

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2017

**by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 5 May 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/17/3166725**

**40 Elm Farm Avenue, Marston Green, Solihull, West Midlands B37 7AA**

- 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 Robert Ison against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref PL/2016/02503/MINFHO, dated 29 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2016.
  - The development proposed is first floor extension to side, with new roof to ground floor kitchen and loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached hipped roof dwelling surrounded predominantly by similar residential properties along Elm Farm Avenue. Surrounding symmetrical hipped roof forms at semi-detached properties give Elm Farm Avenue a pleasant spacious and ordered character. The works undertaken at the site are not in accordance with a previously granted planning permission, hence the consequent submission of the application to secure planning consent.
  4. The roof alteration is visible from the wider street scene, including from public vantage points at the Station Road junction. The shape of the roof, when viewed alongside the adjoining semi-detached property, has an asymmetrical and unbalanced appearance. Consequently, the proposal has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building.
  5. The roof form is also an incongruous feature when viewed from the noted surrounding area and has a harmful impact on the ordered character (identified above) prevalent at Elm Farm Avenue. The steepness of the roof pitch and the part side gable have increased the mass of the property and led to a harmful effect on the spacious and ordered character and appearance of the surrounding area.
-

6. The use of roof tiles to match other nearby properties and the setback design of the extension does not reduce or prevent the harm I have identified above. Nor does the proposal's compliance with building regulation requirements or resultant additional head space prevent or reduce the proposal's resultant harm.
7. The Council refer to its House Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However no specific reference is made to the SPD nor is a copy of it before me. This aside, paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of good design in positively contributing to making places better for people. Based on my reasoning above, the proposal fails to meet this requirement.
8. Therefore I conclude that the proposal has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently the proposal is contrary to Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan which is of most relevance to this matter. This policy requires development to achieve a good quality design that conserves and enhances local character.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*B Bowker*

INSPECTOR