



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3364707

7 Honeysuckle Drive, Coventry CV2 1JH

- 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 Zahra Hossaini against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0002523/HHA.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Retention of as built external wall at front, porch and rendering to front elevation'.
-

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 Matter

3. At the time of visiting the site, the development was substantively complete. I have therefore assessed the appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 7 Honeysuckle Road is a two storey, mid-terraced dwelling. The wider terrace has an overriding uniformity due to its largely consistent building line, the predominant red facing brickwork, and the regular spacing of windows and front doors. The terrace is also set well back from the highway with generously proportioned, open front lawns. Open grass frontages are also a prominent feature across the wider estate. There is some variation in facing materials in the area such as the render at 13 Honeysuckle Drive which sits at one end of the host terrace. However, the prevailing shared characteristics across the terrace and the spaciousness and verdancy of its frontage are an integral part of the order and consistency of the area.
6. The rendered finish differentiates the front elevation of the host dwelling from the prevailing brick facing material of the wider terrace. Whilst the depth of the porch is not excessive; its width, pitched roof, and enclosed form appears bulky, particularly

in the context of this terrace where there is a general absence of such front projections. In combination, these aspects of the development undermine the general uniformity of the terrace. This is further compounded by the enclosure of the property's frontage which appears discordant amongst the lawns of neighbouring properties and the open plan character of the wider estate. Therefore, the development significantly detracts from the rhythm, order and consistency of the street scene.

7. There are some examples of front boundary treatments in the area, such as at 23 Honeysuckle Drive. However, where front boundary treatments exist, they tend to be low in height and set well back from the highway boundary and so are not comparable to the appeal development.
8. I conclude, the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it conflicts with the requirements in Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Local Plan (2017) for development to respect and enhance its surroundings and to positively contribute towards the local identity and character of the area.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has suggested that they would be agreeable to reducing the height of the wall and setting it back together with tree planting. However, I have no plans before me showing precise details of an alternative scheme for the site frontage. Even if I did, accepting an alternative scheme would have the potential to deprive those with an interest in the proposal from having the opportunity to comment. Alterations to the wall would not in any case overcome the harm resulting from the other elements of the development. Therefore, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the development as applied for and shown on the drawings before me.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR