

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc

### Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

---

#### Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/24/3357054

#### 36 Evenlode Crescent, Coventry CV6 1BP

- 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 Abdul Wali Mohammadi against the decision of Coventry City Council.
  - The application Ref is PL/2024/0001704/HHA.
  - The development proposed is double storey rear extension and change of roof from flat to pitch.
- 

#### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

#### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

#### Preliminary Matters

3. I observed on my site visit that development has taken place at the property. However, this does not include the first-floor rear extension, or the same roof form as shown on the submitted plans. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

#### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

#### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located within a residential area with predominantly terraced dwellings. Corner plots are quite prominent and create a strong building line for the end terraced dwellings. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner plot alongside Trensale Avenue. This makes the rear elevation highly visible from both Evenlode Crescent and Trensale Avenue.
6. The main aspect of the development which is in dispute relates to the proposed first floor rear extension. I have therefore confined my findings to this aspect of the appeal.
7. The proposed first floor rear extension individually would be modest in scale and subservient to the host property. However, when considered in conjunction with the other existing extensions and alterations, the cumulative impact would result in a

large, bulky and dominant appearance. The combined scale of the development would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, with the combination of the various additions appearing disjointed and incohesive.

8. Given its prominent and highly visible position, this would amplify the visual impact of the proposed first floor rear extension. Although the proposed extension would be set back from the shared boundary with the neighbouring occupiers, it would appear disjointed from the rest of the host dwelling, creating an incongruous addition which is exacerbated when viewed from adjacent streets.
9. The appellant has cited examples of similar corner plot extensions in the area, including properties on 92 Evenlode Crescent, 77 Cedar Avenue, 19 Browett Road and 1 Trensale Avenue. I do not have the full context regarding the circumstances in which these extensions were carried out, however, the Council have outlined that these examples either predate the current design guidance or do not appear to have planning permission. As such, they do not justify allowing harmful development, and I therefore give them limited weight in the appeal.
10. Although the dormer may be permitted development it is not part of the development before me. Its existence is however a pertinent factor when considering the cumulative impact of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
11. Consequently, the proposed first floor rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (2017), which states that development proposals must positively contribute towards the local character of the area.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*A Khan*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*A M Nilsson*

INSPECTOR