



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022

by Nichola Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/22/3298626

117 Derwent Road, Wolverhampton WV6 9EU

- 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 Aamir Razzaq against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01716/FUL, dated 13 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is 1st floor extension to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 1st floor extension to front elevation at 117 Derwent Road, Wolverhampton WV6 9EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01716/FUL, dated 13 December 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved drawings Nos A.01, A.02, A.03 Rev C, A.04 Rev D, A.05 Rev D and A.06 Rev C.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modern two storey detached dwelling with a first floor pitched gable projection to the front elevation. The property is situated in a varied street scene which comprises a mixture of detached and semi detached dwellings of differing styles.
4. The extension would mirror the form, pitch and the ridge and eaves height of the existing front gable projection and would therefore be of a similar architectural character to the appeal property. The proposed front extension would run flush with the front of the existing gable and be seen as one projection spanning the width of the property. It would not therefore read as a prominent forward projection.
5. Whilst the first floor section would be finished in render, which is not a material finish currently found on the appeal property or within the immediate

surroundings, it would not appear out of keeping on the host modern dwelling and would not detract from the varied street scene. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

6. Accordingly, I find no conflict with those aims of Saved Policies D4, D6, D7, D8, D9 and H6 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) which, amongst other things, require proposals to be of a high quality design and to respond to the site and its context by having regard to matters including scale, height and massing. I also find no conflict with Supplementary Planning Guide 4 Extension to Houses (1996) which has similar objectives and indicates that extensions should be of a similar architectural character, style, scale and detailing as the existing house.
7. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary, in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. As the proposed external materials will differ from those currently found on the appeal property, I do not consider that a condition concerning external materials is required in this instance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Nichola Robinson

INSPECTOR