



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/24/3340012

112 Wrotesley Road West, Wolverhampton WV6 8UR

- 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 and Mrs K Kandola against the decision of the City of Wolverhampton Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01152/FUL, dated 24 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear, first floor side, double storey front extensions and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and area, and the effect on the living conditions of neighbours in respect of outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal building is a detached house with a large rear garden located in a residential area. It has two extant permissions, with one granted on appeal, for a single storey rear, first floor side, double storey front extensions and loft conversion. The main difference in the current appeal scheme is the proposal for an amended design adding an extension at loft level at the rear of the building.
4. The rear of the building is not visible from Wrotesley Road West. The proposed rear elevation, as granted permission, includes a symmetrical design with prominent twin gables. Other neighbouring properties are also characterised by rear gables. The proposed high-level extension would be seen from the gardens of the neighbouring detached houses at either side of the appeal site. There would also be views from their upper floor rear windows of the extension because of its height.
5. The appeal proposal would result in visually balanced rear-built form, but with two asymmetric gables and a flat roofed rear projection at high level. This arrangement would harm the appearance of the rear elevation because of the uncharacteristic appearance of the asymmetric gables and altered roofscape, and also the increased massing at high level. The proposed development would

appear incongruous and out of character with the proposed rear elevation of the building as designed under the extant permissions. It would also be discordant with the gabled design and roofscape forms of neighbouring detached buildings.

6. The proposal would conflict with Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS) policy ENV3 concerning design quality and Saved Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policies D4, D6, D7, D8 and D9 which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that adjacent buildings relate positively to each other, that proposals reinforce local distinctiveness, and are of appropriate height, scale and massing. It would also fail to comply with the design objectives in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Effect on living conditions

7. The proposal would include altered fenestration at high level in the gables and proposed loft extension compared to the permitted scheme. There would be a slight increased loss of privacy for neighbours when compared with the permitted scheme because of the possibility for overlooking from the proposed windows. Although the fenestration would fail to align vertically with others in the rear elevation it would be possible to impose a condition requiring the submission of amended fenestration details, including obscure glazing to protect the privacy for neighbours.
8. There would be a significant increase in harm for the outlook of neighbours at either side of the appeal building from their gardens because of the more imposing and overbearing effect of the proposed increase in bulk of the development at high level. In this latter respect the proposal would conflict with BCCS policy ENV3 and UDP saved policies D7 and D8 which seek to avoid overbearing development and to protect peoples' amenities, including their immediate outlook.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would provide the private benefit of increased living space, albeit limited, compared to the extant schemes. Nevertheless, that would not overcome the overall harm from the appeal proposal that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR