopted in 2020 and those extensions could have been granted prior to the adoption of this document. Furthermore, those extended dwellings were typically located on junctions which would not be the case in this instance. Each case must be assessed on their own merits and the Council granting planning permission elsewhere does not justify this proposal.
8. Whilst the proposed extension would be subservient in scale and appearance to the host dwelling, its siting would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE3 of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan (adopted 2019) which states the development proposals must be designed to a high standard. Additionally, the proposal would be contrary to the SPD which requires, amongst other matters for extensions not to be an intrusion into the street scene or result in large blank elevations visible within it.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

9. There are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Sibley*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

*RC Kirby*

INSPECTOR