

Planning application no.	21/01642/FUL	
Site	1 Clifton Road, Wolverhampton, WV6 9AN	
Proposal	Provision of two storey side extension to property (facilitates the internal reconfiguration of property and insertion of new windows to rear elevation).	
Ward	Tettenhall Regis;	
Applicant	Mr & Mrs T Jackson	
Cabinet member with lead responsibility	Councillor Stephen Simkins Deputy Leader: Inclusive City Economy	
Accountable Director	Richard Lawrence, Director of Regeneration	
Originating service	Planning	
Accountable employee	Vijay Kaul	Senior Planning Officer
	Tel	01902 553791
	Email	vijay.kaul@wolverhampton.gov.uk

1.0 Summary recommendation

1.1 Refuse.

2.0 Application site

- 2.1 Detached property forming part of a group properties comprising 1, 3 and 5 Clifton Road and 6 Stockwell Road. The property has previously benefitted from single storey extensions to the side, rear and front of building.
- 2.2 The application property is located in Tettenhall Greens Conservation Area, and along with 6 Stockwell Road fronting an area of public open space, are very prominently located from Clifton Road and Upper Green.
- 2.3 16, 18 and 20 Clifton Road opposite the application property are a red brick finished terraced group of Grade II Listed dwellings. Beyond which are Locally Listed 2-12 Clifton Road, a row of two storey cottages and 2-4 Stockwell Road a semi-detached pair, these dwellings have red brick ground floors with distinctive applied black and white timbering to the first floor.

3.0 Application details

3.1 Provision of two storey side extension to property to create a garden room on ground and a cantilevered first floor providing two additional bedrooms. This development would facilitate the internal reconfiguration of property to and insertion of new windows to rear elevation. The property would increase from two to four bedrooms on the first floor. There is also an existing guest bedroom and en-suite on the ground floor.

4.0 Relevant planning history

4.1 19/00234/FUL - Proposed two-storey side extension to form extended ground floor sitting room and additional first floor bedroom and bathroom – Granted 14 June 2019

4.2 05/0791/FP/R – Ground floor front extension including porch and two storey rear extension – Refused 15 July 2005

4.3 04/1615/FP/R - Two storey front extension, first floor side extension and erection of a conservatory at rear – Withdrawn 27 October 2004.

4.4 04/2047/FP/R – Ground floor front extension including porch and conservatory to the rear – Granted 8 April 2005

4.5 96/1094 – alterations and extension to existing garage to form new bedroom shower room and altered garage. Granted 20 January 1997

5.0 Relevant policy documents

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.2 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

5.3 The Development Plan:
Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS)
Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan Area

6.0 Publicity

6.1 The application was advertised by direct neighbour notification, newspaper advert and a site notice. One representation was received and can be summarised as follows:

- Proposal would be over development and closes space to boundary
- Existing (approved) plans appear to be far less invasive or invading on my plot than the new proposed plans
- Adverse effect on conservation and the streets outlook and openness/space from Stockwell road

- Grass verge between the two properties has several large trees with TPO on them and is enjoyed by many in the summer and throughout the year along with the beautiful listed buildings in this vicinity.
- General separation distances and habitable windows need to be considered along with a light survey.

7.0 Consultees

- 7.1 Conservation Officer: Design would cause harm to conservation area.
- 7.2 Tree Officer: Subject to appropriate tree protection conditions in relation to foundation design the proposal could be constructed without having a detrimental impact on the health of the tree. Some concern raised about proximity of adjacent trees upon adjacent habitable rooms.

8.0 Legal implications

- 8.1 The legal implications arising from this report are detailed in the body of this report. SE/11032022/F.

9.0 Appraisal

- 9.1 The main issues for consideration are:
- Impact on character and appearance of the conservation area
 - Residential amenity
 - Tree impacts

Impact on character and appearance of the conservation area

- 9.2 The side elevations of the application site along with 6 Stockwell Road, currently offer relatively simple modern elevations in red-brick construction and plan tile roofs. Whilst of more modern appearance than the listed and locally listed dwellings, there is a sense of consistency in appearance and materials. The side gardens emphasise and enhance spaciousness in conjunction with the open space immediately adjacent, there is a clear view of the dwelling. The site currently makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 9.3 As seen within the planning history, there has been several attempts at this property to accommodate a two-storey addition. Most recent planning application 19/00234/FUL was approved for two-storey extension to create a sitting room and bedroom. The previous extension though projecting out minimally closer the boundary was in the form of a wing at a right angle to the side elevation, this was smaller, and provided a slender profile when viewed across the green allowing the original dwelling to be appreciated. As it did not span the entire width, overall there was a greater degree of spaciousness retained.

The extensive use of glazing and an oak frame provided a contrasting and contemporary design which sympathetically took account of the local heritage and character.

- 9.4 While the proposed extension would be set back from the main front elevation on Clifton Road, its size, design and massing obscuring the entire side elevation, incorporation of a twin gable roof against the plane of the existing roof, plus the introduction of cantilevered first floor, would diminish the simplicity of the original design of the house. That the proposal would involve the installation of timber cladding to the front, side and rear elevations of the property would represent an incongruous addition that would result in a loss of pleasing coherence which currently exists in the immediate setting. The accompanying design statement states the development would provide a 'grey backdrop to the trees' as it ages, however for the reasons set out above, this does not weigh in favour of the development. The glazing detail in the rear elevation adds further harm to the development.
- 9.5 The degree of alteration to the property would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The harm to the significance of the conservation area would be less than substantial and therefore it is necessary, in accordance with paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework, to consider any public benefits from the proposal. There does not appear to be any public benefits that would outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Residential amenity

- 9.6 Some concern has been expressed by the neighbour at 6 Stockwell Road. The proposed extension would not extend beyond the existing rear elevation, and therefore the distance to the boundary is considered acceptable to avoid an overbearing impact.
- 9.7 Proposed windows in the rear elevation serving a newly created en-suite and repositioned bedroom on the first floor would be 17.5m away from 6 Stockwell Road, this is less than the ideal 22m separation distance between habitable rooms. However, this is not closer than existing rear elevation windows and the plans indicate the use of obscure glazing and top opening windows (above 1.7m of the internal floor height). A condition could secure this provision permanently to protect the privacy of adjacent neighbour.
- 9.8 The proposed ground floor plan shows the inclusion of glazed roof in the rear conservatory, this minor addition would not cause any harm to neighbouring properties
- 9.9 Some concern is expressed by the Tree Officer about the impact of nearby trees on the outlook from and daylight to new first floor bedrooms and a ground floor existing living room. However, as plans show secondary windows serving these rooms, and any proposals to significantly prune the trees to reduce the impact on the application property that would result in a detrimental impact on the amenity value of long term health of the adjacent trees are likely to be resisted, on balance, refusal on this ground could not be sustained.

Tree Impacts

9.10 As trees on adjacent public open space are within a Conservation Area they are automatically protected. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment supports the proposal. The Council's Tree Officer confirms that further investigations would be required to inform foundation design to ensure no harm to protected trees, a condition could be attached to secure this.

10.0 Conclusion

10.1 The proposed extension would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, this would be contrary to the Development Plan, and there are no material considerations or public benefits which would outweigh the harm identified.

11.0 Detail recommendation

11.1 Refuse planning permission on following ground:

The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its size, design and massing obscuring the entire side elevation, incorporation of a twin gable roof against the plane of the existing roof, plus the introduction of cantilevered first floor, would diminish the simplicity of the original design of the house respect and would not respect the established character. The installation of timber cladding to the front, side and rear elevations of the property would represent an incongruous addition when viewed in the surrounding context. The degree of alteration to the property would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would be contrary to Saved UDP policies D7, D8, D9 HE4 and HE5, BCCS Policies ENV2 and ENV3, and Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan Area Policy TNP12 Parts A, B, C, D.