
Appeal Decision

Site visit made 16 May 2024

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/24/3341539

26 Newey Road, Coventry, CV2 5HA

- 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 Sivasubramaniam Suthakaran against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2024/0000113/HHA, dated 15 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is the formation of four new windows to side elevation and new dormer to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of four new windows to side elevation and new dormer to rear at 26 Newey Road, Coventry, CV2 5HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/0000113/HHA, dated 15 January 2024, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house located on a residential street. A single and two storey rear extension has previously been granted planning permission and has been completed. At the time of my site visit the development the subject of this appeal had also been completed. Two other dwellings in the same terrace had similar dormer roof extensions.
 4. The Council raises no concerns regarding the four windows in the side elevation facing No 24 and I agree that these are acceptable. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the rear roof dormer. Both the Council and the appellant point out that a similar dormer could be built under permitted development rights. However, in this case the presence of the pitched roof of the two storey rear extension, which adjoins the original roof, and the fact that the dormer has not been finished in materials similar to those used in the
-

construction of the roof of the original dwelling meant that a full planning application was required.

5. The proposed dormer is set in about 1m from the end of the terrace and is barely visible in oblique views from Newey Road due to the presence of an intervening chimney. It is set in about 0.5m from the adjoining dwelling, No 28, and up about 0.2m from the rear eaves, where these remain above the single storey rear extension. It is not higher than the original roof and cannot be seen from the front of the dwelling.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Householder Design Guide (SPD), adopted 2023, states in Principle 6 that rear dormer windows should be of a proportionate scale and subservient to the main roof. It explains that this can be achieved by ensuring that the dormer is set in from the sides with its front face set up from the eaves to ensure it does not appear as an extension to the first floor. The guidance goes on to explain in paragraph 4.19 that acceptable solutions may include, amongst other things, ensuring dormers do not come within 0.7m of the side boundary of the roof slope and 1m measured from the eaves line and vertically along the roof slope.
7. In the appeal case the dormer does not come within 0.7m of the side boundary of the roof slope at the end of the terrace and the 0.5m inset from the boundary with the roof of No 28 provides a clear separation, ensuring it is seen as a roof extension. Although less than 1m, the set up from the eaves allows for the dormer to be seen as clearly separate from the rear elevation and to be read as a roof addition, rather than an extension of the first floor.
8. In my view, although not strictly in accordance with the dimensions set out in the SPD explanatory paragraphs, the dormer would achieve the aims of proportionate scale and subservience through appropriate set-ins, as described in Principle 6 of the SPD. Moreover, the presence of the two storey rear extension reduces the prominence of the dormer when seen from the rear, firstly, by obscuring part of it from view, and secondly, by having the effect of making it appear to recede into the background due to the extension's greater scale and closer proximity.
9. Turning to materials, the dormer has been finished in painted render to match the walls of the dwelling, with windows and rainwater goods also matching those used in the main dwelling. The dormer is therefore visually well integrated. Principle 6 of the SPD expects dormer extensions to be of high-quality materials which complement the main roof of the existing dwelling. Whilst materials in this case do not match, they nevertheless complement both the roof and the dwelling as a whole and thus comply. More detailed SPD guidance in explanatory text suggests that an acceptable design solution may include dormer cheeks finished in traditional roofing materials such as lead, tiles or slate. However, whilst these are possible options, I am satisfied that the matching render used on the appeal dormer is both in keeping and complies with Principle 6 of the SPD.
10. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed dormer would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. In consequence, it would comply with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan, 2016 and the National Planning Policy

Framework. Taken together these expect new development to respect and enhance its surroundings and contribute positively towards the character of an area through good architecture that is visually attractive and of high quality.

11. Since the development has been completed neither a statutory commencement condition nor any others are necessary.

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down

INSPECTOR