
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/22/3305514
72 Alpine Rise, Coventry CV3 6NR

- 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 Palwinder Bains against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2022/0791, dated 26 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2022.
 - The development is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 72 Alpine Rise, Coventry CV3 6NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2022/0791, dated 26 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location Plan C490/010, Site and Block Plan C490/011, Existing Floor Plan and Elevations C490/012 and Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations C490/013.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision letter describes the single storey rear extension as retrospective. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the single storey rear extension had been constructed. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at Nos. 70 and 74 Alpine Rise with particular regard to light, overshadowing and outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey extended mid terrace dwelling with a relatively long and narrow enclosed rear garden. The single storey rear extension extends across the full width of the dwelling and projects out by about 4m from the rear elevation with a mono-pitched roof with a maximum height of about 3.7m. I observed on my site visit that a number of the nearby dwellings have single storey rear extensions of varying styles and designs that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the dwellings.

5. The single storey rear extension is located adjacent to the two storey terraced properties at Nos. 70 and 74 Alpine Rise (Nos. 70 and 74), to the north-west and south-east of the site, respectively. The row of terrace properties at Nos. 76-80 Alpine Rise immediately to the south-east of the site are set further back within their individual plots than Nos. 70 and 74.
6. The adjoining property at No. 70 has a recently constructed single storey rear extension of a similar design to the appeal scheme. The adjoining unextended property at No. 74 has a ground floor living room and kitchen leading out to a small patio area and enclosed garden area at the rear. The rear extension projects out along the common shared boundaries with Nos. 70 and 74 and is separated from the rooms and gardens at the rear of the adjacent properties by a high close boarded fence running between the properties.
7. Whilst I accept that there is some impact from the development, given the modest overall scale, design and layout of the development, together with the boundary treatment, the separation distance between the properties and the orientation of the buildings, I consider that the rear extension does not result in significant loss of light and overshadowing to the main habitable rooms and gardens at the rear of Nos. 70 and 74, nor significantly dominate the views to cause an overbearing effect and an unacceptable sense of enclosure at the rear of Nos. 70 and 74. The outlook at the rear of No. 74 is already toward the high boundary fence and the brick gabled side elevation of the two storey property at No. 76 and the appeal site is separated by the existing garden areas at the rear of Nos. 70 and 74.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the rear extension does not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at Nos. 70 and 74 Alpine Rise with particular regard to light, overshadowing and outlook. It is consistent with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Document: Extending your Home - a Design Guide 2003 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development, including extensions, create high quality design that respect and enhance their surroundings, including the residential environment of neighbouring properties. In addition, it accords with the National Planning Policy Framework that development should seek to create places that promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users (paragraph 130).

Conditions

9. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 56, I have specified the approved plans as a planning condition as this is necessary to provide certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR