



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/25/3368786

33 Eastfield Grove, Wolverhampton WV1 2RF

- 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 Kartar Mehmi against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00512/FUL.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for first floor extension at 33 Eastfield Grove, Wolverhampton WV1 2RF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00512/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 0S/1002 (dated 11-06-25); Existing Ground Floor Plan 1001-01; Existing First Floor Plan 1001-02; Existing Elevations 1001-03; Proposed First Floor Plan 1003-04 (dated 11-06-25); and Proposed Elevations 1002-05 (dated 04-06-25).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 34 Eastfield Grove with regards to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Number 33 Eastfield Grove (No 33) is an end of terrace dwelling located within a residential area. The surrounding properties are of a uniform design and type and follow a linear building line. The regular pattern of development results in a well-ordered layout which gives a pleasing degree of visual consistency and cohesiveness, and which contributes positively to the street scene.

4. No 33 already has a single-storey rear elevation, which is an uncharacteristic feature of the row of terraces. As the extension is at the rear of the dwelling its visibility is limited to views from the rear of neighbouring properties. The proposed first floor extension would likewise be at the rear of the dwelling. There is a small gap between No 33 and the neighbouring block of terraces which would enable partial views of the proposed extension from certain public vantage points along Eastfield Grove. However, visibility of the proposed extension would be minimal, and an extension would not look untypical or uncharacteristic in the residential context.
5. The proposed extension would be set in from the boundary with 34 Eastfield Grove (No 34) and the roof would be set down from the ridge of the host property. It would not project as far as the existing ground floor extension and would not lead to a loss of garden space. It would not appear as over dominant, but rather the size and scale of the proposed extension, along with the drop in height, would ensure that it would be subservient to the original dwelling. Furthermore, the use of matching materials would assimilate the extension with the host property.
6. The proposal would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conform with Policies D4, D6, 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, preserves townscape character, is of appropriate height, scale and form and uses good quality materials.

Living conditions

7. The Extension to Houses Supplementary Planning Guidance Note (1996) highlights that in order to protect neighbours' amenity extensions should not significantly reduce the sunlight or daylight enjoyed by habitable rooms of adjoining properties, should not be overbearing and not adversely affect outlook.
8. No 34 is the dwelling attached to No 33. The proposed first floor extension would be set in from the immediate boundary with No 34. The proposal would be of an appropriate scale, and it would not sit so close to the boundary with No 34 so as to appear as a looming or overbearing feature nor to create a tunnelling effect.
9. The submitted drawings indicate that the proposal would pass the 45-degree test from the closest windows at No 34. As such, the extension would not significantly block natural light from entering habitable rooms at the property, and an acceptable outlook from the windows would be retained.
10. Similarly, the scale and positioning of the proposed extension, set in from the boundary, would not harm the outlook from the garden of No 34. Whilst the introduction of built form at first floor level may at times cast a shadow across part of the garden of No 34, given the size of the extension any overshadowing would be modest and transitory, resulting in any adverse impact being temporary and limited. The proposal would therefore not result in a significant loss of light to the garden of No 34.
11. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 34 with regard to outlook and light. As such, it would conform with UDP Policies D7, D8, D9 and H6 which together seek to prevent development that is overbearing and protect the amenity of neighbours in respect of outlook and light.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition in respect of materials is necessary.

Conclusion

13. 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.
14. As a result, the appeal should be allowed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR