



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/21/3283400

21 Larkfield Way, Coventry CV5 7QB

- 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 and Mrs White against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/1437, dated 27 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a Side Extension at First Floor Level, and Rear Double Storey Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No 17 Larkfield Way, with respect to overshadowing and loss of outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling in an established residential area. The surrounding area consists mainly of detached dwellings with front driveways and rear gardens.
4. The proposal includes a first-floor side extension above the existing ground floor garage. From the evidence before me, this proposed first-floor side extension would be located 8.6 metres away from the neighbouring property at No 17. I note that No 17 has, by design, a large single storey rear extension, and that the property's double storey footprint starts further north of the appeal site dwelling. Therefore, the proposed extension is unlikely to impact negatively on the double storey footprint of No 17. However, the footprint of the existing single storey rear extension of No 17 is 8.6 metres from the existing west wall of No 21 and this separation distance forms the focus of this appeal decision.
5. From my observations, I note that there are two large windows in the east elevation of the single storey rear extension of No 17. These two large windows face east towards the west side of No 21 and would be the primary source of light into this room. I also note that the modest sized rear garden of No 17 is located to the east of the property and borders the west side of No 21. Whilst out on my site visit, it was also apparent that the appeal site ground level is slightly higher than the adjoining property at No 17.
6. The Coventry City Council's design guide SPG Extending Your Home (adopted 2003) states that side extensions to dwellings should normally maintain a 12-

metre minimum distance between the side elevation of the extended property and the rear elevation of the neighbour's property. It also states that this separation distance may need to be increased if the ground level is elevated above the neighbour's property.

7. I accept the appellant's reasoning that the separation distance of 8.6 metres exists between No 21 and No 17 by virtue of the properties original design layout. However, the proposal is for a first-floor side extension above the existing garage and would also extend beyond the existing rear elevation by around 3 metres. This would significantly increase the height, scale and mass of the side footprint and elevation of No 21. The separation distance between the proposed extension and the footprint of No 17 would remain at 8.6 metres, falling short by around 3.4 metres. I consider that this shortfall in separation distance combined with the ground level changes would result in the proposed extension being a significant mass of built form in close proximity to No 17, and in particular, the windows in the neighbour's existing single storey rear extension and their rear garden. Consequently, it would appear as an enclosing feature when viewed from the windows and rear garden of No 17. I consider that this loss of outlook would impact negatively on the living conditions of No 17. In addition, light into the windows and rear garden of No 17 would be meaningfully reduced due to overshadowing from the built form of the proposed extension. I conclude that the harm caused by loss of outlook and overshadowing would be unacceptable to the occupants living conditions of No 17.
8. For the reasons above, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (LP) (adopted 2017). Amongst other things, this policy seeks to ensure that development complements or enhances the surrounding area and responds positively to the physical context of the site with regard to siting, scale, and mass. It would also fail to accord with LP Policy H5, which recognises that improvement and renovation is required to the existing housing stock where appropriate, but this should be in association with the enhancement of the surrounding residential environment. The proposal would also not comply with the Coventry City Council's design guide SPG Extending Your Home (adopted 2003), which provides guidance on house extensions.
9. In addition, the proposal would fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks a high standard of amenity for existing users.
10. I note the examples of the properties with extensions provided by the appellant. However, I have determined this appeal on its own individual merits having regard to the particular characteristics of the site and have found no factors that would outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR