



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2024

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30.01.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/23/3333108
26 Ringwood Highway, Coventry CV2 2GF

- 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 Kevin Howse against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2023/0001001/HHA, dated 2 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2023.
 - The proposed development is a two storey side extension (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact on (a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 24 Ringwood Highway.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey end of terrace property which lies on the corner of Ringwood Highway and Kentmere Close. It is within a residential area, including both terraced and semi-detached properties of similar age and appearance. The original dwelling on the appeal site is set back from both front and side boundaries and the two-storey extension, which has already been built, is sited to the side of the dwelling between its flank elevation and the side boundary along Kentmere Close which is marked by a 1.8 metre fence.

Character and appearance

4. Whilst the extension can be viewed within the street scenes of both Ringwood Highway and Kentmere Close it does not extend forward of the front elevation of the original dwelling. It has been constructed with long 'catslide' roofs to front and rear with a ridge height just below that of the host dwelling and set towards the rear section of the side elevation. The slope of the roof does not mirror that of the host dwelling, being of a steeper pitch, however, it is of pitched design and constructed of matching facing bricks and roof tiles and overall, I do not consider that it appears wholly at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling. Furthermore, whilst it does have a large roof element, it remains subservient in size and appearance.
5. The flank wall is set back from the side boundary retaining a reasonable gap such that it does not appear overly dominating in views along Kentmere Close. I note that the set-back distance does not accord with that set out in the

Council's Householder Design Guidance SPD (2023) (HDG SPD) but there is an extant permission for a single storey side extension of a similar width, details of which the Appellant provided (HH/2021/2545). Whilst noting that corner plots such as the appeal site provide more 'openness' in contrast to the continuous built frontages of the terraces of dwellings along Ringwood Highway, due to its lower overall height and set back position, the extension does not detract from this character to an unacceptable degree.

6. I therefore find that the proposal is not harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It thereby accords with Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (adopted 2017) (CLP) which seeks development of high-quality design that respects and enhances the local identity and character of an area.
7. I also find that it would satisfy the aims and objectives of the HDG SPD which recommends that extensions respect the main building and, in the case of side extensions, are proportionate additions that are normally subservient with a lower ridge height and complementary roof pitch, style and materials.

Living conditions

8. No 24 Ringwood Highway is located on the other corner of Kentmere Close opposite the appeal site. Whilst the flank elevation of the extension at the appeal site is set back from the boundary with Kentmere Close, the first floor window that has been inserted in this elevation provides a direct view towards the rear garden of this property, in particular, a view of the currently private patio and garden area immediately to the rear the dwelling.
9. This direct view, which I was able to see at the time of my site visit, results in a significant loss of privacy for this adjoining property. As this is currently the only window that serves the first floor bedroom within the roofspace of the extension, it is not appropriate to require it to be obscurely glazed which otherwise would have mitigated this impact. The Appellant refers to a previously existing flank window but this was set further away from the boundary and was considerably smaller.
10. As such the extension results in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No. 24 Ringwood Highway. It thus conflicts with Policy DE1 of the CLP which seeks to ensure that development respects its surroundings. It also fails to satisfy guidance in the HDG SPD which seeks to prevent the material loss of amenity in relation to eroding privacy.

Conclusions

11. I have taken into account the National Planning Policy Framework but find, for the reasons set out above, that the development fails to accord with its policies that seek well designed development that is sympathetic to the surrounding built environment. Whilst acknowledging the benefits of the enhanced accommodation provided by the extension this does not outweigh the harm identified.
12. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR