

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022

**by David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17 October 2022.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/22/3293744**

**11 Ellis Park Drive, Coventry CV3 2UG**

- 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 Colin Roper against the decision of Coventry City Council.
  - The application Ref HH/2021/3519, dated 30 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2022.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side and two storey rear extension and alterations.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor side and two storey rear extension and alterations at 11 Ellis Park Drive, Coventry CV3 2UG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. HH/2021/3519, dated 30 November 2021 subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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:

Site Location Plan, 9106-01 Rev A and 9106-03 Rev A.
  - 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.

## Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's Decision Notice rather than the Application Form as it is a more accurate reflection of the scheme.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.
-

## Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached house located on a modern housing estate which is home to dwellings of a variety of styles and sizes.
5. The proposal seeks to increase the size of the existing bathroom and adjacent bedroom of the dwelling by changing the existing catslide roof which sits next to the main projecting gable of the host dwelling by continuing the main ridge and introducing two traditional dormer windows. The proposal also includes a two storey extension spanning the full width of the rear of the dwelling, projecting some 3420mm from the existing main rear elevation. The Council raises no issue with this element of the scheme and from what I could see, I have no reason to disagree.
6. The Council's main concern relates to the alterations to the front elevation, suggesting that the continuation of the main ridge would add significant bulk to the roofline.
7. I am mindful that the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance titled '*Extending Your House*' (SPG) recommends that for first floor side extensions on non-terraced houses, the ridge height should be lowered in conjunction with a set-back of at least 1 metre from the main front wall. In this instance, the extension would be set well back from the main projecting gable of the host dwelling. Whilst the ridge of the main body of the dwelling would be continued rather than set down, the two dormers proposed would be well proportioned and they would sit comfortably in the context of the existing fenestration. As a result, I am satisfied that the extension would not appear overly bulky.
8. The existing dwelling sits directly on the boundary shared with the neighbouring dwelling, No. 9 Ellis Park Drive. However, this neighbouring house sits off the boundary with its front elevation angled away from the appeal dwelling. As a result, I am satisfied that adequate separation would remain at first floor level and there would be no threat of a terracing effect. Although the Council asserts there are no similar extensions within the local area, it is home to a wide variety of house types and I am satisfied that the extended dwelling would sit comfortably within this context.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would respect the scale and form of the host dwelling along with the character and appearance of the street scene. In such terms, I find no conflict with the overall aims of policies DE1 and H5 of the adopted Coventry City Council Local Plan or the SPG.

## Conditions

10. In addition to the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and direct that development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, the Council has suggested one other condition in the event that the appeal succeeds. I agree that a condition to ensure the external materials of the extension match those of the host dwelling is necessary in order to ensure a visually acceptable development. In allowing the appeal, I shall impose these conditions.

*David Fitzsimon* INSPECTOR