
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by **C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/25/3371003
110 Yelverton Road, Coventry CV6 4AH

- 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 Sukhjit Singh against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0000994/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of one bedroom detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to detrimental impact on the occupiers of 110 and 112 Yelverton Road (Nos 110 and 112). However, the Council officer's report and appeal evidence refers to harm caused to the occupiers of No 112 and that, the residents of No 110 would overlook the proposed dwelling, harmful to its future occupiers, rather than any harm caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 110.

Main Issues

3. In view of the above, the main issues are, the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the surrounding area,
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 112 Yelverton Road (No 112), in particular regard to outlook; and,
 - whether the occupiers of the proposed dwelling would have acceptable living conditions in regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is within a predominately residential area, typically of two-storey, pitched roof, terraced properties set within long plots, with front elevations set back from the road, forming strong, consistent building lines. Either side of the stretch of Yelverton Road where the appeal site is, there are the rear gardens of dwellings and respective side boundary treatments, although no dwellings directly front onto it. Also, along this part of the road, rear garden outbuildings are visible above boundary treatments and there are several access points to parking and rear garden areas and an electricity sub-station. Additionally, there is a large tree visible from the road, located within the rear garden of No 112.

5. The proposed dwelling would include some traditional design features, although it would be a detached property, one and a half storey high with a low-pitched roof, of L-shape design and include a dormer window to the front. Such scale and design features are not typical of existing dwellings within the surrounding area. Additionally, the new dwelling would not be set back that far from the road and the appeal plot is of limited depth, with the proposed garden to the side, rather than at the rear. As a result, the proposed dwelling would appear as a cramped form of development and would not be in keeping with the established pattern and form of development in the local area.
6. Therefore, despite that the appellant asserts the proposed dwelling has been designed to seek to minimise its visual impact and massing from the road and neighbouring properties, by virtue of its design, form and position within the plot, the proposal would appear harmfully incongruous within the street scene.
7. Even if this part of Yelverton Road is of poor quality, due to existing boundary treatments and other features and, the proposed dwelling would break up the extent of boundary treatment to the roadside, adding more variety to the street scene. Such matters and the use of appropriate external materials for the new dwelling, would not reduce its harmful prominence within the streetscene, nor ensure that it would be in keeping with the prevailing character of the surrounding area.
8. Also, while the roofs of single storey garages and other buildings are visible from the street scene, the proposed dwelling would be much larger and of a different form to such subordinate outbuildings. As a result, the new dwelling would appear overly dominant and anomalous within the streetscene. Whereas, as existing, the appeal site comprises a rear garden area with close boarded boundary fencing around it, which is in keeping with the local context along this stretch of the road.
9. In view of the above, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies DE1 and H3 of the Coventry City Local Plan (December 2017) (LP), which amongst other matters, require high quality design that enhances the surrounding built environment and makes a positive contribution to the character of an area.

Living conditions- existing residents

10. No windows are proposed in the rear elevation of the new dwelling and so, there would be no direct overlooking and loss of privacy caused to the occupiers of No 112. However, even though the proposed dwelling would not be directly to the rear of No 112, not that close to its rear elevation and toward the bottom end of its garden, the new dwelling would be located close to the side boundary of its rear garden. This would result in a tall dominant form of development, prominently visible from the rear windows and garden of No 112.
11. Also, even if the rear portion of the garden of No 112 is not currently used by its occupiers, due to its height and close proximity to the boundary and that, the garden of No 112 is long and narrow, the new dwelling would appear as an overly dominant feature from the rear garden of No 112. As a result, it would have an oppressive, harmful overbearing impact on the living conditions of occupiers of No 112.
12. While the proposed dwelling would be 1.5 stories with a low-pitched roof, it would be much larger and more prominent than typical, single storey garden outbuildings. Furthermore, despite the orientation of the proposed dwelling to No 112 and its likely

impact on sunlight thereto, this would not reduce its overall dominance and subsequent harm caused to the outlook of occupiers of No 112.

13. Having regard to the above, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 112 Yelverton Road, in particular regard to outlook. Consequently, there would be conflict with Policies DE1 and H3 of the LP, which amongst other things, require new development to be high quality and have a suitable residential environment, including in terms of function and impact.

Living conditions- future occupiers

14. The proposed dwelling would be to the rear of No 110, within part of its garden currently fenced off. The principal outdoor garden space of the new dwelling would be to the side nearest No 110 and, the dwelling would have a large habitable room, ground floor opening in its side elevation facing toward the rear of No 110.
15. There would be no direct window to window overlooking between the new dwelling and No 110, due to intervening boundary fencing and the position of windows. However, due to the position and separation distance between the new dwelling and No 110, it would be possible to harmfully overlook into the garden space and large ground floor opening of the new dwelling from the first floor windows of No 110. Furthermore, even though it would not be a traditional back-to-back relationship, the proposed distance separation between the rear windows of No 110 and the proposed side elevation of the new dwelling would not meet the minimum separation distance standard in order to protect privacy; as set out in the Council's Design Guidance for New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document.
16. While a further window opening is proposed to serve the lounge/kitchen area of the new dwelling on its front elevation, this would not remove the potential for harmful overlooking from the windows of No 110, including overlooking into the private garden area of the new dwelling. Additionally, as this is the only proposed opening onto the new dwelling's garden area, it would not be reasonable to restrict via condition that it is obscurely glazed or reduced in size, as this would not ensure suitable outlook and enjoyment of the new dwelling by its future occupiers.
17. In view of the above, the occupiers of the proposed dwelling would have unacceptable living conditions in regard to privacy, in conflict with Policies DE1 and H3 of the LP, which require new development to provide a suitable residential environment, including in terms of function and impact.

Other Matters

18. It is undisputed that the internal layout of the proposed dwelling would meet the Nationally Described Space Standards. Also, even if the new dwelling would provide a small, affordable starter-home, in a sustainable location, such matters do not affect my findings on the main issues. Furthermore, I have no substantive evidence to demonstrate the new dwelling would be affordable or support a particular need for smaller dwellings in the local area.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it.

20. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR