

CITY OF
WOLVERHAMPTON
COUNCIL

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 11 July 2023

Planning application no.	23/00350/FUL	
Site	112 Wrottesley Road West, Wolverhampton, WV6 8UR	
Proposal	Single storey rear, first floor side, double storey front and roof extensions. (Amendment to 22/00229/FUL - ground floor rear extension increased and has an additional central rooflight).	
Ward	Tettenhall Regis;	
Applicant	Mr and Mrs K Kandola	
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	Stephen Alexander	Head of City Planning
	Tel	01902 555610
	Email	stephen.alexander@wolverhampton.gov.uk

1.0 Summary recommendation

1.1 Grant subject to conditions.

2.0 Application site

2.1 Large detached single dwelling house with a large garden, in a row of similar properties, in a wide, tree-lined residential street with grass verges. The character of the area is generally open, green and spacious.

3.0 Application details

3.1 A previous application for a similar extension, 22/00229/FUL, was allowed on appeal. The only difference between this application and the one that has been approved by the Planning Inspectorate is the length of the approved ground floor rear extension is slightly increased and has an additional central rooflight.

4.0 Relevant policy documents

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 4.2 The Development Plan: Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (UDP), Black Country Core Strategy and the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan (TNP).
- 4.3 UDP policy D8 “Scale - Massing” aims to ensure that proposals make a positive contribution to an area through appropriate scale buildings that do not harm people's amenities.
- 4.4 TNP policy 12A “New Development to Respect Existing Local Character” aims to ensure that extensions respect and reinforce the established character of an area by taking into account the spacing between buildings and domestic gardens (including the proportion of garden area to building).

5.0 Publicity

- 5.1 One representation has been received objecting on the following grounds:
- Overlarge size of the proposed single storey rear extension detrimental to neighbours' amenities and the character and appearance of the area.

6.0 Legal implications

- 6.1 No implications arising from the report. SE/27062023/A

7.0 Appraisal

- 7.1 The rear extension allowed on appeal extended 6m from the back of the house.
- 7.2 The length of just over half of the extension has been increased by less than 0.5m closest to the neighbour to the east. This part of the extension is set 1.5m away from the neighbour's boundary. The part of the extension closest to the neighbour to the west has been increased by 1.3m. The neighbour to the west has existing extensions.
- 7.3 In their decision letter the Planning Inspector made the following comment:
- “The rear extension would not affect the street scene. It would project out a marked distance beyond the rear wall of the house but a sizeable garden would remain. Also, the addition would have a flat roof and so only the top part would be visible above boundary features from ground floor level at adjoining residences. The extension would be seen from the upper floor windows of adjacent dwellings but these localised and private views would not meaningfully affect the general character and appearance of the area”.*
- 7.3 The decision to allow the appeal and these comments are a material consideration in the determination of this application that in planning law attracts significant weight. Also, the part of the extension closest to the neighbour's garden to the east is not significantly larger than the approved scheme.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 The Inspector thought that the appeal extension was acceptable. Each case is treated on its merits, and in this case the Inspector's previous decision carries significant weight in

the planning balance. The current proposal would be the same height and would not project much further. It would still not affect the street scene, there would still remain a sizeable garden and only the top part would be visible above boundary features. The extension would have a slightly greater impact on localised and private views. The slight increase in size would not result in a meaningful affect on the general character and appearance of the area that would be significantly different to the allowed scheme. Given the decision made by the Planning Inspector and their comments, the proposal in this case is acceptable.

9.0 Detail recommendation

- 9.1 Grant subject to conditions (the same as recommended by the Planning Inspectorate in the allowed appeal for the sake of consistency).

