

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

**by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 7<sup>th</sup> November 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/23/3324638**

**17 Thomas Sharp Street, Coventry CV4 8DQ**

- 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 R Liu against the decision of Coventry City Council.
  - The application Ref PL/2023/0000317/HHA, dated 10 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2023.
  - The development proposed is extensions to property comprising single storey front, two storey side and a two storey rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. The applicant's name is not provided on the application form and, therefore, I have relied on the name given on the appeal form for the purposes of the above heading.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the street scene.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace two storey dwelling in a residential road of similar property types and some maisonettes and apartment buildings. The surrounding area is residential in character.
  5. Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (2017) seeks to ensure high quality design and requires that all development proposals must respect and enhance their surroundings and positively contribute towards the local identity and character of an area.
  6. The Council's *Extending Your Home – A design guide* supplementary planning guidelines (SPG) indicates that for front extensions proposals must be sympathetic and complimentary to their surroundings and adding extra space at the front of a property needs the most careful attention because of its potential impact upon the street scene. It also states that all side extensions should have a pitched roof with materials and slope matching the existing
-

- house; and extensions at the side should not extend beyond the established front building lines of the house, unless part of the established character of the area.
7. My attention is drawn to an unsuccessful appeal for similar extensions to the front and side of No 17<sup>1</sup>. As such, the decision is material to the current appeal and I have had regard to it.
  8. Properties in the terrace of which No 17 is part are laid out on a consistent front building line and the dwellings in this and the other terraces are largely unchanged with only the addition of canopies and porches visible to the front. The terraces and other buildings are laid out on staggered building lines and, as the Inspector noted in the earlier appeal, there are appreciable gaps between the blocks of terraces and other built forms. For these reasons, there is a good degree of uniformity in the street scene with the original planned design and layout still readily apparent.
  9. The proposal involves a two storey extension to the side of the appeal property, but forward of the front building line, with a single storey part stepped down from this. The main element visible from the front would be subordinate in height to the host dwelling and would have a similar pitched roof. However, the position of the extension would upset the uniformity of the terrace by introducing considerable bulk beyond the established building line. Moreover, the design of the proposal would add to its incongruous and uncharacteristic appearance. In particular, the single and two storey flat-roofed elements would not respect the existing pitched roof forms and the lack of windows in the front and side elevations would present featureless blank walls to the public realm. This would not reflect the balanced and uniform approach to fenestration in the front elevation of the terrace and so would not represent good design.
  10. As in the earlier appeal, while the extensions would not project beyond the adjacent building, they would nonetheless be highly visible within the street scene, from where the harmful effects described would readily be apparent. I agree also with the Inspector in the earlier appeal, that the extent and position of the extensions would have an erosive effect on the pattern and layout of development by materially reducing the distinct gap between the terrace and adjacent building. The appellant refers to other examples of extensions within the surrounding area, but there are no similar additions to those proposed here within the immediate street scene. Consequently, any other extensions within the wider area are not sufficient reason to set aside the findings of harm in this case.
  11. I am not aware that the Council raises any concerns about the proposed rear extension and I consider this to be a proportionate and subordinate addition that would not be harmful. Nonetheless, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed front and side extensions would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, the proposal is contrary in this regard to Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan and to the SPG, described above.

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/U4610/W/20/3247846, dated 7 August 2020.

12. I have had regard to the representation made by an interested party concerning the effect of the proposal on living conditions. However, this does not raise any matters in addition to the main issue that would result in a different overall conclusion in this case.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Bell-Williamson*

INSPECTOR