



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 September 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/25/3367743

198 Holbrook Lane, Coventry CV6 4DD

- 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 Tarndeeep Singh Viridi against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0001854/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extension to create a retail unit at ground floor level and extend residential property at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for erection of two storey side and rear extension to create a retail unit at ground floor level and extend residential property at first floor level, at 198 Holbrook Lane, Coventry CV6 4DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/0001854/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Block and location plans AL (P) 00; Existing ground floor plan AL (P) 01; Existing first floor plan AL (P) 02 Rev A; Existing roof plan AL (P) 03; Proposed ground floor plan AL (P) 04 Rev B; Proposed first floor plan AL (P) 05 Rev A; Existing elevations AL (P) 06; Proposed elevations AL (P) 07; External works plan and roller shutter details on Sunningdale Avenue AL (P) 08 Rev A.
 - 3) Other than where specified on the approved plans, the external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the decision notice, as this more fully describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Number 198 Holbrook Lane (No 198) is located on a corner plot at the end of a small terraced parade of commercial and retail units with living space above. The

surrounding area has a mixed character, with other retail units, a large social club and associated car park, a recreational park, and residential properties in proximity. There is no uniform style, size or design of building, and the residential properties are a mix of terraces, semi-detached and detached dwellings.

5. The proposal would not continue along the established building line of the terrace but would be set back from the front elevation of the host property, with a lower roof and ridge line. However, this set back and drop in roof line would ensure that the extension would be subservient to the host property and would not be overbearing or dominant in the street scene. The use of matching materials would also ensure that the proposed extension would not be overly conspicuous but would integrate well with the host property.
6. Whilst the proposal would be set forward of the neighbouring property along Sunningdale Avenue, this property is itself set forward from its neighbour, thus the proposal would not unacceptably disrupt an established building line along Sunningdale Avenue.
7. Unlike the corner opposite, there is already an element of built form at No 198, a wall, which extends towards the pavement. Nevertheless, the proposal would be a more substantial addition and would be two-storeys in height. This would reduce the openness of the plot.
8. However, Holbrook Lane is a busy road with numerous subsidiary roads leading off it, with a resultant number of corner plots. There is no consistent pattern of development of the neighbouring corner plots. Several buildings located on nearby corner plots extend towards the pavement and as such the corner plots do not have an overall uniform characteristic of openness. The proposal would not appear as incongruous or jarring in this context. Moreover, as the proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation, the spacious paved area between the front of the property and the highway would be retained.
9. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan (2017) which requires development to respect and enhance its surroundings by responding to the physical context of the site and by considering local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would have rear windows which would face the garden area and side elevation of 7 Sunningdale Avenue (No 7). However, a degree of intervisibility is commonplace in urban residential areas and already occurs given the positioning of the two properties and the placement of the current first floor rear windows at No 198. The separation distance that would exist between the proposal and No 7 would be sufficient to ensure that an acceptable level of privacy would be maintained for the neighbouring occupiers at No 7.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the Planning Practice Guidance on conditions. Where necessary, I have amended the conditions in the interest of clarity.

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition in respect of materials is necessary. Provision for cycle storage is shown on the submitted drawings and as such the Council's suggested condition seeking the submission of details for cycle parking facilities is not necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would comply with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
14. As a result, the appeal should be allowed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR