



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: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3364695

25 Bennetts Road South, Coventry CV6 2FP

- 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 Farman Mustafa against the decision of Coventry City Council.
- The application Ref is PL/2024/0002343/HHA.
- The development proposed is double storey extension to side and front and associated boundary treatment.

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. Works have already commenced on the appeal site. Notwithstanding this, I am determining the appeal on the basis of the plans provided.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - ii) the living conditions of occupiers of 11 Wickham Close, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character & Appearance

5. 25 Bennetts Road South is a semi-detached property located in a predominantly residential area. There is not a consistent building line on Bennetts Road South and the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour at 27 Bennetts Road South (No 27) are set well back from the highway boundary. Front boundaries are more often characterised by hedges and low walls. There are a variety of dwelling types in the area including detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, although the prevailing scale is two storeys. Following a previous extension, the front elevation of No 25 is broader than that of its attached counterpart at No 27. Nevertheless, their gable ended form, the common alignment of their two-storey front elevations, consistent roof line, similarly styled windows with arched headers, and single storey

projections to the front and side contribute to a distinctive and well-balanced architectural composition. As a result, the pair make a positive contribution to the street scene.

6. The Coventry City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states amongst other things that where front extensions are proposed, distinctive features of the host dwellinghouse should be maintained, whilst rooflines and facing materials should complement the existing property. The SPD also advises that all boundary treatments visible from publicly accessible land should seek to positively contribute to the character of the street scene and that boundary treatments more than 1.2m in height adjacent to the highway will be discouraged.
7. Due to its substantial projection forward of the existing front elevation, together with its wide front gabled form, the extension would dominate the original architectural form of the dwelling. This would also significantly undermine the visual harmony and distinctive character of the semi-detached pair. Even accounting for the dwelling's recessed position from the road, the road's varied building line, and the rendered finish which would otherwise provide a consistent finish across the pair, these factors would not be sufficient to assimilate the discordant appearance of the extension when viewed alongside its counterpart at No 27.
8. Furthermore, whilst the proposed boundary treatment would be interspersed by railings, the height of the brick pillars and the closed panel gate together with their solid composition would have a stark and unduly dominant appearance across the site frontage. It would be a discordant feature seen in the context of the generally lower-level boundary treatments and planting to the frontages of other properties to this section of Bennetts Road South.

To conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, the proposal conflicts with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2017 which requires that development respects and enhances its surroundings and positively contributes to the local identity and character of the area. For the same reasons, the proposal would also conflict with the SPD.

Living Conditions

9. The rear elevation of No 25 sits in very close proximity to the boundary with 11 Wickham Close (No 11). There is an established hedge along this boundary. The existing rear elevation at No 25 has no first-floor windows and this ensures No 11 is not overlooked by the appeal dwelling.
10. However, the proposal would introduce three first-floor windows to the rear elevation. From the evidence before me, the relationship of these windows with No 11 would be somewhat below the minimum interface distances in the Coventry City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. Moreover, due to their very close proximity, they have the potential to significantly overlook the rear elevation and back garden serving No 11. Even though, the proposed bathroom window would be obscure glazed, its presence would add to the overall perception of being overlooked for occupiers of No 11.
11. The boundary hedge has the potential to reduce overlooking to some extent. However, from my observations, there is the potential that due to their elevated position, the first-floor windows would offer views over the top of the hedge and so

the hedge would be unlikely to fully eliminate the overlooking effects. In any case, the evidence before me suggests that the hedge lies outside the control of the appellant, and so a condition could not be imposed to ensure its retention.

12. The appellant has suggested that the windows could be omitted and replaced with roof light windows. However, I have not been provided with alternative drawings to show this. In any case, making such alterations to the windows would not overcome the harm identified under the first main issue.
13. I conclude, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of 11 Wickham Close, with particular regard to privacy. In that regard, it would conflict with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (2017) (LP) which requires that development proposals must respect their surroundings. It would also conflict with Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

14. The appellant contends that the boundary wall is required to prevent the headlights of vehicles visiting the neighbouring takeaway from entering the front room windows of the appeal dwelling during the evening. However, this does not justify the harm identified under the main issues. In any case, there is nothing to suggest that other measures such as blinds or curtains would not perform a similar function.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. 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

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR