



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2023

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/23/3314230

25 Harewood Road, Coventry, West Midlands, CV5 8BS

- 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 Mrs Tessa Colledge against the decision of the Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref HH/2022/2302 dated 28 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension together with single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the street scene and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached residential dwelling which is located on the outside of a bend on Harewood Road. As a result of this bend the host dwelling is located in a plot that is narrower at its closest point to the road (the driveway) before progressively widening in the garden to the rear. Whilst one boundary is straight the other boundary, against which the proposed extension would be constructed, is dog-legged with the neighbouring property being at an angle to the host dwelling (an angle stated to be in the region of 30% in the appellant's statement). At the time of my site visit I noted that physical and visual separation between rows and pairs of dwellings is a characteristic of the area. The gap either side of the pair of dwellings that the appeal site is part of is notable with glimpsed views to the trees beyond. The gaps provide a visual break between the rows of terraced dwellings either side.
4. The Supplementary Planning Guidance Extending Your Home 2003 (SPG) notes that each site is unique, and consideration will be given to other factors such as the site surroundings. I note that, when considered in the context of the host dwelling alone, the proposals would provide setback, set down and would provide more than 0.5m from the side boundary but I find that this general guidance is aimed at more uniform boundaries with properties generally being parallel to each other. The site characteristics mean that application of this guidance alone does not, in this case, result in an appropriate form of development. I find that when viewed from the front elevation, head on, the extension appears to extend across the whole plot width visually and that this

- would be the case from general views within the street scene in the vicinity of the proposal. It would be notable in terms of the appearance of the dwelling.
5. I note the applicant has submitted a drawing (0322-22-010 A) with their submissions. Given that this does not attempt to evolve the scheme, but rather has been annotated with regard to view points, I have taken this into account. I find that these drawings demonstrate that the proposed front elevation, facing neighbouring no. 23, would show a gap of 0.85m to the side but this would realistically be visible from a limited and specific viewpoint.
 6. Whilst I note the appellant's comments regarding views I find it cannot reasonably be said that the proposed 0.85m gap is to be able to be appreciated within the wider street scene or general views within it. At the time of my site visit I viewed the site from further down the road, to the Northwest, and still found some limited gap visible though I note the second tier would be stepped back. Closer to the appeal site views from this angle are only shielded by the vegetation to the front boundary. The proposed front elevation facing the appeal side, head on, shows that there would be a complete closure of the existing visual gap with the proposed built form. I find this results in a terracing effect, in most views from within the street scene, which is not alleviated as a result of the step back or hipped roof design.
 7. Due to the orientation of the neighbouring property, and the dog-legged boundary, this would result in the visual gap being filled by the proposal creating a terraced appearance which would merge into the terraced row to the East of the appeal site which would be uncharacteristic. Ultimately the proposed two storey extensions, at their maximum width, are wider than the actual plot width at the front of the property because of the boundary line between the appeal site and no. 23. I find the proposals, cumulatively, present as cramped within the plot and the roof design is overly complex because of attempts to maximise extensions in this area alongside the tapered boundary.
 8. The proposal would be contrary to Coventry City Council Local Plan 2017 Policy DE1 which requires development to respond to the physical context of the site and positively contribute towards local identity and character of an area and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, paragraph 130, which seeks to ensure that developments add the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

9. I note that it is contended that the Council were content with certain elements of the proposal, however, I can only determine the proposal as is before me as per the plans a decision was made upon. In this case the Council's decision notice references plan 0322-22-002 F and 0322-22-003 B. In addition, I note the appellant has stated that further changes were offered, however, these unfortunately cannot be considered as part of the appeal before me.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR