



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/21/3288989
395 Holyhead Road, Coventry CV5 8HS

- 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 Tasleem Razak against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/2188, dated 07 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and insertion of a rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description I have used above is taken from the Council's decision notice as that describes the development more comprehensively than the description given on the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area on the southern side of Holyhead Road. No 395 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a half hip roof and a full height bay window. The street scene is characterised by a mixture of 2-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings, including hipped, half hipped and gable roof types. No. 395 forms a pair with No. 393. Whilst there is variation in the design details of these attached dwellings, they display broad symmetry in terms of their main roof form and 2-storey bulk.
5. The proposed side extension would have a minimal set back from the existing front elevation and includes a full height bay window. The ridge line of the roof would be extended rather than being set down, finishing in a gable end rather than a half hip. The width and 2-storey scale of the side extension, in combination with its limited set back, assertive bay window, and no set down from the original dwelling, would result in the extension visually competing with the original dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge that the side extension shares many of the design details of the original dwelling, in the absence of a significant design break, the extension, by virtue of its gable end and additional

bulk, would harmfully disrupt the balance and symmetry of form between no 395 and no 393. As such, the extension would not appear sufficiently subordinate and would be detrimental to the appearance of the main dwelling and the wider street scene.

6. The Council's Extending Your Home – A Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted 2003) (SPG) provides advice and guidance on extensions. It sets out principles for the design of 2-storey side extensions to ensure that they protect the character of the surrounding area. The side extension would fail to accord with those principles by virtue of its lack of a 1 m setback at first floor, no set down in ridge height, and by not matching the existing roof form.
7. The proposed rear dormer is flat roofed and would extend across both the existing roof and that of the side extension. The dormer would not reflect the existing character of the roof and would appear as an incongruous addition, dominating the roof when viewed from Sherbourne Crescent. The proposal would not, therefore, accord with the SPG which states that large box dormers on the rear roof slope are unacceptable. The Council does not object to the single storey elements of the proposals, and I see no reason to disagree.
8. Overall, however, the proposal would 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. It would not accord with the advice within the SPG insofar as it states that it is important to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the design and character of the existing house and of the surrounding area. Moreover, the development would be inconsistent with the provisions 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

9. My attention has been drawn to other examples of 2-storey side extensions to semi-detached dwellings in the local area. The full circumstances leading to those developments are not before me and they do not form a reason, on their own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and have concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out.

Conclusion

10. 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.
11. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR