

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

**by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 July 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/17/3173910**

**88 Woodthorne Road South, Wolverhampton WV6 8SW**

- 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 Rajiv Chopra against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
  - The application Ref 17/00035/FUL, dated 10 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2017.
  - The development proposed is a sitting room, shower room and garage extension with a double storey bedroom and en suite above.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a sitting room, shower room and garage extension with a double storey bedroom and en suite above at 88 Woodthorne Road South, Wolverhampton WV6 8SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00035/FUL, dated 10 January 2017, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block and Location Map Rev A, drawing number 2/17 Rev A (Sheets 1 to 3) and Sheet E1.
  - 3) 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.

### Procedural matter

2. In emails dated 11 and 12 July 2017 the Council and the appellant confirm that the Council's decision was based on the drawings labelled Revision A. My decision is therefore also based upon those drawings.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. The dwellings on this part of Woodthorne Road South are generally large and set on spacious plots. To the front there is often planting or trees between the

dwelling and the highway. The style and appearance of the dwelling is varied, as is the gap between them. For instance, some have fairly significant side gaps to their neighbours, either at ground or first floor level, whilst in other instances dwellings are sited much closer to one another.

5. The proposal would involve a two storey side extension to replace a single storey side projection. Consequently the scheme would close the gap above ground floor level to No. 86. However, the existing gap affords only limited views of the sky, and is not prominent in the streetscene, partly due to the trees and landscaping in No. 86's front garden.
6. Given the scheme's form, with a roof which would slope away from the boundary, a larger gap would be retained at roof level. There are only small gaps between the two storey dwellings at Nos. 88 and 90, and Nos. 90 and 92. Consequently, in the context of the immediate and wider area, the reduction in the gap here would not appear out of keeping.
7. The proposal would have a forward projecting gable, with a ridge which would be set down from the host. Given the roof form of the proposal, the different style and appearance of Nos. 88 and 86, and the retention of a gap between them, there would not be a significant 'terracing effect'.
8. In streetscene views from the south the two storey flank of No. 86 stands forward of No. 88. Other dwellings, such as No. 90, have front-projecting gables. Consequently, the two storey front projection here would not appear discordant, and as the resultant dwelling would still be significantly set back from the road behind landscaping, it would not appear obtrusive or overbearing in the streetscene.
9. As the scheme would not harm the area's special qualities, local character, context or distinctiveness, it would not conflict with Policies ENV2, ENV3, or CSP4 of the Black Country Core Strategy 2011, Policy D6 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan 2001 – 2011, or with the broadly similar 'place-making' objectives of the Planning for Sustainable Communities Supplementary Planning Document 2008. For similar reasons it would comply with Policy TNP12 of the Neighbourhood Plan for the Tettenhall Wards 2014-2026 (2014), including its requirement for development to acknowledge the spacing between buildings.
10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition, and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Additionally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be faced with matching materials.
11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

*Chris Couper*

INSPECTOR