



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/20/3257893

30 Compton Hill Drive, Wolverhampton WV3 9DL

- 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 Nigel Rogers against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00518/FUL, dated 20 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with 2 storey rear/side and 1st floor side extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area including the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policies D4, D6, D7, D8, H6 and Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS) Policies ENV2, ENV3, Policy TNP 12 of the Neighbourhood Plan for the Tettenhall Wards (the NP) requires that new proposal should, amongst other matters, "respond positively to the established pattern of streets and buildings", reinforce local distinctiveness, respond to the site and its context, and make a positive contribution to the area.
4. The appeal property is a detached dormer bungalow that forms part of a development of a number of similarly sized and styled properties on Compton Hill Drive (CHD). Consequently, the character and appearance of this part of CHD is heavily influenced by the presence of these very similar properties, all of a modest scale and appearance.
5. The submitted plans show that the key difference between the appeal scheme and an earlier approved scheme is the gable extension, located centrally in the front elevation of the property raising to a point just short of the ridge.
6. The proposed extension by virtue of its height and considerable bulk, particularly at the first floor/roof level, would dominate the front of the dwelling harming the character and appearance of the dwelling. Furthermore, the extension would appear as an incongruous feature when viewed from the street in the context of the adjacent buildings, thus harming the character and appearance of the area.

7. The appellant refers to a number of other developments that are of a similar theme to that sought here and carefully explains the design rational, specifically providing an "aesthetic front lift and to make a focal point of the gable feature". I appreciate that design can be a subjective issue. However, the appeal scheme would fail to respond to local character and appearance.
8. As such, I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area including the existing dwelling. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policies D4, D6, D7, D8, H6 and BCCS Policies ENV2, ENV3, Policy TNP 12 of the NP.

Conclusion

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

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR