

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by D Boffin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Dip Bldg Cons (RICS) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/16/3161993
36 Milford Road, Wolverhampton WV2 4NG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Baldev Kainth against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00857/FUL, dated 29 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has referred to Wolverhampton City Council SPG4: Extension to houses (SPG). However, I note that the Council's reason for refusal on the decision notice does not refer to this document and I have not been provided with a copy of the SPG. Consequently, I give it little weight.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the streetscene within Milford Road and Selwyn Close and the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises one of a pair of semi-detached houses located within a mainly residential area. There is variety in the architectural style of the dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. However, the overriding characteristic is mainly semi-detached houses set back from the street and regularly spaced close to each other. There are some single storey side extensions but the majority are restricted in width due to the close spacing of the dwellings.
 5. The host dwelling is sited at the junction of Milford Road and Selwyn Close with a generous side garden. There are a number of instances in the immediate vicinity where the dwellings are aligned in a similar way at road junctions. As such the dwellings at these road junctions are a prominent feature of the street scene.
 6. I note that the extension would be inset from the site boundary and single storey in height. However, the proposal would considerably increase the footprint of the dwelling as it would be substantial in width and depth and it
-

would wrap around the whole of the side elevation facing Selwyn Close and the rear elevation. As a result, I consider the extension to be disproportionately large in relation to the existing semi-detached dwelling. An extension of this size and wrap around form would be unduly prominent and obtrusive despite the use of sympathetic materials and window/door details.

7. Moreover, the shallow lean-to pitch to the roof of the extension would not reflect the steeper pitches of the roof of the existing dwelling and due to the corner location of the appeal site, the discordant nature of the proposal would be plainly noticeable from Milford Road and Selwyn Close. In my assessment the extension is of a poor design and when this is taken together with its prominence in views from the public realm I consider that the Council's objections are well founded.
8. The appellant refers to the fact that extensions on similar types of houses, including the adjacent dwellings, have been built or approved in the surrounding area. The full details of them are not before me and such proposals tend to be determined upon individual site circumstances. However, I noted at my site visit that, in the immediate vicinity of the site, where dwellings have been extended to the side the majority of extensions are restricted in width and do not wrap around the rear and side. Furthermore, nothing that I saw persuaded me that the development subject of this appeal is acceptable in this location. I have, in any case, determined the appeal on its own merits.
9. Taking into account all of the above I conclude that the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the street scene of Milford Road and Selwyn Close and the host dwelling. As such it would conflict with saved Policies D6, D7, D8 and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan and Policies CSP 4 and ENV 3 of the Black Country Core Strategy. These policies seek development that, amongst other things, is of a high quality of design, influenced by its context, preserves or enhances qualities of townscape and relates positively to its surroundings by means of appropriate massing and form.
10. For the reasons outlined above and taking all matters into account, I conclude that the development would be contrary to the relevant policies of the development plan and that the appeal should be dismissed.

D. Boffin

INSPECTOR