
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/22/3306762
119 Canley Road, Coventry CV5 6AR

- 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 Paul Woodward against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2022/0674, dated 15 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side and rear extension at 119 Canley Rd, Coventry CV5 6AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HH/2022/0674, dated 15 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 119CAN/1, 119/CAN/2 and 119/CAN3.
 - 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. The appellant has confirmed that the appeal is made in the name of Mr Paul Woodward rather than Miss Helen Owen as stated on the submitted planning appeal form. This change has been confirmed in writing by the appellant and I have determined the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 121 Canley Road with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property at No. 119 Canley Road (No. 119) is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey pitched roof extension and garage at the rear. The proposal would entail the construction of a single storey side and rear extension set back from the front elevation of the host property and set down with a low pitched tiled roof. The side extension would be set in from the

common shared side boundary with the adjacent detached bungalow at No. 121 that is set further forward than No. 119. The proposal would also involve the construction of a car port at the side that the appellant has indicated would be used as a covered storage area.

5. The adjacent property at No. 121, immediately to the south of the site, has a conservatory leading out to a patio area and enclosed garden area at the rear. The proposed extension would be set back from the nearest ground floor windows to the habitable rooms at the rear of No. 121 and would be separated by an access way, brick boundary wall, high mature hedge and trees running along the boundary between the properties.
6. Whilst I accept that there would some impact from the development, given the modest overall scale, design and layout of the development, set back and set down, together with the boundary treatment, the separation distance between the properties and the orientation of the buildings, I consider that the proposed extension would not result in significant loss of light to the main habitable rooms and garden at the rear of No. 121, nor significantly dominate the views to cause an overbearing effect and an unacceptable sense of enclosure at the rear of No. 121. The outlook at the rear of No. 121 is already toward the high mature boundary vegetation, two storey side elevation of the appeal property and the extension and garage at the rear of No. 119. The proposed extension would be separated by the boundary wall and access way at the side of No. 119 and the mature boundary vegetation and garden area at the rear of No.121.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed extension would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 121 Canley Road with particular regard to light and outlook. It would be 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 would accord 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

8. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 56, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.

Conclusion

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR