



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

**by John Gunn DipTP, DipDBE, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 4 May 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/23/3317661**

**52A Spring Road, Ettingshall, Wolverhampton WV4 6LQ**

- 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 Gurnek Uppal against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
  - The application Ref 22/01550/FUL, dated 16 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2023.
  - The development proposed is a double storey side extension, first floor rear extension and new front and rear facing roof lights to support habitable loft conversion.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development provided on the application form has been replaced by fuller versions on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider the subsequent details to be usefully more comprehensive and I have therefore used them within this decision.
3. I have not been provided with an officer's report by the Council and consequently I have based my assessment of their concerns on the reasons for refusal as set out on the decision notice.

## Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area; and
  - the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular regard to parking.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

5. The appeal site lies in a predominantly residential area at a point where Dock Meadow Drive joins Spring Road. The houses fronting onto Spring Road, in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, are typically two-storey semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. They are set behind modest sized front gardens, the majority of which have been hard surfaced to provide off street parking. Properties in Dock Meadow Drive comprise primarily of semi-detached

bungalows with hipped roofs. Commercial properties are situated to the north, of the appeal site, and include retail premises on the opposite side of Dock Meadow Drive.

6. It was readily apparent from my site visit that the host property had already been extended with the provision of a part single/part two-storey side extension and a single storey ground floor rear extension.
7. The proposal would further extend the existing side extension with the front wall of the ground floor extension being brought in line with the main front elevation, and the first floor being set back by a short distance from the principal elevation. An additional storey would be added above the existing single storey rear extension, with three hipped roofs extending backwards from the main building.
8. Given its prominent corner position the proposed development would be readily apparent from Spring Road and Dock Meadow Drive with the two-storey side extension sitting close to the back edge of the footpath as it runs alongside Dock Meadow Drive. The proposal would significantly increase the bulk and massing of the property at ground, first and roof level and appear as a conspicuous and incongruous addition to the street scene.
9. I note the attempt to make the side extension subordinate by setting the first floor back from the front elevation and setting the ridge line below that of the host property. However, this would not overcome the obtrusive nature of the proposed development when added to the significant additions that have already been carried out at the property.
10. I acknowledge that the appeal site includes a generous rear garden and would therefore be capable of accommodating substantial development, however, this does not justify a proposal which represents a harmful increase in bulk and massing to the host property, which would be out of character with its surroundings.
11. I therefore conclude, on this main issue, that due to its scale and design, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CSP4 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS) and saved Policies D4, D6, D7, D8 and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan 2001-2011 (UDP). These policies seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design that respects local character. The proposal would also conflict with the Extension to houses Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in respect of the consideration of potential harm arising from two storey rear and side extensions.

#### *Highway safety*

12. The appeal property has a hardstanding at the front of the property that is used for parking. This area can accommodate 3 cars parked side by side, with the potential to create a further space at an angle. The Council's Transportation Service has confirmed that this quantity would meet the parking standards that are set out in the City of Wolverhampton Councils Highways and Transportation Technical Guidance Note, for a house of this size at this location. Whilst not an ideal arrangement it was clear from my observations that the forecourt would provide the requisite amount of off-street parking.

13. During my site visit I noted that the appeal property was passed by a relatively light flow of traffic. Most properties in the locality provided at least one off-street parking space. Although on-street parking was evident, Spring Road was not inundated with parked cars. My site visit was carried out during the daytime, which only represents a snapshot in time, and I acknowledge that on-street parking is likely to be much more prevalent during the evening. That said, there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that on-street parking in the area is a particular problem.
14. The addition of one bedroom within the appeal property would not result in a significant increase in traffic movements in the locality. Moreover, the consequence of potential additional parking on the street would not have a detrimental to the free flow of traffic within the road. Nor would it otherwise unacceptably compromise highway and pedestrian safety in the area.
15. I have taken into account the Council's concern that the proposal has the potential to create a 9 bedroom dwelling. In this regard, I note that there are rooms on the first and second floor that are annotated for use as a study and storage space, which could potentially be used for other purposes. However, I have no substantive evidence before me to indicate that this is the appellants intention.
16. In light of the above I conclude, on this main issue, that the amount of off-street parking available is sufficient to serve the proposed development, and highway safety would not be adversely affected. Consequently, there is no conflict with Policies AM12 and AM15 of the UDP which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that the level of parking provision is appropriate to the proposal and its location.

### **Other Matter**

17. The proposal would provide extra accommodation which would be to the benefit of the appellant and his family. However, it is unlikely that the proposal before me is the only way in which that aspiration could be achieved.

### **Conclusion**

18. Whilst I find no unacceptable harm to highway safety this does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified. There are no other relevant material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan as a whole. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*John Gunn*

INSPECTOR