



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 November 2021

by Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/21/3278346

42 Addison Road, Coventry CV6 2JN

- 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 & Mrs Devey against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref FUL/2021/0993, dated 30 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of new dwelling to the side of No.42 and retention of single storey rear extension to 42 Addison Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the surrounding area; and,
 - highway safety and sustainable travel

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is roughly wedge-shaped with the narrower end fronting on to Addison Road. Along one side of the site is a gated laneway which connects to the rear of a number of the neighbouring properties. The site contains a semi-detached dwelling set back from the road by a parking area while to the rear and side of the house is a large garden area. The street scene is characterised by terraces of properties that are largely uniform in terms of their scale, proportions and features, although I note there is variation between groups of properties along the street.
4. The front elevation of the proposed dwelling would replicate the form and features of the surrounding dwellings, including the host dwelling. In particular I note the continuation of the host roof, the arch over the front door, and the two-storey bay window. However, the features would be noticeably smaller, and the proportions of the elevation as a whole would be significantly narrower, than those of the existing dwelling. As a result, the proposal, while replicating features of the host property, would be a jarring feature within the regular pattern of development and appear as a pastiche of its surroundings.
5. Moreover, while the stepped projections to the side of the proposed dwelling would be set back from Addison Road, the level of openness to this side of the site, including the laneway, would provide views of them. Given the simple and

regular form of the surrounding properties these projections would be out of keeping and would contribute towards the overall incongruous nature of the proposal. Whilst the rear extension does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, this does not outweigh the harm identified above.

6. In light of the above I find that the proposed dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would therefore conflict with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (the LP) which requires that development is of a high quality design that considers local identity and respects its surroundings. It would also conflict with Section 12, including Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires that development is sympathetic to local character and maintains a strong sense of place.

Highway Safety and Sustainable Travel

7. The proposal would result in two parking spaces to the rear of the site accessed via the laneway and a further parking space to the front of the proposed dwelling, accessed from Addison Road. As such there would be three parking spaces serving the proposed dwelling. Policy AC3 and Appendix 5 of the LP require that 2 car parking spaces be provided for a dwelling of the size proposed before me. As such the proposal would result in the over provision of 1 parking space
8. Although the over provision would only be one parking space, it would still conflict with the Council's sustainable transport strategy by allowing for the ownership and use of motor vehicles over and above the number the Development Plan has set out as being appropriate. As raised by the appellants, the appeal site is within an accessible location and near to bus stops. However, I do not find that this in itself would necessarily dissuade future occupiers to limit the number of motor vehicles, or their use, given the ease at which the three spaces could be accessed relative to public transport. While I note the intention is to use the parking space for visitors, such provision is only required by the parking standards in Appendix 5 where five dwellings, of the size proposed before me, are provided. Therefore, and given the above, the additional parking space would not support the Council's aims of promoting sustainable transport options.
9. The parking space at the front of the site is largely analogous with the off-street parking common on Addison Road, where vehicles park perpendicular to the road and cannot turn on site. Given that it is typical along this road for motor vehicles to reverse on to, or off of, the carriageway, pedestrians and highway users would be more alert to sudden vehicular movements. Furthermore, whilst the space is narrow and at an angle to the road, this is not to such an extent as to affect the useability of the space. As such, it would not result in any unacceptable impact on highway safety.
10. I note the appellants' willingness to remove the parking space to the front of the appeal site and their suggestion to do so through a condition. However, such an amendment to the scheme would not give interested parties the opportunity to comment.
11. Although the proposal would not unacceptably affect highway safety, the over provision of parking spaces would encourage the use of motor vehicles and

therefore, conflict with the Council's strategy on sustainable travel. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy AC3 and Appendix 5 of the LP which requires that a maximum of 2 parking spaces are provided for new three bedroom dwellings in order to encourage sustainable travel. It would also conflict with Section 9 of the Framework with regards to promoting sustainable transport.

Other Matters

12. Although the proposal may provide high quality living accommodation for future occupiers and not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, these matters are not benefits of the proposal. As such I attach only neutral weight to them, and they do not outweigh the harm identified above. While it has also been suggested that the proposal would result in environmental improvements on site it has not been demonstrated how this would occur.
13. The glossary to the Framework describes brownfield, or previously developed, land as not including land in built-up areas such as residential gardens. Therefore, whilst the Framework may attach substantial weight to the use of brownfield land under Paragraph 120 this is not directly relevant to the case before me.

Conclusion

14. The Government's objective is to significantly boost the supply of housing and the proposal would provide a new dwelling in an accessible location. Given the small scale of the proposal the provision of this additional dwelling attracts only modest weight. The scheme would also lead to a limited economic and social benefit by way of future occupiers.
15. Conversely, as outlined above the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with the local and national sustainable transport strategy, these matters attract significant weight and outweigh the benefits associated with the proposed development.
16. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR