
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/21/3288010
33 Brackenhurst Road, Coventry CV6 2DS

- 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 Ashfaq Hussain (Malik Enterprises) against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/2263, dated 13 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and single storey extension to rear with boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Dwellings on Brackenhurst Road are generally set back from the highway and arranged along consistent building lines. The dwellings are predominantly terraced in form and share common architectural details, including chimneys, double bay windows, and projecting gables with timber barge boards. The regularity of dwelling design, in combination with the consistently set back and uniform building lines, gives the area a distinctly cohesive and spacious character. No 33 has front and side elevations that are set back from the highway consistent with the prevailing building lines of both the front and perpendicular street scene. It also retains original architectural features that contribute to the attractive symmetry of the street scene. In these regards, No 33 makes an important and positive contribution to the sense of spaciousness and visual cohesiveness that forms the established character of the area.
4. The proposed two-storey side extension would match the existing ridgeline of No 33 and would not be materially set back from the existing frontage of the dwelling. The loss of the original chimneys, in combination with the lack of a significant design break between the existing dwelling and the side extension, would harm the characteristic symmetry of the terraced housing on Brackenhurst Road.

5. I note that the separation distance between the side extension and the highway boundary fencing is compliant with the minimum 2m guidance within the Council's Extending Your Home – A Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted 2003) (SPG). The proposed side extensions would, however, project significantly beyond the predominant building line and would not reflect the established pattern of development in the surrounding area. The two-storey element, in particular, would appear harmfully out of kilter with existing development, incongruously protruding towards Brackenhurst Road. The largely blank two-storey flank elevation would provide minimal visual relief and would represent a discordant feature in the street scene, harmful to the spacious character and visual cohesiveness of the surrounding area.
6. The development would, therefore, be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (adopted 2017) which, taken together, amongst other things, require that development respects and enhances its surroundings, positively contributing towards the local identity and character of an area. Furthermore, the proposal would not accord with the advice within the SPG insofar as it states that extensions to dwellings on corner plots must be sympathetic and complementary to their surroundings. Moreover, the development would be inconsistent with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not be sympathetic to the local character.

Other Matters

7. I have had regard to the two-storey side extensions on corner plots referred to me by the appellant. Apart from the extension at 49 Brackenhurst Road, the other referred extensions are a significant distance from the site and are not readily perceived as part of the character of the area surrounding the appeal site. I have not, however, been provided with full details of the scheme at no 49 and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the current proposals. From what I saw of the referred extensions, they are very much in the minority and do not define the character of the wider area or materially reduce the harms that I have identified. In relation to the appeal decision at 71 Loudon Road¹, I note that the extension is set down and back from the original dwelling and is not, therefore, directly comparable to the current proposal. I have, in any case, determined this appeal on its own specific merits.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would not be 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.
9. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/18/3192967