



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/21/3282500

Quinton Parade, Quinton Park, Coventry CV3 5HW

- 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 Cheylesmore Enterprises Ltd against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref FUL/2020/2817, dated 4 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of 16 apartments as an additional floor on an existing mixed use building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises the construction of 13 apartments. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and area; and
 - The effect of the proposed development upon the safe and efficient operation of the highway network.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is formed of a three storey U shaped building located within a local centre containing retail and commercial uses at ground floor with apartments above. Within the central courtyard is a car park which is available for occupiers of the development and third parties via paid parking permits.
5. A retail parade extends along Daventry Road comprising two and a half and three storey buildings. The wider area is characterised by typical two storey suburban housing development. The road serving the retail parade and the surrounding roads on the northern side of Daventry Road are subject to daytime parking restrictions.

6. Quinton Parade has a simple appearance largely constructed from brick with rendered sections. Its architecture has a noticeable rhythm and verticality resulting from the window alignment and rendered sections creating visual interest. The appeal property sits on the junction with Daventry Road which due to the width of the road and Quinton Park opposite results in a sense of spaciousness.
7. The proposed development would add an additional floor to the building covered in a dark grey metal cladding. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be set in from the front walls and has been designed to contrast to the host building. However, its overall form and appearance would result in an overly dominant and unsympathetic addition, harming the appearance of the host property. Given the degree of openness that exists the proposed development would be visually prominent when viewed from street level. As such, the proposal would be a visually prominent and intrusive feature within the area.
8. There are examples of where modern development can sit comfortably side-by-side more traditional architecture. However, the proposed development would neither reflect the character of the host building nor would it be truly architecturally different. The size and position of the windows would bear no relationship with the alignment and size of the windows of the host property, nor would they be an appropriate contrast to the floors below resulting in a disjointed appearance. This would lead to an uncomfortable juxtaposition between the host property and the proposed development resulting in visual confusion harming the appearance of Quinton Parade and the area.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and area contrary to the Coventry Local Plan (2017) (LP) Policy DE1 which, amongst other things, seeks high quality design that respects and enhances its surroundings and positively contributes towards local identity and character. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, advises that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Safe and efficient operation of the highway network

10. The Council's LP parking standards sets out a maximum requirement for 15 spaces for residents and visitors. The development proposes no spaces therefore it is deficient of parking spaces.
11. At the time of my visit on a weekday morning, I observed significant pressure for parking in front of Quinton Parade, the retail parade on Daventry Road and on the verge in front of dwellings along Quinton Park. On surrounding roads including Blondvil Street and Mary Herbert Street, which are not subject to parking restrictions, I observed less parking demand and on street parking availability. Whilst I acknowledge that this is a snapshot in time, based on my observations and the information before me, it is evident that the availability of on street parking is at a premium in the area resulting from uses in the area, particularly during the day.
12. The appellant contends that spaces are available within the courtyard which future occupiers would be able to rent. Whilst currently roughly half the spaces are available future occupiers would have to pay a monthly fee for a space. This is likely to deter many occupiers from parking in the courtyard thereby

displacing cars onto the surrounding roads. Furthermore, businesses in the parade and other local occupiers are also able to rent these spaces therefore there is no certainty that they would be available for occupiers of the proposed development.

13. I acknowledge that the appellant's parking survey indicates that spaces are available in the area. However, the proposed development, due to the number of individual occupiers and my concerns regarding the onsite parking arrangements, would generate additional vehicle movements and parking demand around Quinton Parade where demand is already high.
14. Whilst some occupiers may be content to park along Blondvil Street and Mary Herbert Street, not everyone will, and occupiers are more likely to park as close as possible to their dwelling for convenience and security, particularly late at night or during inclement weather. This is likely to result in more instances of residents and visitors looking to park in the immediate area around Quinton Parade.
15. I note lower usage in Daventry Road, Quinton Road, Franciscan Road and Carthusian Road but given they are subject to daytime parking restrictions combined with their distance from the site future residents would be unlikely to park along these roads.
16. Despite the site being accessible to local services, facilities and public transport the shortfall of onsite spaces and the number of apartments proposed would, in my judgement, displace resident's and visitor vehicles onto the area around Quinton Parade. This would result in inconsiderate and indiscriminate parking hindering the use of pavements and roads.
17. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably affect the safe and efficient operation of the highway network. It would not accord with LP Policy AC3 which, amongst other things, seeks to manage additional traffic movements and car parking.

Other Matters

18. Whilst the Council's Urban Design and Highway Officers did not raise concerns to the application this does not alter my findings in respect of the main issues.
19. I acknowledge that the proposed development would lead to construction jobs and the availability of housing. However, these factors would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
20. I note that representations were made by local occupants raising additional concerns. However, given my findings, it is not necessary to consider these matters in detail.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR