



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/19/3234102

270 Warwick Road, Solihull, West Midlands B92 7AE

- 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 Shahzad Chachia against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2019/01069/MINFHO, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey front extension/front façade, part two storey/part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and extension and alteration of existing roof to facilitate second floor loft room with ensuite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two storey front extension/front façade, part two storey/part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and extension and alteration of existing roof to facilitate second floor loft room with ensuite at 270 Warwick Road, Solihull, West Midlands B92 7AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2019/01069/MINFHO, dated 15 April 2019, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: the Proposed (For Planning) images on the drawings numbered NSQ1034_PL_01 revision P1 and NSQ1034_PL_02 revision P1.

Procedural Matter

2. On my site visit I saw construction being carried out at the appeal site with the external works being almost complete. At the time of the Council's decision it would appear that a front extension had been erected with taller eaves height. However, since then further works have been undertaken so the extensions and alterations generally accord with the submitted proposed elevation drawings. I have dealt with the appeal based on the submitted plans, although I have considered the appeal as a retrospective application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a house in a line of dwellings in an urban area. The appeal scheme consists of various extensions and alterations including the

erection of a 2 storey high bay with hipped roof to the front of the house as well as a rear extension and dormer window. The front extensions are seen from Warwick Road whilst the rear extensions are partially visible over a fence from Sherwood Close.

5. Planning permission has already been granted for extensions and alterations similar to those subject to this appeal¹. As this is a recent permission, there is a greater than a theoretical possibility the approved development would be constructed regardless as to my decision in respect of this appeal. This fallback position is a consideration in my assessment.
6. The front extension matches the depth and has a similar roof overhang to that already approved. Whilst projecting further forward, the bay is not unduly larger than others on neighbouring properties. The rear extension is slightly taller and the dormer is marginally larger than the approved scheme, but both are subservient to the scale of the host property and are not prominent.
7. Single pane windows have been installed on the front elevation, but the plans show the provision of top lights, in keeping with those on nearby houses. The front extension includes some untypical elements, however front bays in the area are all slightly different in form and appearance. Subsequently the appeal development is not markedly out of character with the area.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, and in this regard, it would accord with policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013 and the National Planning Policy Framework which aim, amongst other things, to conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Other matters

9. By virtue of its design and positioning off the side boundaries, the development avoids significant overshadowing, loss of outlook or unacceptable overlooking.

Conditions

10. As construction is well advanced, there is no need to attach conditions setting time limits on the commencement of development or requiring the use of matching materials. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt.

Conclusion

11. For these reasons, I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

¹ Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council planning permission ref. no. PL/2017/01093/MINFHO dated 28 June 2017.