



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3368701

80 Stanley Road, Coventry CV5 6FF

- 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 James Bogle against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref. is PL/2025/0000424/HHA.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether this would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Earlsdon Conservation Area ('the CA').

Reasons

3. The proposed development is for a loft conversion to achieve additional habitable accommodation in the roofspace by means of a rear dormer. The extension would cover much of the rear roof plane except for 0.2m to the sides and 1m from the eaves. And although only the two roof lights would be visible from Stanley Road, the proposal would be a significant alteration to the character and appearance of the property and to some degree also the terrace of which it forms part.
4. The grounds of appeal argue that there is a larger dormer extension next door at No. 82 and other examples at Nos. 12, 20, 22, 25, 40 & 59. However, as the Officer's Report observes, most if not all of these alterations were carried out as permitted development before Earlsdon, including Stanley Road, was designated as a CA.
5. I agree with the Council's view that any dormer should be in accordance with the guidance in the Householder Design Guide SPD to achieve a degree of subservience to the host property that would retain its character and appearance. And although the appeal scheme is consistent with the required 1m set up from the eaves, the proposed 0.2m set in from the flanks is significantly below the 0.7m referred to in the guidance.
6. The Officer's Report says that consent was granted for a smaller dormer at the property in January 2025 under reference PL/2024/0002241/HHA, as it was considered that this extension complied with the SPD guidance. To my mind this

shows that the CA designation notwithstanding, the Council has adopted a reasonable and flexible approach to proposals for increased and improved living space in the property. And whilst I understand the appellant's understandable aspiration to further extend the roof, I consider that the Council is correct to refuse the appeal proposal because it would have an adverse effect not only on the character and appearance of No. 80 but also that of the wider terrace.

7. This in turn would fail to at least preserve the character and appearance of the CA in conflict with Policies DE1 and HE2 of the Coventry Local Plan 2017 and with Government policy in Section 16: 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024. The CA is a designated heritage asset and paragraph 215 of the Framework says that where a development proposal will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
8. The appeal proposal is an example of 'less than substantial harm' but whilst there may be an economic benefit to the local economy arising from the building work, I do not consider that this would outweigh the harm caused by the proposal to the character and appearance of the CA.
9. For the reasons explained, the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR