



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2020

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) PgDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/20/3254537

32 Maple Road, Wolverhampton WV3 7JD

- 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 Paul Wright against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00464/FUL, dated 5 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of first floor side and single storey rear extensions and detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area, and on the living conditions of the neighbouring property, No. 33 Maple Road, in terms of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling located within a primarily residential area. There is some variation in property designs within the locality including on this street. A number of houses have been extended also with resultant varying roof forms. The appeal property is unusual in that it sits at an angle as the road bends sharply towards the cul de sac head. The adjoining property is set-back from the appeal property but on a straight alignment with the road by comparison. The present single storey garage is set back slightly from the host property and runs at an acute angle along the common boundary with No. 33 to maximise the available space between the two neighbouring houses.
4. The proposed two storey extension would be built above the existing garage structure thereby taking the same acute angled alignment along the common side boundary. The proposed two storey extension would be long; it would have an uncharacteristic angled dimension. When viewed from the front, the scale and size of the roof to the extension would visually elongate the frontage to the property, which would dominate and fail to respect the proportion of the original dwelling. From the street, the angle of the first-floor walling and

roofscape would be prominent and incongruous, which consequently would be an inharmonious addition to the property. Far from the appeal scheme having "subtlety of design" as claimed, it would rather have a disjointed appearance when viewed from the public domain. Overall, the proposal would result in the dwelling having a cluttered and disrespectful roof profile which would be out of character with the simplicity of the original property.

5. Therefore, I consider the proposed development would materially harm both the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policies D4, D6, D8 and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which require new developments to respond positively to the established pattern of streets and buildings, including in terms of massing, scale and orientation so as to reinforce local distinctiveness.

Living conditions – outlook

6. The existing garage runs along the angled common boundary with No.33 and is set slightly back from the host property. Due to the acute angle, the two-storey extension would introduce a sheer mass of walling into most of the available space that would originally have been the front garden to No.32. The occupiers of No.33 would be confronted by a large two storey structure running along the full length of the front garden. This to my mind would be overbearing and create a most unneighbourly sense of enclosure and dominate the outlook from the nearest windows at the front of No.33 and reduce the enjoyment of the front garden of the neighbouring property.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed two storey extension would harm the living conditions of the neighbours and would be contrary to UDP Policies D7 and D8 and to Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new developments do not have unacceptable consequences in terms of the amenity of adjoining properties in terms of outlook arising from developments that are overbearing.

Other matters

8. The Council does not appear to object to the rear single storey extension or the proposed double garage. I have no reason to disagree and find those elements acceptable in planning terms. I am aware that a slightly modified scheme has gained approval. However, the proposal before me differs because of the angled first floor extension and positioning relative to No.33, which I have found visually jarring and unneighbourly.

Conclusion

9. Although I have found that certain aspects of the scheme do not raise issues of concern and I accept that the 45 degree code is not offended, the two storey extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and also cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring property, No 33.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR