



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2025

by **L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/24/3354006

2 Peverill Road, Wolverhampton WV4 6PB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jarnail Deol against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00852/FUL.
 - The development proposed is ground floor garage conversion along with outbuilding and first floor side and rear extension to create gable end and rear bedroom.
-

Decision.

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it related to first floor rear side and rear extension to create gable end and rear bedroom. The appeal is allowed insofar as it related to ground floor garage conversion along with outbuilding at 2 Peverill Road, Wolverhampton WV4 6PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00852/FUL, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and 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, insofar as it relates to the ground floor garage conversion and outbuilding only, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Site Plan 02 006 B; Proposed Elevations 02 010 B; Proposed Ground Floor Plans 02 007 B; and Proposed Outbuilding 02 011.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the ground floor garage conversion hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The external surfaces of the outbuilding hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no 02 011.

Preliminary Matters

2. A single storey rear extension has been subject to prior approval¹, and thus the principle of development for a single storey rear extension has been established.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

¹ 24/00644/PDPA

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 2 Peverill Road (No 2) is a semi-detached dwelling. Whilst there is a bungalow at the corner of the cul-de-sac, and a single detached property close by, neighbouring dwellings are generally semi-detached two-storey properties of a similar design, age and style to No 2. The catslide roofs on the majority of neighbouring properties give a pleasing degree of visual consistency and symmetry between pairs of properties and are an attractive design feature significant to local character.
5. No 2, along with its semi-detached neighbour 1 Peverill Road has retained its original catslide design. Despite there being small design differences between the properties to their front elevations, the properties are well balanced and read as a pair.
6. Whilst the proposal would not protrude forward of the building line, and the property would remain as a two-storey dwelling, the first-floor extension would result in the loss of the catslide roof. The width and the design of the first-floor extension would fail to respect or complement the host dwelling and would alter the overall look of the property to a degree that would give the dwelling a discordant and incongruous appearance. The first-floor extension would be a dominant feature that would unbalance the pleasing symmetry of the semi-detached pair of dwellings and would jar within the context of the surrounding properties. This would be to the detriment of local character.
7. A number of other properties in the vicinity have undergone various alterations, including at roof level, and the appellant has drawn my attention to other dwellings in the area that have been extended in similar fashion to that proposed. However, I have limited information on the circumstances that led to their construction. I note that two of the examples given, at 66 and 95 Laburnum Road, were permitted some time ago, under a different local and national policy context. The extensions at Nos 70 and 79 Laburnum Road have both kept elements of the catslide roof and as such do not appear as inharmonious in the street scene. These extensions have not compromised the symmetry to the same extent as that proposed, and are more subservient to the host property. I note that the dwelling directly opposite No 2 has been extended in a very similar way to that proposed. However, this has resulted in a lack of symmetry with its semi-detached neighbour. The extensions and alterations to the catslide roofs are not the prevalent roof form in the locality, and do not serve to justify the proposed development, which I have determined on its own merits.
8. The proposed first-floor extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposed first-floor extension would therefore conflict with Policies D4, D7, D8 and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan 2001-2011 (2006) (UDP) which seek to ensure that development responds positively to its surroundings, the established pattern of streets and buildings, is of appropriate massing and that its form takes account of rhythm and balance. It would also conflict with the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) (CS) policies CSP4 and ENV3 which seeks to ensure high quality design.
9. A single storey rear extension at the appeal property has been subject to prior approval, and thus the principle of development for a single storey rear extension has been established. The proposed outbuilding would be at the rear of the

property and would not be visible from the street. The proposed garage conversion would not affect the catslide roof. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling appears to have had its garage converted into a habitable room, and the proposed conversion would not appear as discordant nor harm the prevailing pattern of development. As these elements of the proposal are physically and functionally severable from the proposed first-floor extension, I consider a split decision would be appropriate to allow planning permission for these elements of the proposed scheme.

10. The proposed ground floor garage conversion and outbuilding would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. They would accord with Policies D4, D7, D8 and D9 of the UDP and with CS policies CSP4 and ENV3 which seek to ensure that development responds positively to surrounding buildings and is of high quality design.

Other Matters

11. The living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would not be harmed. The proposal would provide extra living space for the occupiers and would allow natural supervision of the street scene. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm that the first-floor extension would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Conditions

12. For the part of the proposal that I am recommending is approved, conditions are necessary requiring that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings and that materials match the existing property and those detailed on the drawings, in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.
14. I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the ground floor garage conversion and outbuilding.
15. In relation to the first-floor extension, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. This element of the appeal should be dismissed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR