



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3362540

104 Hinckley Road, Coventry CV2 2EU

- 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 Gulam Nabi against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0002485/HHA.
 - The development proposed is a rear single-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear single-storey extension at 104 Hinckley Road, Coventry CV2 2EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/0002485/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 drawing nos: 80064-05-01; 80064-05-04; and 80064-05-05.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 106 Hinckley Road with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling set back from the road behind a driveway. To the rear of the building is a single-storey rear extension that is located on the opposite side of the dwelling to 106 Hinckley Road. The proposal seeks to create a large single-storey rear extension that would be similar in depth to this existing rear extension.
4. 106 Hinckley Road is a single-storey dwelling and there are three windows on the ground floor that face towards the proposed extension. The window located towards the rear of the dwelling serves a utility room and the window next to this serves a bathroom and has obscure glazing. The final window serves a small room that is used as a study and this is the window that is located closest to the proposed rear extension. The outlook from this window generally overlooks the existing rear extension and the rear garden at 104 Hinckley Road. The two dwellings are both set back from the shared boundary, delineated by a timber fence and as such there is already a modestly sized gap between the properties.

5. The proposed extension would introduce built form closer to the window serving the study and as a result the outlook would become more enclosed than it currently is, which would cause some visual intrusion and partially enclose the outlook compared to the current situation. However, given the modest height and depth of the proposed extension which would have a flat roof the room would retain an outlook above and beyond the extension and as such, the proposal would not appear unduly overbearing, even when taking into consideration the proposed roof lantern. Considering the retained separation distance between the two buildings and the modest scale of the extension, it would not significantly overshadow the room. Consequently, the outlook from this room would not be significantly harmed by the proposed development. As a result, the proposal would generally be consistent with the guidance within the Coventry City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document concerning extensions.
6. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of 106 Hinckley Road. Consequently, the development would comply with Policies DE1 and H5 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan. These seek, amongst other matters, for development to seek high quality design and attention to detail in the layout of developments in terms of function and impact, not just for the short term, but over the lifetime of the development.

Conditions

7. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, a condition requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is necessary in the interests of certainty. Furthermore, a condition requiring matching materials be used is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. The proposed development would comply with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR