



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2025

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3364683

19 John Shelton Drive, Coventry, CV6 4PE

- 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 Ms Jane Stokes against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0002263/HHA.
 - The development proposed is front garden removed and replaced with block paving driveway with flower bed and fence fitted down boundary line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the front garden removed and replaced with block paving driveway with flower bed and fence fitted down boundary line at 19 John Shelton Drive, Coventry, CV6 4PE, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PL/2024/0002263, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan - SP3383NW; Block Plan - 0000001; Before and After Plans – scale 1:50; Elevation Plans - scale 1:50 and 1:20; Proposed Fence Plan - scale 1:50.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling, which is situated within a modern residential estate. The appearance of front gardens along John Shelton Drive varies and includes a mix of grassed frontages, hard surfacing or a mixture of both. In addition, some of the gardens are enclosed, or partly enclosed by planting and/or low fencing, although at my site visit, I observed that the front gardens of the dwellings nearest to the appeal site were generally open and grassed.
4. The appeal proposal, which has already been carried out, is for a block paved driveway in lieu of the original grass, together with a low wooden arched fence with trellis along the side boundary with the neighbouring dwelling. A planting bed has also been created alongside the fence.
5. The Council contends that the proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the area due to the loss of the green space and the enclosed effect, because of the fencing. It argues that the proposal conflicts with Policy DE1 of the Coventry

City Council Local Plan 2017 (LP) and with guidance contained in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

6. Policy DE1 seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that development proposals respect and enhance its surroundings and positively contributes towards the local identity and character of the area. The SPD advises that boundary treatments should positively contribute to the character of the street and that hard standings that are not part of a soft landscaping scheme will be resisted. I consider that the LP policy and the SPD guidance accords with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which also requires developments to reflect local character and make a positive contribution to the area.
7. The open plan grassed front gardens would have been part of the original layout of the street and, in that regard, the SPD advises that the proposal should be resisted. However, I am not persuaded that the development is harmful. The work appears to have been carried out to a high standard and although the fence has resulted in some enclosure, the overall impression is still one of an open frontage.
8. Furthermore, I agree with the appellant that some of the grassed areas along John Shelton Drive have become eroded or unkempt and they tend to detract from the appearance of the streetscene. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal does not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the streetscene and there is no conflict with Policy D1 of the LP.

Conditions

9. As the development has already been carried out, there is no need for the standard condition relating to the time period in which to commence the development. For clarity, a condition specifying the approve plans is imposed.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR