



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/U4610/D/21/3274113

199 Four Pounds Avenue, Coventry CV5 8JS

- 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 Dr Baseerit Nissah against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2020/2969, dated 22 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is rear single and side double storey 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 199 is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located on the junction between Four Pounds Avenue and Sussex Road. The dwelling is within a row of semi-detached dwellings whereas the dwellings along Sussex Road to the rear are predominantly older terraced properties. There are a number of junctions off Four Pounds Avenue and typically the dwellings on these corner plots have not been extended and the corner plots are generally free of development which allows open views of the roads to the rear. Both Four Pounds Avenue and Sussex Road have largely uniform front building lines and the flank wall of No 199 has been built generally in accordance with the building line of properties on Sussex Road.

6. Although narrower than the width of the host property the proposed side extension would bring the flank wall of the dwelling significantly forward of this building line. The extension would block views of dwellings in Sussex Road from Four Pounds Avenue and would appear as a prominent, dominant feature in the street scene, significantly reducing the open vista along Sussex Road from Four Pounds Avenue, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene. The presence of the existing boundary wall forward of the Sussex Road building line does not provide justification for the extension as proposed.
7. It is noted that a previous Inspector allowed a side extension at No 215 Four Pounds Avenue but in that instance the extension was single storey. As such, it was unlikely to have been significantly taller than the boundary treatment around the dwelling. Additionally, the Council granted planning permission for a single storey side extension at No 199 which follows a consistent approach to decision making in this regard. The two storey nature of the proposal is not comparable to these developments and they do not provide justification for harmful development.
8. The single storey rear extension would, for the most part, be located behind the rear of the dwelling and would comply with the requirements set out within the Extending Your Home – A Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (adopted 2003). Consequently, the rear extension directly behind the dwelling would not harm the character of the street scene. Notwithstanding the above, given that the side and rear elements of the proposed extension are connected, they would not be easily severable. Accordingly, it would not be possible to issue a split decision in this instance.
9. Therefore, the scale and siting of the proposed double storey extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (adopted 2017) which combined expects development proposals to respect and enhance their surroundings. Additionally, the proposal would be contrary to the SPG which requires proposals to be sympathetic and complimentary to their surroundings and that extensions on corner plots should not, amongst other matters, infringe on any established building lines in the immediate vicinity. These policies and guidance are broadly consistent with the Framework's objective of requiring developments to be sympathetic to local character, which maintains a strong sense of place.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. 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

11. 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