
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip Up MRTPA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/22/3291150

18 Kings Park Drive, Coventry CV3 2UJ

- 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 Dan Tidman against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/3301, dated 5 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor extension to rear, dormer to rear elevation and new rooflights to existing roof to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the dormer to rear elevation and new rooflights to existing roof to front elevation. I allow the appeal however, insofar as it relates to the ground floor extension to the rear at 18 Kings Park Drive, Coventry CV3 2UJ in accordance with the terms of the application ref HH/2021/3301, dated 13 January 2022 subject to the following conditions.
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1256.01, 1256.04B, 1256.05A.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the rear elevation and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is located within a wider modern residential development and is visible from public vantage points to the side and rear. The surrounding properties have pitched roofs and pitched front gables are part of the overall

design. Pitched dormers punctuate the eaves line and where there are true dormers these are small with pitched roofs and do not dominate the roofscape.

5. In contrast, whilst set slightly down from the ridge, up from the eaves and in from both sides, the proposed rear dormer would be substantial in scale, measuring approximately 7.5m in width and 2.5m in height. The materials proposed would match the existing property, however, the resultant visual impact would still be significant, and the dormer would overwhelm the existing rear elevation and dominate the rear roof plane. Consequently, it would not appear sympathetic to the host dwelling and would result in a significant adverse visual impact when viewed from Ellis Park Drive to the north and Stradey Close to the rear.
6. The dormer would be considerably larger than the existing dormers on nearby properties, which are carefully designed to remain in keeping with their surroundings. The dormer would also be larger than recommended by the detailed advice given in the Supplementary Planning Document, 'Extending Your Home A Design Guide' (2003) (SPD), which is intended to limit the scale, mass and proportions of dormers, having regard to the local distinctive character of the area.
7. This advice is not policy; however, it provides guidance with regards to the requirements of Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (2016) (LP), which seeks to ensure that, amongst other matters, development respects and enhances their surroundings and positively contribute towards the local identity and character of an area.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the visual impact of the proposed dormer would adversely harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with the high-quality design requirements of LP Policy DE1 as set out above, in addition to advice set out in the SPD. This policy and advice are consistent with the high-quality design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and National Design Guide.
9. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the single storey rear extension. From everything which I have seen and read, I have no reason to disagree and find that there is no conflict in this regard with LP Policy DE1 as set out above.
10. The Council refer to LP Policy H5 in the delegated report, however this policy relates to 'Managing Existing Housing Stock' and is not specifically relevant to the proposal before me.

Other Matters

11. The rear dormer would not harm the living conditions of neighbours. However, this is to be expected of any well-designed development and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
12. I acknowledge that the proposal would result in additional accommodation for the appellant. However, this is a private benefit.
13. The appellant refers to an alternative design suggested by the Council. No drawings of this scheme are before me to compare and in any case, I am required to consider the scheme submitted to and refused by the Council.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in relation to the dormer to rear elevation and new rooflights to the existing roof to front elevation, which are indivisible. However, in relation to the ground floor extension to the rear, I conclude, subject to the conditions detailed at the beginning of this decision letter, this appeal should be allowed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed in relation to the ground floor rear extension and dismissed in relation to the dormer to the rear elevation and new rooflights to existing roof to front elevation.

Louise Nurser

INSPECTOR