



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **Les Greenwood MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3369447

88 Church Lane, Stoke, Coventry CV2 4AJ

- 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 Aaron Somal against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0000944/HHA.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a habitable room in the roofspace with a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 88 Church Lane is a mid-terraced house within a residential area of similar houses. The adjoining houses Nos 86 and 90 already have full width, flat roof rear dormers. The appeal proposal is for a full-width dormer window structure that would infill the entire gap between the adjoining dormers. It would be as high as the existing roof and extend almost all the way back to the rear wall of the house, leaving just a thin strip of roofing along the eaves.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Householder Design Guide* (HDG) advises that dormer window extensions on rear facing roof slopes should be set in at the sides and set back from the rear wall so that they are of a proportionate scale and subservient to the main roof. The proposed dormer would, in contrast, effectively replace the whole of the rear roof so that it would look more like a flat roofed second storey extension.
5. On the plus side, the proposed dormer would be similar in design to the 2 adjoining box dormers and would not be seen except in limited views from a side street and views from neighbouring properties. It would be of similar size to the dormer at No 90, but the dormer at No 86 is notably set well back from the eaves at the back so that it is a much smaller, less dominant structure that sits better on its rear roof slope. By infilling the gap between the 2 existing dormers with such a sizeable new dormer, the proposal would substantially intensify the built form here, combining with the other dormers to create an overly large, unsympathetic block of high level, flat roofed structure.

6. I furthermore saw very few, if any, other comparable dormer structures in the local area. This reinforces my view that the proposal would not fit well in its local context.
7. I recognise the appellant's argument that it could be impractical to inset the dormer by a small amount at the sides as this would make construction difficult. Even so, the dormer could presumably have been set back further from the rear wall and eaves so that it would be seen as being inset in the roof rather than replacing it.
8. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the local area. It therefore conflicts with policy DE1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan, the HDG and the National Planning Policy Framework, which aim to secure high quality design that respects its surroundings and contributes positively to the local identity and character of the area.
9. The appeal application follows on from the refusal of an application for a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC). That application sought to show that a similar dormer would be permitted development so could proceed without a planning application¹. The appellant argues that this appeal should be allowed because the LDC should have been granted. The refusal of the LDC is not, however, in front of me for determination and I do not have the benefit of full arguments on that matter. The LDC refusal could have been appealed separately. I have to assess this as an appeal against the refusal of the planning application.
10. I do consider it very likely that some sort of permitted development dormer could be built here, but without clarification of the extent of such a dormer I can give little weight to any such fall-back position. Having regard to all matters raised, I see nothing to override my concerns about the visual impact of the proposal.
11. I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR

¹ Under Schedule 2 Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended)