



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2020

by David Carter BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/19/3242460

23 Overfield Drive, Wolverhampton WV14 9XW

- 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 Singh against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00877/FUL, dated 25 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and first floor side extension.
-

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. The appeal site lies at the corner of Overfield Drive and Prestons Row. It is a modern, detached property on an estate of similar types of dwellings. There is an existing garage and utility room to the side of the property. This is built close to the site boundary with Prestons Row and the proposal would add a first floor to provide an additional bedroom and bathroom and a 3m extension to the rear on the ground floor only. Additionally, a ground floor rear extension would extend the main body of the dwelling by c1.7m.
4. The appellant has drawn my attention to several instances on the same estate where similar scale extensions have been permitted. On my site visit I viewed all of the other examples drawn to my attention. However, in this appeal my concern is the impact of the appeal proposal on its immediate locality given its raised and prominent corner position. The other examples occupy corner plots but do not possess the same degree of prominence.
5. No 23 Overfield Road has been extended previously, including the garage/utility adjacent to the Prestons Row frontage. Planning permission was granted in 2012 for a more modest and subservient first floor extension above the garage and utility room. While this has not been implemented, I note that the approved plans superseded a larger first floor extension very similar to that now proposed.
6. No 23 occupies a very prominent raised position and the existing garage extension already dominates the street scene. The first-floor extension, as

proposed, would add significantly to this, creating a dwelling that is significantly larger than both the original and neighbouring dwellings. As such the proposed extension would appear disproportionate in scale and overbearing given its raised position, disrupting the underlying pattern and rhythm of buildings in the locality. As such the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The detailed design to the frontage of the first-floor element of the extension would fail to match the rest of the existing frontage and would appear out-of-place. This adds to my concerns.

7. The projection of the proposed single storey extension to the rear of the main body of No 23 would not give rise to issues relating to daylight for occupiers of the neighbouring property. However, the nature of the proposal is such that the rear and side elements of the extensions are not severable both physically and functionally so a split decision would not be feasible.
8. For the reasons stated above, I consider that the proposed first floor extension would have a harmful and overbearing impact on the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the scale, bulk and design of the proposal particularly given its prominent raised corner position. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies D4, D6, D7, D8, and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Policies CSP4 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy 2011. These policies, among other things, emphasise the importance of responding positively to urban grain including the existing pattern of buildings (Policy D4), the importance of reinforcing local distinctiveness (Policy D6), appropriate massing of proposals (Policy D8) and the appropriate use of form and good quality detailing (Policy D9).

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

David Carter

INSPECTOR