



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/22/3291747

59 Ullswater Road, Coventry CV3 2DH

- 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 J McKiernan against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref FUL/2021/3117, dated 12 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 3 dwellings with garages.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In both the Officer Report and the Statement of Case of the Council, no objection has been raised to Plots 1 & 2 which are the plots on the Ullswater Road frontage of the site. The concerns of the Council relate to Plot 3 at the rear of the site. I find no reason to question the Council's assessment and will therefore concentrate my report on Plot 3.

Main Issue

3. In light of the above, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular reference to Plot 3 of the proposed development.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a predominately residential area made up of a mix of dwelling types. The dwelling currently located on the site is a single storey dwelling in a sizable plot. An access track runs to the rear of the site and beyond that are the rear gardens of the Loweswater Road properties.
5. The appeal proposal would see the demolition of the existing bungalow, and the construction of three dwellings with garages. An access road would be created between Plots 1 and 2 to allow access to Plot 3 and the garages for all three plots.
6. Plots 1 and 2 are frontage development and I have no concerns with the principal and layout of those dwellings as stated above. The street scene displays a relatively consistent pattern of development and uniformity which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

7. Plot 3 of the appeal proposal would result in a dwelling which does not front the road. This would be incongruent to the established pattern of development of the area. The appeal proposal would result in an incongruous form of development which would fail to reflect the established character of its surroundings and the area in general.
8. Whilst the proposed Plot 3 development would not be readily visible from any public vantage point, it would be highly visible from neighbouring properties and gardens.
9. The proposed siting of Plot 3 siting would be at odds with the prevailing built form and layout of the estate. Backland and tandem developments are not, having walked around the estate, particularly evident or common features of the estate.
10. I acknowledge the built-up nature of the surrounding area. Be that as it may, this is not reason to allow development on a site that fails to respond to this residential setting. I find that Plot 3 of the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
11. I find that the siting and layout of the proposed Plot 3 dwelling to the rear of two proposed frontage dwellings would fail to respect the prevailing character, layout and form of the locality.
12. As such, I find conflict with Policies DE1 and H3 of the Coventry Local Plan (2016) which, collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to respond to the physical context of the site, respect and enhance landscape features of value and must provide a high-quality residential environment and overall enhances the built environment.
13. I also find conflict with the design and amenity guidance set out in the New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge the appellant's reference to similar nearby developments. However, those cases are not directly comparable to the case before me as they are set within an entirely different context and are not an equal comparison to the scheme before me.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR