



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 November 2021

by R Walmsley BSc, MSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/W/21/3277191

2 Millfield Way, Wombourne, Nr Wolverhampton WV5 8HA

- 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 T Singh Johal against the decision of South Staffordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00594/FUL, dated 27 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of boundary wall to front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The properties fronting Millfield Way have open frontages owing, in part, to the lack of boundary treatments between the highway and the houses themselves. This creates a street with an open character which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area overall. Soft landscaping, including hedges, adds to this pleasing and attractive character.
4. The development, by encircling the front of the appeal site, would create an enclosure that would contrast awkwardly with the open character exhibited elsewhere in the street. The prevalence of brick and metal would be a stark contrast to the more verdant and relaxed appearance of other frontages in Millfield Way. Being on a corner plot, this harm to the overall character and appearance of the area would be acute.
5. I have taken into account the appellant's desire for security. However, there is no suggestion that this is the only way of making the site more secure. Nor is there evidence to suggest that the scale of the security problem demands a solution that is otherwise harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
6. And so, notwithstanding the design changes made to the development during the course of the application, the development proposed would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and would fail to accord with Policy EQ11 of the Local Plan (2012) which, amongst other things, seeks development that respects local character.

Other Matters

7. I sympathise with the appellant on the time the Council took to decide the planning application. However, it is not within the remit of this appeal to comment on the events that led the Council to its decision. Any grievances the appellant has in this regard should be directed to the Council.

Conclusion

8. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR