



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/21/3284951

30 Broad Oaks Road, Solihull B91 1JB

- 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 Mohammed Hameed against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2021/00825/MINFHO, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations and extension including: a side and rear extension with a first-floor rear extension; a roof conversion from hipped to gabled with a rear dormer and Velux windows; garage conversion with replacement of garage doors and front porch door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of proposed development on the Council's Decision Notice differs a little to that provided on the application form. As I have no evidence that a change in description was agreed, and the description given on the application form adequately describes the proposed development, I have used the description provided on the application form.
3. I understand amended plans were submitted during the planning application, primarily retaining the hipped gable. I have made my decision, as did the Council, based on the amended plans.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the host property and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The site is located within a residential area on a street that is characterised mainly by two-storey, semi-detached and detached dwellings of varied architectural styles with varied design features. Although many are designed with several roof lines, and the roof lines between properties vary, nearly all have dual-pitched roofs either hipped or gabled. Only a small number have roof lights or small dormers in their side or front roof slopes that are visible from the street. Many of the properties along the street have been extended and/or altered, some of which have been extended significantly. Although there is a mixed palette of external materials used, the external elevations are mainly brick and/or render and the roofs tiled with red/brown tiles.

6. The proposed extensions and alterations to the front and side of the property would be of a design, size, and scale in keeping with the host property. Additionally, as most of the proposed development would be to the rear of the dwelling, and therefore barely visible from the street, I consider the proposal would not harm the street scene.
7. However, the proposed extensions and alterations to the rear of the property would be visible from several of the properties located on Wadleys Road and their rear gardens, and from several of the rear gardens of neighbouring properties on Broad Oaks Road.
8. The plot sizes of the host property and those of most of the properties on the street are generous, and most of the properties are also generously sized. As noted above, some have been significantly extended. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be similar in depth to the two-storey rear extension that exists on the neighbouring property, number 28. Within the context described above, I consider the siting, design, size and scale of the proposed ground and first floor extensions and alterations would be proportionate and in keeping with the host dwelling.
9. I accept the broad concept that some of the design features of the proposed development, along with the external materials that would be used, would differentiate the proposed from the original. I believe a balance between the appearance of the original and the distinctness of the proposed would be achieved with regard to the proposed extensions and alterations at ground and first floor level. However, I consider the design, size, scale, and materials of the proposed dormer would not respect, and indeed would clash with, the host property.
10. The large cube-like dormer would be wider and taller than the openings of the window and glazed doors that would be directly beneath it at first and ground floor levels. The shape and size of the proposed dormer, along with full height vertical windowpanes, would emphasise its disproportionate size relative to the window and door openings that would be below it. It would also be a disproportionate insertion in the section of rear roof slope that would be retained. The dormer would have a very top-heavy appearance. As such, its addition would create an overall imbalance between the original and the proposed. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal, as a whole, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and therefore the character and appearance of the area.
11. The appellant suggests that the proposed materials would be in keeping with those used on extensions at numbers 46 and 60 Broad Oaks Road. I have not been provided with full details of these schemes/properties and therefore cannot be certain of the extent to which either are comparable to the proposal before me. Notwithstanding, I have not dismissed the use of the materials proposed outright. I also note that there is a flat-roof dormer in the rear roof slope of the immediate neighbouring property No. 32. However, I do not know if this received planning permission or not. Regardless, I consider it to be of a design, size and scale that respects the property.
12. In light of the above, the proposal would therefore not accord with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan: Shaping a Sustainable Future, 2013, which requires, among other things, all development to achieve good quality design that conserves or enhances local character and ensures the scale, massing and

materials respect the surrounding built environment. Additionally, I consider the proposal, as a whole, would not create a high quality, visually attractive, beautiful building that would be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, which is a significant material consideration.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR