
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: 2 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/21/3285566

2 Butlin Road, Coventry CV6 4JS

- 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 Tajinder Thandi against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/2150, dated 4 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a double 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No 2 is a two-storey semi-detached property located on the junction between Butlin Road and Dymond Road. The pair are built at an oblique angle to both roads and do not follow the building line for either road, a layout common to many junctions in the area. As a result, the semi-detached pair are in a prominent location within the street scenes for both roads. The properties in the area are a mix of semi-detached and terraced dwellings typically rendered or covered by pebbledash with hipped roofs and feature gables.
5. Whilst the attached dwelling 9 Dymond Road has been extended, this extension is of modest scale and the gable feature is sympathetic to the host dwelling. Consequently, it does not unbalance the appearance of the pair, whose consistent appearance contributes positively to the appearance of both street scenes and the spacious character of the junction.
6. The proposed extension would be considerably wider than the existing house with the same ridgeline and a gable roof. While it would use matching materials, as a result of its scale and form the extension would appear disproportionately large and unsympathetic to the host dwelling. It would be highly visible from the junction and from Butlin Road, appearing as an incongruous feature in these street scenes of otherwise largely consistent

dwelling. The natural break created by the driveway of 4 Butlin Road would do little to alter this perception of the scale of the extension.

7. The proposal would extend along Butlin Road in line with the road but at an oblique angle with the house itself. It would therefore contrast markedly with the extension to No 9 which includes an angled gable feature but otherwise follows the line of the host dwelling. While it would follow the building line and the scale of the dwellings along Butlin Road, the proposed extension would still be viewed as an extension to No 2, particularly as it would be set behind its boundary fence and parking. Due to its scale and siting it would visually compete with the host dwelling and would unbalance the semi-detached pair.
8. Therefore, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene and would be contrary to Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (adopted 2017) which requires that development complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area.
9. Furthermore, the proposal would not accord with the advice within the Extending Your Home – A Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted 2003) insofar as it states that extensions to dwellings on corner plots must be sympathetic and complementary to their surroundings. Moreover, the proposal would not comply with the general design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. On the corner of Briscoe Road and Masser Road is a new development of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings. The corner pair extends along Masser Road but with a larger gap to its neighbour than the appeal proposal. Both pairs are largely symmetrical creating a balanced form, and while they use different materials to their neighbours, the hipped roofs and gable features are sympathetic to the form of nearby properties. Consequently, they are materially different to the appeal scheme and do not weigh in its favour.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. There are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not be in accordance with development plan as a whole, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. 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.

L McKay

INSPECTOR