



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by Guy Rigby LLB ACGI CEng FICE FCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/25/3368469

Land adjacent to 45 Brade Drive, Coventry CV2 2BL

- 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 Spyridon Defteraios against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0000714/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1no new, 2-storey, 2-bedroom dwelling without on-site car parking provision and stopping up highway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No. 45 Brade Drive is an end-terrace property set at a shallow angle to Brade Drive in a residential area in the Walsgrave area of Coventry. The appeal site is an adopted grassed highway verge located adjacent to No. 45 Brade Drive to the south and No. 14 Lucian Close to the west. During my site visit I observed that the site is well maintained and forms a valuable informal visual break in an otherwise dense built-up environment.
4. The proposed dwelling would be attached to the north side of No.45 Brade Drive and be end-terraced, with the angle and a stepped building line bringing it closer to Brade Drive. There would be a private garden to the north side of the proposed dwelling bounded by timber fencing with a laurel hedge along Brade Drive. The portion of the grassed area adjacent to the front garden of No.14 Lucian Close would remain as public open space.
5. I note that the proposed dwelling would be a continuation of the terrace rather than detached from it. I also note that it would be similar in scale and form to No.45 Brade Drive.
6. However, from observations made during my site visit, I consider that there are several aspects of the proposed development related to its size, shape and configuration which would cause harm to the openness of the street scene and to the character and appearance of the area. The stepped building line and the shallow angle with Brade Drive would result in the proposed dwelling being close to the highway. There would be very little garden space in front of the proposed

dwelling and the private garden would be located to the side of it, with hard landscaping features along the new highway boundary.

7. Also, notwithstanding that the part of the site adjacent to the front garden of No.14 Lucian Avenue would be retained as public open space, it is my view that the enclosure of a large part of the site as private garden would to all intents and purposes remove an established area of open space. I consider that the site is not an incidental area of open space, and that its loss would cause harm to the street scene. The Council states that it has been maintained in such a way that it contributes positively to the character of the street scene, and from my observations during my site visit I have no reason to disagree.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is in clear conflict with Policies DE1 and GE2 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan 2017, adopted December 2017, and Principle 8 of the Council's Design Guide for New Residential Development SPD. Together these seek to ensure that development proposals respect and enhance their surroundings and contribute positively to the local identity and character of the area, and resist the loss of green space which is of amenity value.

Other Matters

9. I note the planning history of this site and that the appellant has sought to address previous concerns raised by the Council. However, I must consider this proposal on its own merits. The general design of the dwelling would be in keeping with the attached and nearby properties, the proposed lack of on-site parking is acceptable in this location and the development would not have unduly adverse effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. These matters indicate a lack of harm and so they are neutral in the overall consideration of the appeal.
10. The evidence suggests that there is a good amount of high quality open space in the nearby area. However, this does not mitigate the harm that would result from the loss of the open area within the appeal site, which is primarily related to the associated impact on the character of the area rather than the loss of recreational value. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling in an area that is suitable for housing in terms of location and accessibility but, given the small scale of the scheme, the associated benefits would be very modest and would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan when considered as a whole, and I find no material consideration which would justify a decision other than in accordance with it.
12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Guy Rigby

INSPECTOR