
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2022

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/21/3288173
100 St James Lane, Coventry CV3 3GS

- 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 Welsh against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/1890, dated 07 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 04 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for a single-storey timber side extension and a single-storey timber outbuilding extending out from the garage for use as an office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has already occurred. I am, therefore, considering the development retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached, pitch-roofed dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of St James Lane and Yarningale Road. The frontage of no 100 is set back at an angle from St James Lane, behind an area of public landscaping and private front garden. The dwelling occupies an elevated plot when viewed from St James Lane due to the land initially rising in a south-easterly direction along Yarningale Road. After this initial rise in land levels, Yarningale Road becomes more level and is typically characterised by semi-detached two storey dwellings set back from the road behind small front gardens/driveways. There is a relatively consistent building line along the northern side of Yarningale Road which the original flank elevation of no 100 aligns. Dwellings in the area are predominantly a mix of brick and render, although timber materials are sporadically apparent on some garages and outbuildings.
5. No 100 has previously been extended to the side with a pitched roof, brick and tile single-storey extension. Whilst that previous extension has breached the predominant building line of Yarningale Road, its design and materials are

sympathetic to the host dwelling and reflective of the character of the surrounding area. In contrast, the mono-pitch timber clad side extension is significantly different to the host dwelling. Neither its design nor its materials reflect the dominant built forms that comprise the surrounding area. The detrimental effect of the extension's incongruous appearance is exacerbated by its limited set-off from the back edge of the pavement and its projection forward of the predominant building line. Whilst the extension is small scale, given its corner plot location, it is prominent above the adjacent brick wall from several public vantage points, including Yarningale Road and Royal Crescent. As a result of these factors, the extension appears harmfully intrusive and discordant in the street scene.

6. The single-storey timber outbuilding extending from the garage is less prominent than the timber extension given that it infills between dwellings and does not project forward of the predominant building line. Nevertheless, the awkward juxtaposition of the brick wall with the timber above, in combination with the non-traditional roofline, results in a building that is not sympathetic or complementary to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. I have had regard to the fall-back arguments put forward by the appellant, including the possibility of constructing outbuildings to the side and rear of the dwelling under permitted development rights. However, no details of these options are before me. A flat roof outbuilding constructed to the rear of the dwelling under permitted development rights would be lower than the existing outbuilding. Construction of an outbuilding to the side of the dwelling would have implications for access to the side of the dwelling. I have therefore attached only limited weight to the potential fall-back options presented as there is no certainty as to their implications or that they would be implemented.
8. I therefore conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (adopted 2017) which requires that development respects and enhances its surroundings, positively contributing towards the local identity and character of an area. Furthermore, the development does 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 development is inconsistent with paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it does not add to the overall quality of the area and is not sympathetic to the local character.

Conclusion

9. The development is not in accordance with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, of sufficient weight to outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area and the subsequent conflict with the development plan.
10. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR