



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025

by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/25/3363578

42 Mount Street, Coventry CV5 8DE

- 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 Ehidiamen Abhulimen Anao against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0002541/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective application for 4 x Air B&B Bedrooms (Sui Generis Use)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development is retrospective, as the application form indicates that the change of use was completed in April 2022. I have considered the appeal development on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling, located within a predominantly residential area. The retrospective scheme seeks to regularise the use of the four-bedroom property as short-term rental accommodation. The maximum occupancy of the property is 4 people at any given time. Stays are generally ranging from 2 days to 2 weeks.
5. Whilst those who are staying at the property are mostly professionals who require short-term accommodation, visitors staying in the accommodation are, by definition, more transient in nature than residents living in their permanent home. Whilst every guest may not cause undue noise and disturbance, the high turnover increases the number of guests who are less likely to temper their behaviour to accommodate the living conditions of their neighbours, since they do not have to live alongside them beyond a few days/weeks.
6. The appeal statement indicates that the property is managed through a system that provides continuous support and monitoring, which includes, amongst other things, electronic monitoring systems which detect noise levels above acceptable thresholds and external cameras. However, even with such management, the

response is likely to be reactive and any instances which result in noise and disturbance will have already resulted in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties before any management response has resolved the situation.

7. Furthermore, to control and manage the impact of the property's use, the appellant has stated that a robust vetting process was adopted, to prevent bookings by leisure travellers looking for party venues. However, no specific details of how guests are "vetted" have been provided. I am therefore unconvinced that these measures would be adequate or sufficient to mitigate the harmful effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to noise and disturbance.
8. I have had regard to the appellant's suggestions for conditions. However, given the site-specific circumstances, and my findings above, a Management Plan condition and a condition securing a bookings log would not make the development acceptable in this case.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the development has a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to noise and disturbance. As such, the development conflicts with the aims of Policy DS3 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan adopted 2017, which requires developments to, amongst other things, increase wellbeing and quality of life. The development also conflicts with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, which at paragraph 135 states that developments should provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

10. The appeal site is within the Chapel Fields Conservation Area (CFCA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Given my site visit observations of the surrounding area and the nature of the development, which involves no external alterations, I am satisfied that the development has a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CFCA.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to two appeal decisions¹. I do not have full details of those cases. However, from the evidence before me the appeal scheme is not directly comparable with those developments because of the difference in the type of permission (permanent or temporary), number of bedrooms and occupiers, main issues, and evidence from the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regard to the effect of the development on their living conditions. The appellant also indicates that a similar management approach was successfully implemented for other properties. Be that as it may, I have considered the appeal scheme based on its own planning merits and site-specific circumstances.
12. I acknowledge the benefits of short-term accommodation in supporting the local economy. However, given the nature and scale of the development, such benefits are limited and do not outweigh the harm identified above.

¹ Appeal refs: APP/Q1445/W/24/3353006 & APP/A5270/W/24/3339503

13. There were no complaints from the Environmental Protection, no objections from the Highway Authority, and the Council found no harm regarding the character and appearance of the area. However, these are neutral matters rather than ones that carry positive weight for the development.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

INSPECTOR