The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/22/3310259
24 Cannon Close, Coventry CV4 7AS

- 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 Sukvinder Sandhu against the decision of Coventry City Council.
- The application Ref HH/2022/1540, dated 6 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2022.
- The development proposed is two storey rear extension, part ground floor side extensions, loft conversion, and internal and external alterations including new feature windows to front and rear (Amendment Scheme HH/2020/1769 - Approved 30/09/2020; increase gable height, alteration to windows and render property).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling located in a relatively spacious landscaped plot in a mature well-established residential area.

5. Cannon Close is characterised by detached properties of varied styles and design set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. These properties, despite some variations, are predominantly constructed in brickwork facades and a similar palette of materials which gives the area a strong unifying character and appearance. Some properties have distinctive central gable features projecting from the front that are either aligned or slightly lower than eaves line of the properties which positively contribute to their character.

6. The appeal site has an extensive planning history. The appeal proposal seeks to amend the previously approved scheme (ref HH/2020/1769) relating to

proposals to extend the property to include, amongst other things, an increase in the ridge height of the central front projecting gable and the full off-white rendering of the external facades of the property.

7. The use of full rendering on the main facades of the property would be very much at odds with the older more traditional character and appearance of many of the properties in the area. Although set down below the main ridge line of the host property, the increased scale and height of the front projecting gable would create an awkward design and unsympathetic appearance when set against the distinctive central front projecting gable features in the area.

8. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Cannon Close. The contrasting use of render and timber cladding materials contribute to the overall scale of the proposed elevational alterations and the central front projecting gable, giving it particular prominence in relation to its surroundings. As such, I consider that the proposed alterations would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that would adversely harm rather than positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

9. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design of the proposed development has been carefully considered and redesigned in order to minimise any impacts on the area. However, whilst the use of some matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.

10. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the various examples of residential properties using render on the external facades of the properties are a different scale and form to the appeal proposal and are unrepresentative of the overall character and appearance of the area. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases.

11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Document: Extending your Home - a Design Guide 2003. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development proposals and extensions or other alterations to residential properties demonstrate a high quality design that respects and enhances the surrounding residential environment and positively contribute towards the local identity and character of an area. In addition, the proposal would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 126) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 130).

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR