

Planning application no.	18/00978/FUL	
Site	Land Between 2 And 2A Newbridge Crescent, Wolverhampton	
Proposal	Erection of 1 bedroom dwelling	
Ward	Park;	
Applicant	Mr Bawa Singh	
Cabinet member with lead responsibility	Councillor John C Reynolds	
Accountable Director	Richard Lawrence, Director of Regeneration	
Originating service	Planning	
Accountable employee	Tracey Homfray	Planning Officer
	Tel	01902 555641
	Email	tracey.homfray@wolverhampton.gov.uk

1.0 Summary recommendation:

1.1 Grant

2.0 Application site

2.1 The proposal site comprises of a small triangular shaped piece of land, which currently houses a pair of detached garages, with an existing vehicular access off Newbridge Crescent, and secured by a 2 metre high fence/Gate. The site appears unoccupied and is in a relatively poor condition. The site is within the Tettenhall Road Conservation Area.

3.0 Application details

3.1 The proposal is for the removal of a pair of detached garages, fencing to the street, and the construction of a one bedroom detached dormer bungalow, with an open plan living area at ground floor and one double bedroom with bathroom at first floor (within the loft area), and associated landscaping and parking, including a detailed wall to the street scene, which will enclose a small private garden area to the left of the proposed property.

4.0 Planning History

The land has been the subject of previous planning applications for similar proposals and subject to an appeal as follows:

- 2687/88 – Studio and Garage – Refused 19/12/88
- 1427/89 – Two Bed House and Garage – refused overdevelopment, amenity, privacy, disabled access. Dismissed at Appeal.
- 2155/89 – Studio and Garage – Refused 23/10/89 – Allowed at Appeal
- 0769/91 - Studio and Garage – Refused 3/6/91
- 1848/91 – Studio and Garage -Granted 16/9/91
- 93/1236/FP – One Bed Dwelling – refused overdevelopment, amenity, privacy and disabled access.

Appeal

The two appeals noted above were assessed at the same time in one joint decision, one for a dwelling (1427/89), the other for a commercial studio and garage (2155/89). There were two main issues one “seriously harmful to overall character and appearance of the area, due to the limited size of the site” and the second “that the house would have a significant effect on quality of residential environment of adjacent dwellings”.

5.0 Relevant policy documents

- 5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
Black country Core Strategy (BCCS)

6.0 Publicity

- 6.1 Seven Objections received concerns include:

- Highway Safety
- Restrictive Covenant preventing development
- Inappropriate plot size to support a dwelling
- Unfavourable impact on neighbouring properties
- Adverse effect of adjacent trees.
- Structure would result in unacceptable level of density for the area.
- Design and position of the development would be out of keeping visually and historically and have a negative impact on Tettenhall Road Conservation Area
- The site is small and would be over-developed.
- The style and scale would not be in keeping with surrounding properties
- The garden would not respect the building line.
- Existing road traffic problems will be exacerbated by additional vehicles associated with any development at this site.
- Planning records indicate that permission to develop this site has been rejected on previous occasions. On appeal.
- Replacement of the existing constructions with the jarring juxtaposition of a modern dwelling of style, proportion and materials out of keeping with the surrounding dwellings will not improve the area visually or in amenity.
- Loss of parking

- Visual Amenity
- Outlook
- Security of Site
- Dominated with Parking to frontage
- Out of keeping with established setting

7.0 Consultees

- 7.1 Conservation – No Objection
Highway and Transportation – No Objection
Trees – No Objection

8.0 Legal implications

- 8.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report KR/19122018/A

9.0 Appraisal

- 9.1 This is a small plot of land located between residential properties at No. 2 and 2a Newbridge Crescent. The site currently contains two detached garages, constructed in concrete post and panels which have intermittently been used either as storage or workshops by motor mechanics over the years. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with a mixture of type of properties. Most of properties to this side of Newbridge Crescent, are large detached houses, in staggered positions, some of which are set well back on the building plot, with large mature front gardens. The principle of residential development within this area, is acceptable. Because the properties are so set back from the road and have a wide variety of boundary treatment this corner makes very little contribution to the Conservation Area as it lacks frontage.
- 9.2 The proposal seeks to remove the detached garages and fencing to Newbridge Crescent, and replace it with a small starter home. During the assessment process, the proposed plans were significantly amended due to the constrained nature of the plot and to provide an appropriate design to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area. The overall size/design has been reduced, changing it from a two storey, two-bedroom house to a bespoke cottage style dormer bungalow, with an open plan ground floor and one double bedroom to the first floor in the roof area. The amended proposal has garden to the side, which would be secured by fencing to the rear, and a brick wall to the frontage providing privacy and enhance this part of the conservation area. There would be one parking space accessed directly off Newbridge Crescent, via the existing access.
- 9.3 Although, initially the site may appear too small for a dwelling, the Planning Authority has worked closely with the applicant, to work towards a bespoke scheme which would have a suitable design and layout, whilst enhancing this part of Newbridge Crescent, and the conservation area.
- 9.4 The amended proposal has a sufficient amount of amenity space and parking to support its future occupants, and the new design works well in relation to neighbouring amenities, where the development would not be overbearing, or reduce privacy. It is acknowledged

that the two neighbouring properties are set well back on their plots, however, the building line is inconsistent, with properties, further along having a typical presence in the street scene, with private rear gardens. Although sitting proud of its neighbouring dwellings, this dormer style cottage, would enhance this prime corner position, which currently has a negative impact on the street scene and the conservation area, due to the derelict nature of the garages/workshops, and deteriorating boundary fence.

- 9.5 A residential use would be more in keeping with the predominant residential nature of the area, and the development would improve the frontage with a new brick wall, and property which would be set a little further back, behind a dwarf brick wall, and vehicular access, providing an active frontage. Its presence would be comparable to a coach house, similar to development on the opposite side of the road in Newbridge Crescent, which often sit proud of larger properties
- 9.4 Neighbours have raised concerns regarding highway \ pedestrian safety at this location, due to the bend in the road. It should be noted that the proposed development is unlikely to generate an increased amount of vehicle movements when compared to the existing site use. Furthermore, whilst it is acknowledged that this is an existing vehicular access into the site, the changes that are proposed to the boundary treatment along the Newbridge Crescent frontage will improve visibility for those vehicles accessing the development, vehicles travelling along Newbridge Crescent and pedestrians using the adjacent footway.
- 9.5 Neighbours have mentioned a restrictive covenant on the site, preventing any development within 10 yards or more from Newbridge Crescent highway. This is a private issue and would be for the residents to investigate further.
- 9.6 Previous failed appeals for similar development proposals have also been noted in neighbour objections. I can confirm the latest appeal was back in 1989. Each application is assessed on its own merits, and in line with planning policy. The inspector has not suggested that the site was undevelopable, just that this is a difficult site to develop due to its limited size. This is a bespoke scheme, which has been designed to ensure satisfactory amenities for future occupiers, minimal impact to neighbouring amenities, whilst enhancing this part of Newbridge Crescent, and the Conservation Area.

10.0 Conclusion

- 10.1 The proposed development is acceptable and would enhance the street scene and the conservation area. The proposal would not cause any undue adverse impacts to neighbour amenities. The proposed development is in accordance with the policies of the development plan.

11.0 Detail recommendation

- 11.1 Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- Details of boundary treatments
- Landscaping scheme

This report is PUBLIC
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

- Joinery details
- Materials
- Parking and access as shown on plan
- Construction working hours
- Remove permitted development rights for extensions/outbuildings/first floor windows
- Electric vehicle charging point.

