
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/25/3371900

83 Goldthorn Hill, Wolverhampton WV2 3HY

- 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 Rohail Aslam against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00289/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a double storey front extension with over garage storey and hipped roof with enlarged dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Goldthorn Hill comprises a broad mix of house types and architectural styles. The appeal site (No 83) sits within a short row of three detached dwellings that, despite some individual alterations over time, share key characteristics including their two-storey height, curved bay windows and the use of similar facing materials.
5. Each of the three dwellings also has an attached garage to the side, creating a clear visual gap between them. These gaps, combined with the wide, landscaped pavement and the dwellings' slightly elevated and set-back position from the road, lend this part of Goldthorn Hill a notably open and verdant character. Taken together, the visual cohesion of the built form and the spacious setting contribute positively to the overall character and appearance of the street scene.
6. The Council's reason for refusal specifically relates to the proposed side extension. Based on the submitted plans and my own observations on site, I am satisfied that the proposed rear extension would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed two-storey side extension would occupy the first-floor space above the existing garage, substantially narrowing the gap between No 83 and the neighbouring property at No 81 Goldthorn Hill. Although set down from the ridge of the main roof and set back from the principal elevation, the appeal scheme would significantly reduce the openness at first-floor level, restricting views of the mature trees to the rear, and resulting in overly dominant façade when viewed from Goldthorn Hill. The extended dwelling would also be disproportionate in scale and spacing compared to the neighbouring properties, disrupting the established pattern of development and eroding the positive contribution these dwellings make to the street scene as a group.
8. Whilst the detailed design elements of the appeal scheme, such as the proposed apex window, would generally assimilate with the appeal property and the removal of the existing dormers who result in a more simplified roofscape, this would not be sufficient to mitigate the overall harm caused by the loss of spaciousness and the incongruous scale of the proposed development in its context.
9. Accordingly, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed side extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Saved Policies D7, D8 and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (2006), which seek to ensure that developments are of a height, scale and appearance that relates positively to its surroundings. It would also fail to comply with Policies ENV3 and CSP4 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011), which promote high-quality design that is influenced by its context.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to other side extensions referred to by the appellant. However, these are not directly comparable to the appeal site, particularly in terms of the spatial relationship and cohesive character shared by No 83 and its immediate neighbours. The series of side extensions on the opposite side of Goldthorn Road also create a terracing effect that impinges on the character and appearance of the area and would not provide sufficient justification for the proposal before me. In any event, I have assessed the appeal on its own planning merits and site-specific context. Accordingly, the presence of other side extensions in the wider area does not justify a form of development that would be harmful.
11. Similarly, the appellant's desire to extend the appeal property to provide extra space for their family, does not justify the harm identified under the main issue. There is also nothing to suggest that the dwelling could not be made desirable for family occupation through a scheme which does not harm the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR