
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2017

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/17/3170677

66 Lyndale Drive, Wednesfield, Wolverhampton, West Midlands WV11 3JL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Davinder Singh Janday against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01187/FUL, dated 8 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is 3no pillars and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 3no pillars and canopy at 66 Lyndale Drive, Wednesfield, Wolverhampton, West Midlands WV11 3JL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01187/FUL, dated 8 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg No 101 and Drg No 70 B.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit the works had already been completed. However, retrospective as referred to in the application form and decision notice does not constitute an act of development. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought for the 3no pillars and canopy, which is reflected in my description of the development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Lyndale Drive is a residential street comprising detached and semi-detached, two-storey dwellings. There is a common architectural theme throughout the street, which follows through to other neighbouring streets. Properties are set back from the road and have generous spacing between them and open frontages with the street which creates a sense of spaciousness.

5. A number of properties have had alterations to their front elevation. These include full bay windows, porches and canopies. The design of these varies greatly. With regard to the canopies, some extend almost the full width of the property covering both the ground floor window and front door; some wrap around the front and side elevation; and, others cover the front door only. The canopies are predominantly affixed to the dwelling with brackets.
6. The proposal has been installed with 3no white pillars – one either end and one in the middle. The canopy extends the full width of the property and ties in with a single-storey side extension. During my site visit I did not observe any other similar pillars in the locality. However, whilst they are a new feature in the streetscene, they are sympathetic to the white PVCu windows of the host property. Given the width of the canopy and the subsequent separation distances between each of the pillars they do not dominate the front elevation. They are set back from the road and are close to the front elevation of the dwelling and although they are clearly visible in the streetscene, I do not consider that they are obtrusive or appear incongruous.
7. I find therefore that the development does not significantly harm the character or appearance of the area. As such, it complies with Saved Policies D6, D8 and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan, which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development creates or reinforces local distinctiveness, is of an appropriate massing and uses appropriate form and good quality detailing and materials. Furthermore, it would comply with Policies CSP4 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy 2011, which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development makes a clear understanding of the local distinctiveness of the area and provides high quality design.

Conditions

8. The development has already been commenced and therefore it is not necessary to impose the standard commencement condition. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary regarding materials to match the existing dwelling and that it shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR