



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2023

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date :25th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/23/3326491
13 Morris Avenue, Coventry CV2 5GU

- 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 Raj Sohal against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref: PL/2023/0000580/HHA dated 21 March 2023 was refused by notice dated 15 May 2023.
 - The application is for erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in early September 2023 whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey bow fronted end terrace property within this relatively tight knit area of suburban expansion in the city of Coventry. The property forms an end to a relatively consistent row of houses all exhibiting similar architectural features and materials and, in turn, they form a long terrace that is characteristic of the area as a whole.
5. The property sits on the corner of Morris Avenue and Newey Road, which is another street of terrace properties that forms a visually related streetscene. The appeal property has previously been extended with a two storey side and rear extension along with a single storey side extension and detached garage which for some reason appears to have a very large roof form. Despite this much of the garden area of the plot is maintained and remains relatively open, albeit bounded by high hedges.

6. The proposal before me seeks to extend upon the previous ground floor extension and tie into the rear two storey extension. The proposal would accommodate a bedroom and wc to ground floor with a further bedroom to the first floor thereby making the property a five bedroom house. Materials would match the existing and a generous set back of the front elevation would enable this break in material age to be managed. The set back would also enable the ridge of the proposed extension to be set down from the ridge of the host property.
7. In assessing this appeal I give great weight to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for residential extensions that gives valuable guidance on the design of new extensions on corner plots so as to ensure the design of an area is preserved and the hierarchy of a street is similarly respected.
8. In the case before me the main point of contention appears to be the prominence of the first floor extension and the appearance of an added encroachment towards Newey Road as a result. This would manifest in a gap of around one metre being retained between the house and the road and not the two metres as required by the SPG. The Council feel that this encroachment along with the past cumulations and the scale and massing of the proposed extension would cause harm to the openness and character of the area as a result.
9. I saw on my site visit that this area of early suburban development is relatively tightly packed, whereby houses are aligned in terraces along their respective street frontages. Despite this, nearly all houses maintain generous gardens both to the front and rear and although terrace forms create very strong front building lines, to the rears the plethora of gardens retain a sense of openness.
10. The proposal before me would however further enclose the streetscene here through a greater extent of development around the junction of Morris Avenue and Newey Road. In so doing the streetscene would be further encroached upon with built form and a kind of pinch point would be created at this junction as well as a noticeable further protrusion over the perceived building line of Newey Road. The dominance of built form here would therefore be compounded by the one metre set in from the side boundary. Through extending so far to the side the proposed extension would therefore be noticeably closer to the road edge and as such the impact of the extension would be greater.
11. In assessing the impact of this change I consider that harm would occur that would aggravate the impact of the existing extensions and, the cumulative harm created through this extension and the previous modifications, would cause harm to the openness and character of the wider streetscene. Despite the landscaping apparently being retained the visible presence of a greater mass of development at two storeys at this prominent location would add to what is already a highly built up and enclosed area, especially when seen from Newey Road.
12. In light of this, although I consider that there could be ways to extend this property in ways that could meet the guidance within the Council's SPG, the proposal before me, on balance, would cause a harmful encroachment upon this junction and would over dominate the streetscene, especially when viewed

from Newey Road. As such, I consider that the proposed extension would fail to conform to Policies H5 and DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan and as such the appeal must fail.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal

A Graham

INSPECTOR