

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/24/3338164
10B Stockwell Road, Wolverhampton, WV6 9AX

- 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 Rani against the decision of the City of Wolverhampton Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01009/FUL, dated 19 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is extensions to front side and rear together with roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal property benefits from a recent planning permission for a front, side and rear extension and loft conversion¹.
3. In its description of the proposed development, the Council's decision notice refers to "resubmission of approved planning application 22/10389/FUL."
4. The proposal the subject of this appeal differs from this recent permission in that it proposes to replace the permitted hipped roof with a larger gable roof; and it seeks to introduce a new projecting porch, extending to ridge height, to the front of the dwelling.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Tettenhall Greens Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with an attached double garage which projects to the front. There is a long driveway and small garden area to the front and a longer garden to the rear.
7. The appeal property is located within the Tettenhall Greens Conservation Area, characterised by the presence of impressive Georgian and Victorian properties,

¹ Reference: 22/01389/FUL.

houses set within comfortable gardens, traditional stone walls and boundaries, mature trees and green open spaces. Stockwell Road in this location is noticeable for its mature trees and well-spaced dwellings within comfortable garden plots behind low and medium height boundary walls.

8. Further to the above, I noted during my site visit that, whilst many dwellings have been altered and or extended, such changes tend to appear in keeping with host dwellings and their neighbours. This provides for a notable sense of uniformity, whereby the appeal dwelling and its neighbours to the south west share numerous features, including being set well-back from the road, having roofs of a similar height and similarities in scale and design.
9. The proposed development would greatly extend the size of the existing roof, such that it would stretch across almost the full width of the property and would project significantly to the front and rear. The gable design and full height front projection would result in an extremely large and bulky addition at roof level.
10. I find that the above would result in a form of development that would overwhelm and fail to appear subservient to the host dwelling. It would result in the dwelling appearing unduly bulky and top-heavy.
11. Further to the above, the proposed double-height front porch, with its significant projection, large gable and extensive glazing at roof level, would draw attention to itself as a prominent and unduly dominant feature. It would combine with the roof to overwhelm and fail to appear subservient to, the appearance of the host dwelling.
12. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the development as a whole appearing in stark contrast to and out of keeping with, the appearance of neighbouring dwellings.
13. As a result of the above, the proposal would draw undue attention to itself as an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would appear to the detriment of the Tettenhall Greens Conservation Area's qualities.
14. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to conserve the appearance of the Tettenhall Greens Conservation Area. Having regard to paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to Planning Practice Guidance, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. This needs to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring.
15. There is nothing before me to demonstrate that there are any benefits that would amount to such public benefits that they would outweigh the harm identified.
16. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would fail to conserve the character and appearance of the Tettenhall Greens Conservation Area contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (2006) Policies D6, D8, D9 and HE1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR