

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2012

**by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 October 2021.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/21/3276936**  
**40 Gerrard Road, Wolverhampton WW13 3LB**

- 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 Singh against the decision of City of Wolverhampton Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00245/FUL, dated 2 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice as it is clearer than that used on the appellant's application form.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

## Reasons

4. Whilst the appeal dwelling already benefits from a first floor side extension, this is set well back from the front elevation of the property and therefore maintains the space between the appeal property and the neighbouring property, No 42 Gerrard Road. By contrast, the proposed first floor extension would sit flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling. The resultant front elevation would span the full width of the plot and would bring the appellant's home closer to No 42. Whilst the two properties are separated by a public footpath and the roof of the proposed extension would be set down, given the angles at which the properties sit, this would create a visual pinch point and have a cramped appearance. This would also have an unacceptable terracing effect which would unduly harm the openness of the street.
5. In view of the above, the appeal scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D4, D7, D8 and D9 of Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (2006), Black Country Core Strategy (2011) Policy ENV3, Section 4.3 of Extensions to Houses Supplementary Planning Guidance 4 (1996) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which,

taken together, seek to secure high quality design which respects the context of the existing dwelling and area.

**Other matters**

6. I note that the proposed extension would utilise materials which are similar to the existing dwelling, that the proposal would make good use of existing space and that there have been anti-social problems associated with the adjacent path in the past. However, none of these matters outweigh the harm that I have identified.

**Conclusion**

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Rebecca McAndrew*

INSPECTOR