
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2023

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/23/3326433

83 Sabrina Road, Wolverhampton WV6 8BP

- 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 Mrs Diljeet Kaur against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00303/FUL, dated 29 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is rear and front extensions and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear and front extensions and loft conversion in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/00303/FUL, dated 29 March 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 22-160-01, 22-160-04 and 22-160-06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building except where indicated otherwise on the application form.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the bungalow and this part of Sabrina Road.

Reasons

3. 83 Sabrina Road is a detached single storey bungalow within a residential street. The proposal includes a large scale extension to the rear, a smaller scale extension to the front and the conversion of the extended roof space to form upper floor accommodation. I understand that planning permission has been granted for a similar set of extensions in late 2022. If this appeal is dismissed the approved scheme would very likely be implemented in its place, forming a fall-back position which is an important consideration in this appeal.

4. The key difference between the approved and appeal schemes appears to be the replacement of a dormer window at the front with a second projecting gable. The Council's concern is that the resulting dual gable frontage would be unbalanced and disproportionate to the original simple frontage.
5. Sabrina Road is characterised by houses and bungalows of varied architectural designs, materials and detailing. Many of the other dwellings, including examples near to No 83, have dual gables on their frontages in an asymmetrical layout. This design element is therefore fully in character with the street scene.
6. No 83 is set back from the road where the front extension would not break through any established building line. This is not and would not be a tall or imposing structure. The forward projection of the gable would simplify the front elevation in comparison to the approved scheme and would better integrate the existing forward projecting garage. As a result, it would create a more harmonious and less cluttered design. Neither the Council nor I find any objection to the other aspects of the proposal, which are much as already approved.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or the appearance of the bungalow or this part of Sabrina Road. It accords with the design aspects of Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan 2001 to 2011 policies D4, D8 and D9 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance No 4 *Extension to Houses*, which seek to ensure that developments make a positive contribution to the appearance of the area including through the use of appropriate form and good quality detailing and materials.
8. I have also taken a neighbour's comments into account. This would remain a low structure, and the rear extension would be much the same as already approved. High level rooflights would restrict overlooking from the upper floor. Adequate daylighting and sunlight would be retained to the side of No 85, noting that the remaining gap between the properties would be open to the south.
9. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and a condition governing the use of materials to protect local character and appearance. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR