

Appeal Decision

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

Decision by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip Up MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/22/3290349

24 Beanfield Avenue, Coventry, Warwickshire CV3 6NU

- 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 Kamal Vinning against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2021/3200, dated 18 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a proposed first floor side/rear addition -resubmission of HH/2021/0348.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Procedural Matter

3. In the interest of clarity, I have determined the appeal on the basis of drawing BA/2020/004.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, located within an established traditional residential area. There are a number of properties which have been altered. Nonetheless, the area is predominantly characterised by properties of a similar scale, age and appearance. Numbers 24 and 22 Beanfield Avenue were built with a hipped roof form. However, number 22 has been extended with a first-floor side addition whose roof is gabled. The extension is set back from the frontage and is positioned just off the boundary.
6. Despite this particular extension , and several other side extensions nearby,, gaps have been retained, for the most part, between the pairs of semi-detached properties, providing the street with a spacious and open character.
7. The proposed first floor side extension would be set down from the roof and retain a hipped roof form. The main part of the extension would only be set

back 300mm back from the front elevation, less than the 1m requirement of the Supplementary Planning Document, 'Extending Your Home A Design Guide' (2003) (SPD).

8. The rear part of the side extension would extend up to the boundary, reducing the visual gap at first floor between Nos 24 and 26. Whilst this projection is set back from the frontage, it would be clearly visible from the highway and would appear incongruous in the context of the general pattern of gaps between semi-detached units in the street scene. This would also be contrary to the advice set out in the SPD, which advises that a 500mm minimum gap is required to protect the character of a given residential area and prevent the perception of linking between non-terraced houses.
9. Moreover, the combination of the differing side projection elements and three different ridge heights results in an awkward design, which would detract from the original simple form of the appeal property.
10. There are a number of examples of extensions projecting up to the boundary within the vicinity of the site, including at the neighbouring property. The appellant refers specifically to No 101 Wainbody Avenue South¹, and the plans show an existing first floor projection on the boundary. The proposal was for a minor rear addition to the existing projection, which is not directly comparable with the proposal before me.
11. In further support of the appeal, photographs of other properties in the area that have already been extended in a similar manner to that proposed were also provided. I do not know the circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. In any event, those that I saw served to confirm that building to the boundary reduces the roof level gaps, changing the nature of the relationship between the semi-detached properties so that they appear like a terrace, reducing the spacious nature of the street to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
12. I conclude therefore that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DE1 of the Local Plan (2016), which seeks to ensure that development complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area, in addition to the guidance given in the SPD as set out above. This policy is consistent with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.
13. The Council refer to LP Policy H5, however this policy relates to 'Managing Existing Housing Stock' and is not specifically relevant to the proposal before me.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge that the appellant made a complaint to the planning department regarding a lack of engagement and response from the officers. This is a matter between the parties and does not influence the planning merits of the case before me.

¹ Planning application number HH/2020/0391, granted 6/4/20

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Louise Nurser

INSPECTOR