



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

**by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 18 August 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3369109**

**178 Ansty Road, Coventry CV2 3EX**

- 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 and Mrs Mukendi Shakeel against the decision of Coventry City Council.
  - The application Ref is PL/2025/0000641/HHA.
  - The development proposed is a first floor single storey rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor single storey rear extension at 178 Ansty Road, Coventry CV2 3EX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/0000641/HHA, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawing: Project 2025/B80-01 Existing and Proposed Plans Rev C dated March 2025.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
  - The character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
  - Adjacent occupiers' living conditions, with particular regard to the outlook from, and overlooking of, 176 Ansty Road ('No 176') and 180 Ansty Road ('No 180').

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The host property sits within a short terrace on the southern side of Ansty Road. These properties have a broadly similar two storey form and style, and have been extended at ground floor to the rear. At the end of the terrace, 182 Ansty Road ('No 182') also has a flat-roofed first floor rear extension.

4. Whilst the proposal would be just over half the width of the host, its 3.5 metre rearward projection would match the depth of the host's existing ground floor extension. Its roof would also be significantly set down below the terrace's ridgeline, and it would be hipped. As a result, the scheme would have a limited scale and bulk; and its matching materials would help to assimilate it with the existing building.
5. Consequently, the proposal would not appear incongruous, or disproportionate to the host. Although it would be clearly visible from nearby properties, and in views looking across their gardens from Cowley Road, given its form, materials, proportions and siting, along with the existing extension at No 182, it would not appear out of place, and it would not be prominent in the streetscene. It would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
6. Amongst other things, Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2017 ('CLP') requires development to respect and enhance its surroundings by responding to the physical context of the site and by considering local distinctiveness. For the above reasons, the scheme would not conflict with that stance; nor with the advice at Principle 1 of the Coventry Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') that extensions shall usually respect the form, scale, architectural style, and materials, of the original building.

#### *Living conditions*

7. The single storey rear projection at No 176 is similar in depth to the host's. No 176's closest first floor rear window is small, obscurely glazed, and serves a bathroom. Consequently, whilst the proposed extension would abut the boundary with that property, it would not have a significant impact on the outlook from its windows or from its rear garden.
8. Although No 180 has a first floor bedroom window on its rear elevation fairly close to the plot boundary, the proposed extension would be set well in from there. As a result of the scheme's siting and its limited depth, the outlook from that window, and from No 180's rear garden, would not become significantly more enclosed. I have no evidence that a 45 degree line drawn from the centre point of habitable room windows in either of these two neighbouring properties would be breached.
9. A degree of overlooking is commonplace in densely developed urban areas such as this. The outlook from the scheme's first floor rear window would be principally down the host's own garden. Views from it towards the rear gardens at No 176 and No 180 would be slightly angled, and would not be markedly different compared to the existing arrangement. Moreover, whilst the resultant property would project further to the rear at first floor than at present, the outlook from it would be broadly similar compared to the first floor outlook from other nearby properties.
10. For these reasons, the scheme would not harmfully impact the living conditions at No 176 and No 180. It would not therefore conflict with CLP Policy DE1's requirement for high quality design; nor with SPD Principles 1 and 5 which set out that extensions should not cause a material loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, as a result of matters including loss of outlook, visual intrusion, erosion of privacy, and overbearance.

## Conditions and Conclusion

11. I have found that the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, and it would not impact the living conditions at No 176 and No 180 to a harmful degree.
12. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework. As well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plan. Finally, in the interests of good design, and to respect the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the scheme be faced with matching materials.
13. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

*Chris Couper*

INSPECTOR