



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2024

**by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 6<sup>th</sup> September 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/24/3346586**

**39 Arnold Avenue, Coventry, CV3 5LW**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Shekhar Hande against the decision of Coventry City Council.
  - The application Ref is PL/2024/0000492/HHA.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey wrap around extension and first floor side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Arnold Avenue.

## Reasons

3. No 39 is a semi-detached house situated on the eastern side of Arnold Avenue. It has a garage to the side which adjoins a similar garage at the neighbouring No 41. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the garage and the erection of a two-storey side extension projecting to the side boundary. The extension would be set back around 0.3 metres from the existing front elevation, and it would have a hipped roof set down a minimal amount from the roof ridge of the main house. In addition to the side extension, there would be a single-storey front extension projecting across from the existing front bay window to the side boundary. This would have a mono-pitch roof and would effectively wrap round the front of the house from the side extension.
4. Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (LP), adopted in 2017, states that all development proposals must respect and enhance their surroundings and positively contribute towards the local identity and character of an area. It also indicates that all development will be expected to respond to the physical context of the site, consider the local distinctiveness and identity of the site, and have regard to opportunities to enhance the local built environment through new development and enhanced design.
5. Principle 3 of the Council's Householder Design Guide (SPD) indicates that side extensions should normally be proportionate to the existing dwellinghouse; should normally be subservient with a lower ridge; and, to prevent the linking

of non-terraced houses, first floor side extensions should normally be set in 0.5m from the side property boundary and set back 1m from the front principal elevation. The SPD also notes that designers should pay careful attention to the character of the area and the nature of the spaces between buildings and plot boundaries, while extensions should not erode spaces between buildings which contribute to the visual amenity and character of a locality.

6. In this case, the side extension would not be significantly set back or set down from the main house, and it would extend to the side boundary. On this basis it would not appear as subservient or proportionate to the host property and it would result in the potential for linking of non-terraced houses. The gaps between pairs of semi-detached houses on this side of the avenue are relatively narrow but important in establishing the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would significantly reduce the existing gap with No 41, which would be harmful to that character and appearance.
7. I also note that the front extension would project forward beyond the existing bay window, which is somewhat uncharacteristic of other porch/canopy extensions in the vicinity. In addition, it would include what would appear as two front doors in the façade, which would be an incongruous feature that would not represent high quality or enhanced design.
8. The appellant has referred to other examples of two-storey side extensions along Arnold Avenue. There are relatively few examples and, although I have few details of these, it would appear that many are of long-standing and were granted permission some time prior to the adoption of the current development plan. Of those in the vicinity, Nos 43 and 45 are located either side of a footpath between the houses, and are not linked, while Nos 29 and 47 are set further back and down from the main house and have a subservient nature. Other examples on the opposite side of the road, where the gaps between houses are wider, include some with flat roofs. By reason of their scale and detail, I do not consider that these represent good design. They are harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed wrap-around extension at No 39 would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Arnold Avenue and would, as a result, not positively contribute towards its local identity and character. It would conflict with Policy BE1 of the LP and with guidance in the SPD. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

*J D Westbrook*

INSPECTOR