



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/W/25/3364812

208 Newhampton Road East, Wolverhampton WV1 4BB

- 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 Jasbir Lall against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01299/FUL.
 - The development proposed is conversion of single dwelling house into two flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of single dwelling house into two flats at 208 Newhampton Road East, Wolverhampton WV1 4BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01299/FUL 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 drawing nos: Location and Block Plan – 240923P-010; Site Plan – 240923P-011; Existing Ground and First Floor Plans – 240923P-001; Proposed Ground Floor and First Floor Plans – 240923P-002; Existing and Proposed Elevations – 240923P-003.
 - 3) Before occupation of the development hereby permitted, secure and covered cycle storage within the site shall be provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The storage area shall thereafter be kept available for the storage of cycles.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant submitted a Highways Report 'Statement on Highway Matters' (April 2025) with the appeal documentation. The report does not alter the scheme, and the relevant parties have had the opportunity to comment on the report during the course of the appeal process. As such, parties would not be prejudiced by my taking it into account in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to noise and disturbance; and

- the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to parking provision.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal property is a three-bedroomed, mid-terrace dwelling house located in a tightly knit residential area, fronting a busy stretch of road. There are a number of commercial and retail uses nearby. I observed on my site visit that there was a steady flow of traffic along the road, which was on a bus route. Ambient traffic noise was appreciable from the appeal site, leading to a relatively high baseline level of noise for occupants of properties along the road.
5. The proposal for 2, two-bedroomed flats would create one additional bedroom at the appeal property. The proposed development would therefore not result in a significantly greater number of occupants than would be the case were the property to remain as a family dwelling. The use of the house by a single family, which could include a number of children or young adults, is likely to generate a comparable amount of activity, noise and disturbance in and around it, and a similar number of comings and goings as would be created by the occupants of the proposed flats.
6. Whilst the front door of the appeal property is situated close to one of the adjoining terraced houses, the submitted plans indicate that the recessed porch would be retained. This would help limit any disturbance to neighbouring occupiers from the sound of the door opening and closing. Moreover, given that it would only serve one extra residential unit, the additional use of the door would be limited.
7. The proposed flats would have no vehicular access or off-street parking provision. There would therefore be no increase in the noise which may be experienced from vehicular movement related to the appeal property.
8. The proposal would therefore not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regards to noise and disturbance. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies EP5 and H6 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan 2001-2011 (2006) (UDP) which seek to ensure that development does not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise pollution and protects the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Highway safety

9. The current single dwelling unit does not benefit from any off-street parking, and the proposed flats would likewise have no off-street parking provision. UDP Policy AM12 indicates that whilst the Council will be flexible in the application of parking standards, each residential unit should provide a maximum of 1.5 parking spaces. The proposal would therefore generate a requirement for 3 car parking spaces, an increase of 1.5 spaces from the current requirement.
10. A number of dwellings along Newhampton Road East have off-street parking, but the majority of terraced properties in the vicinity rely on on-street parking on Newhampton Road East and the surrounding subsidiary roads. There are parking permit restrictions on match days, with Wolverhampton Wanderer's football ground in proximity. Future occupants of the proposed flats would be able to apply for a match day parking permit.

11. The appellant has submitted a car parking survey. This used the Lambeth style methodology, which surveys the availability of and demand for on-street parking within a 200m walking distance of the site. In order to give an indication of peak on-street parking demand, the survey was undertaken on consecutive weekday nights, and a weekend night, when residents were likely to be at home.
12. The car parking survey showed that there was sufficient vacant on-street parking space available to accommodate any additional on-street parking demand generated by the appeal scheme, even at the times of highest demand. In addition, the survey recorded vehicles that were parked in dangerous or inappropriate locations such as on double-yellow lines, with the results indicating that there was a low incidence of such occurrences. In the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, I have no reason to dispute these findings.
13. Whilst the proposal would see an additional unit at the property, the number of occupants would not be significantly greater than that which could reside at the existing dwelling, which could house a family including young adults who may have their own vehicles. I am satisfied that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate any modest additional demand for on-street parking that would be generated by the proposal.
14. Notwithstanding the above, the appeal property is in an area that has been identified as outside of a 'highly accessible' area according to criteria set out in the UDP. Nevertheless, the proposal would be within appropriate walking distances to local facilities and services such as shops, the nearest primary school, community centre, and supermarket. The appeal site is on a bus route and is located within walking distance of the nearest bus stop. Moreover, I have attached a condition requiring the provision of cycle storage at the appeal site. Future occupants of the proposed flats may not therefore be reliant on a private motor vehicle.
15. The proposal would therefore not harm highway safety, with regard to parking provision. As such, it would not conflict with the overall aims of Policies AM12, AM15 and H6 of the UDP to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and ensure that developments have safe parking provision and do not harm road safety.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard time limit, in the interests of enforceability I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order to facilitate and encourage sustainable forms of travel I have attached a condition requiring the provision of cycle storage.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the proposal would comply with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
18. As a result, the appeal should be allowed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR