



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/24/3350739

The Farmhouse, 215 Beechwood Avenue, Coventry CV5 6HB

- 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 Sunny Mohammed against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0000664/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Tent structure and lean-to extensions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a tent structure and lean-to extensions at The Farmhouse, 215 Beechwood Avenue, Coventry CV5 6HB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/0000664/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with submitted drawing nos. Location Plan DWG BR01, Proposed Site Plan DWG BR02, Existing and Proposed Elevation sheet 1 of 2 DWG BR05 and Existing and Proposed Elevation sheet 1 of 2 DWG BR05.
 - 2) Other than where specified on the approved plans and application form, the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the exterior of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the planning application form; however, I have deleted the word 'retrospective' as this is not an act of development.
3. The application form indicates that the development which is the subject of the appeal has commenced. However, I observed at my site visit that the development that has taken place does not fully accord with the submitted drawings, in particular with regard to the proposed retractable outdoor awnings. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis the development has begun but have assessed the proposal based on the submitted drawings, as to do otherwise could cause injustice to other parties.
4. My attention is drawn by the Council to first floor additions to the building which it is alleged do not benefit from planning permission. Given that these are shown on the existing and proposed elevations of the building, they are not before me for consideration as part of the appeal. As such, nothing in my decision alters the status of these parts of the building.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the designated amenity greenspace.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises The Farmhouse restaurant, a detached 2 storey building and its grounds, including an outdoor seating area and car park. It lies in a prominent position at the corner of Beechwood Avenue and Canley Road on the edge of Coventry Business Park. The surrounding area includes various industrial and commercial buildings interspersed with residential properties, and the open space at Hearsall Common which is opposite the site. Notwithstanding the proximity of the site to the nearby greenspace, which can be seen beyond the appeal property in views along Canley Road towards the site, the site nonetheless forms part of the immediate context of the adjoining built development.
7. The appeal scheme proposes several elements including an enclosed tent which accommodates a seating area, retractable outdoor awnings, and single storey extensions to the front and side elevations of the main building.
8. The tent is made up of a fabric cover stretched taught by poles mostly within the structure, forming a multi peaked roofscape. It covers a timber decked area, with sides fully enclosed by glazing and timber. Notwithstanding its position on the road frontage, and irregular shape, by virtue of the overall height and massing of the tent, together with its dark, recessive colour, it would be subordinate in scale to the host building, despite its projection above the eaves height of the building. For these reasons, it would not appear as an unduly visually intrusive or anomalous feature, particularly given the varied roof height and shape of the existing restaurant building. Furthermore, when taking account of the context of the surrounding built form, including commercial buildings of considerable scale and an eclectic materials palette, the proposed tent would not be visually incongruous or at odds with the surrounding area.
9. The proposed single storey extensions, and the retractable awning, would be sympathetic in terms of design, scale and external materials to the form and function of the existing building, and would not be inconsistent with the surrounding built form.
10. While the appeal proposal would lead to a reduction in the space around the building, including the area between the building and the side boundary of the site, significant parts of the outdoor space would nonetheless remain open. Moreover, given the relatively low profile of the additions, they would not significantly impede views across the site towards Hearsall Common beyond, or diminish the contribution the mature trees on the open space adjacent to the site make to the verdant character and appearance of the area. While I appreciate my findings differ from that of the Inspector in an earlier appeal at the site¹ for the retention of a marquee on a temporary basis, which was dismissed, I do not have full details in respect of the works so cannot be sure of the circumstances of the scheme in that instance. In any event, I have determined the appeal based on the merits of the proposed development before me.

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/17/3177737

11. Concern has been raised regarding the quality of materials. From my observations on site, the materials used in parts of the development that had been carried out, even if considered to be lightweight, appeared to be of high quality. There is no compelling evidence that the remaining parts of the development would not be carried out in a similar way. Furthermore, should the external materials deteriorate over time, they could be replaced to maintain the appearance of the building. Consequently, for the reasons set out, the proposed additions would not appear incompatible with the surrounding built form by virtue of their scale, siting, or design, either individually or when taken cumulatively.
12. The area of land between the rear elevation of the building and the highway, and land at the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Canley Road forms part of the wider area designated as amenity greenspace at Hearsall Common. The Council's submissions² indicate that the proposal would, in part, encroach into this area, which it suggests would detract from the setting of the amenity space. However, given the very modest extent of intrusion into the space arising from the part of the appeal site which falls within the open space designation, the proposal in that regard would not have a significant effect on the overall provision or quality of the open space or its setting.
13. Thus, in light of the above considerations, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, including the designated amenity greenspace. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policies DE1 and GE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan, adopted December 2017, which seek development of a high quality design that maintains the quantity, quality and functionality of existing green infrastructure.

Conditions

14. As the development has commenced, a condition relating to the timeframe for the implementation of the permission is not necessary. I have imposed a condition specifying the drawing numbers in the interests of clarity. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure the materials would match those used in the existing building.
15. The submitted plans label the single storey glass structures to the side of the building as temporary additions. However, there is nothing in the application itself or supporting documents which suggests that this will be the case. Therefore, while I note the Council's suggested condition to limit the planning permission for a temporary period of 2 years, there is no basis for implementing such a condition.

Conclusion

16. For the foregoing reasons the appeal is allowed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR

² Appendix 3 of LPA Statement of Case