



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/24/3337491

190 Barkers Butts Lane, Coventry CV6 1EU

- 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 Gurmukh Singh against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref: PL/2023/0002013/HHA, dated 22 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2023.
 - The development is a single storey entrance porch and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On my site visit I observed that the proposed development had taken place and was complete. The development has been carried out in accordance with the plans before me and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. Since the decision was made by the Council, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published (19 December 2023). This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.
4. I have altered the description of development in the banner above, from that contained in the application, to remove superfluous wording which are not acts of development.
5. The Council has stated in the decision notice and in some parts of its officer's delegated report that the Coventry City Council Local Plan was adopted in 2016, yet the evidence provided, including the front cover of the local plan, shows it was adopted in December 2017. I have had regard to the adopted Coventry City Council Local Plan (2017) (LP) in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with hipped roof and two-storey projecting bay to front, with gable above. The dwelling is set back from Barkers Butts Lane, behind an area of parking. No.192 Barkers Butts Lane (No.192) is the semi-detached pairing, and has been extended to its side

over two stories. The surrounding area comprises predominantly two-storey properties. While there is some variety in dwelling type and design, there is a general sense of uniformity. Front projecting bay windows, over two stories, are a prevailing feature of this particular length and side of Barkers Butts Lane, which add a regular and uniformed, vertical rhythm and character to the dwellings.

8. The development relates to a porch and canopy to the front elevation. The development projects forward across the width of the dwelling and, consequently, forward of the two-storey bay window. The canopy adds a horizontal design feature to the dwelling. This contrasts markedly with the vertical emphasis of the bay window and results in a dilution of its prominence, resulting in an incongruous addition to the dwelling. While the development is modest in scale, its projection across the width of the front elevation results in a disruption to the vertical rhythm of development along this part of Barkers Butts Lane and, as such, appears alien within the streetscene and at odds with its surroundings. I note the level of street furniture and planting to the front of the appeal site, however the dwelling remains clearly visible in the public realm, and I do not find these to lessen the prominence and harmful effect that the development has on the dwelling and wider area.
9. There are a number of single-storey front projections in the area. These appear to be limited to small porches, of varying design, which do not link to, or project from, a bay window feature. Others project from dwellings which do not have a projecting bay window. The side extension to No.192 has imbalanced the scale of the semi-detached pairing, however it does not project forward of the front building line, or alter the bay window. Therefore, that extension has not eroded the prevailing vertical rhythm within the streetscene. For these reasons, I do not find existing developments in the area to be directly comparable to the appeal development. In any event, I have considered the appeal on its merits.
10. Therefore, the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with Policies DE1 and H5 of the LP, and the Framework which, amongst other matters, require development to achieve high quality design, and to respect and enhance the surrounding residential environment. The development also conflicts with the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) which requires that a clear separation be retained between a bay window and a front porch or extension.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR