



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3361361

33 Fivefield Road, Keresley End, Coventry, CV7 8JE

- 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 Hardeep Gheent against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0002272/HHA.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, which is situated in a residential area that is characterised by two-storey houses of a similar style and scale. A number of dwellings on Fivefield Road have been altered and extended since they were originally built. These include both single-storey and two-storey side additions. Notwithstanding, a distinctive characteristic along Fivefield Road is the space between the sides of dwellings, particularly at first-floor level. Although these gaps vary in width, they make a positive contribution to the streetscene.
4. The appeal property already benefits from an earlier hip to gable extension, plus a rear facing dormer in the extended roof area. Planning permission has also been granted for a two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and front porch (PL/2024/0001860/HHA).
5. The appeal proposal is to erect a two-storey side and single-storey rear extension, plus a front porch. Whilst the description of the development is the same as that previously approved, the appeal now proposes that the two-storey side extension would be built up to and partly alongside the shared side boundary with the neighbouring property at number 35 Fivefield Road (number 35). In addition, the porch would be larger. Previously, most of the first-floor side wall was set-in from the side boundary. The boundary runs at an angle and therefore, the appeal extension would also have a tapered appearance. Number 35 has an attached single-storey garage, which is separated from the appeal property by a narrow pathway.

6. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a gabled roof with its ridge slightly lower than the main roof of the dwelling. The front wall of the extension would be built in line with the existing front wall of the dwelling (excluding the existing bay windows). The ground floor element, that would contain a garage at the front, would be in line with the existing bays, whilst the proposed porch would sit further forward. Overall, the proposed extension would be a significant addition to the property, providing a garage, utility, wc, family room/kitchen on the ground floor and a bedroom with en-suite on the first floor.
7. The Council states that the proposal would be harmful to the character of Fivefield Road, due to the scale, siting and appearance of the extensions. The officer's report expresses concern over the side extension, because of the limited set-back from the front elevation and it not being set-in from the side boundary. The report also considers the front porch to be too large. The decision notice cites a conflict with Policies DE1 and H5 of The Coventry Local Plan 2017 (LP). I am not persuaded that Policy H5 is particularly relevant as it mainly concerned with the management of existing housing stock. However, Policy DE1 seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that development proposals respect and enhance their surroundings. This accords with paragraph 135 of The National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which contains similar provisions.
8. In reaching my decision, I have also considered the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Householder Design Guide (HDG). Whilst this states that side extensions will be determined on a case-by-case basis, it also recognises that spaces between buildings are "important components of streetscenes." It advises that first floor side extensions should normally be set-in 0.5m from the side boundary and set-back 1m from the front principal elevation.
9. Regarding the front porch, I am not persuaded that this would be unacceptable. Although it is larger than advised in the HDG, the property is well set-back from the road and would not appear intrusive or harmful in the streetscene.
10. However, the proposed first floor of the side extension would result significantly reduce the gap between the appeal property and number 35. Although its position on the bend of Fivefield Road means that it would appear differently than it would elsewhere, I consider that the reduced space would result in a cramped appearance, which would be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the LP and the Council's HDG, as referred to above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR