
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/21/3285783

1 Grizebeck Drive, Coventry CV5 7PL

- 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 & Ms L & S Sydenham & Banwait against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/2677, dated 24 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first-floor extension over garage, two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and dormer to rear (amendments to approved application HH/2021/1384).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a first-floor extension over garage, two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and dormer to rear at 1 Grizebeck Drive, Coventry CV5 7PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2021/2677, dated 24 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan – drg 1221.01; Proposed 1st and 2nd Plans OP1 – drg 1221.06G; Proposed Ground Floor Plan – drg 1221.05E; and Proposed Elevations – drg 1221.07F.
 - 3) Prior to their use, details and / or samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and / or samples.

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. I have removed 'amendments to approved application HH/2021/1384' from the description in the decision above as this does not refer to an act of development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The proposal includes a number of extensions to the dwelling which the Council concluded were acceptable except in regard to the proposed rear dormer. I note that the first floor, two storey and single storey side extensions already benefit from planning permission (Council Ref. HH/2021/1384) and given their scale and appearance these elements would be sympathetic to the host dwelling. I therefore concur with the Council that those elements would not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or the street scene.
6. Dormer windows are not a common feature locally and the visible roof slopes are typically uncluttered which is a positive characteristic of the street scene. The proposed dormer window would extend across almost the full width of the rear roof slope and while it would be set below the ridge and above the eaves it would appear disproportionately large compared with the roof. The side and part of the rear of the dormer would be visible from public views despite intervening vegetation. The proposed flat roof would not reflect the roof form of the host dwelling and would be contrary to the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003) (SPG) which states that dormer windows that would be visible from public views should include pitched roofs. Consequently, due to its scale and design the proposed dormer would be an alien and harmful addition to the street scene.
7. Consequently, whilst the proposed extensions would not be harmful, the proposed dormer window would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (adopted 2017) insofar as it expects development to respect and enhance their surroundings. Additionally, the proposal would not accord with the advice in the SPG or the design policies within the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. Nevertheless, planning permission has already been granted for two smaller dormer windows on the rear roof slope. Given that the planning permission has not expired, there is a real prospect of the fall-back being implemented. Furthermore, given the similarities between the two schemes it would not be physically possible for both schemes to be carried out.
9. The two approved dormer windows would have flat roofs and extend across effectively the same width and height as the proposed dormer window but with a small gap between them. From public views this gap would not be particularly visible, so would not demonstrably reduce the overall scale of development on the roof when seen from the road. Consequently, there would be very little difference between how the two schemes would be perceived. Accordingly, the proposal would have a similar effect upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene as the approved scheme. Therefore, I give very substantial weight to this fall-back position, and it is sufficient to outweigh the harm that would result from the proposed dormer window and justify granting permission contrary to the development plan.

Other Matters

10. The proposed dormer window, whilst larger, would not allow for a significantly greater field of view of neighbouring properties than the approved scheme and would serve the same bedroom and en-suite as previously approved. As a result, the proposed dormer window would not have a materially greater impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 7 Grizebeck Drive in terms of privacy than the approved scheme. Therefore, this does not warrant refusal of the scheme.

Conditions

11. Further to the statutory commencement condition it would be necessary in the interest of certainty that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Furthermore, it would be necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene to ensure the materials used in the external surfaces are approved prior to their use.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan as a whole but there are 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 allowed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

L McKay

INSPECTOR