



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by G Dring BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MAUDE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 OCTOBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/22/3302151

33 Lodge Road, Knowle, Solihull B93 0HD

- 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 James Perks against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2021/02777/MINFHO, dated 15 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development proposed is comprised of a single storey extension and a dormer window. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and therefore so shall I.
3. I note that discussions took place during the course of the application which resulted in amended drawings being provided to the Council for comment and that these are identified in the appellant's statement. However, the Council's decision was made on the basis of the original plans, and I have determined the appeal accordingly.
4. The existing side elevation drawing does not show the existing dormer window of the attached neighbouring dwelling, 31 Lodge Road. However, given the detail shown on the proposed side elevation drawing and the existing and proposed front elevation drawings and from what I saw at my site visit, I have sufficient evidence before me to fully consider the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached single storey dwelling with first floor accommodation in the roof space along with associated garden area. The dwelling is identified as a non-designated heritage asset on the Council's Local List, a matter not disputed by the appellant. From the evidence before me and following the site visit, the significance of this non-designated heritage asset as

- it is relevant to the proposal, lies in its simple plan form and external appearance incorporating exposed timber framework, traditional brickwork and clay tiled roof.
7. The dwelling is set back from the road frontage. The immediate surrounding area is comprised of buildings of a variety of age, scale, design and appearance with some incorporating front dormer windows and similarly set back from the road.
 8. Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that in weighing applications that directly affect non-designated heritage assets such as the host dwelling, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
 9. The proposed front extension would follow the front building and roof line of the existing front extension of the neighbouring attached dwelling. It would be set in from the edge of the front elevation of the host dwelling and therefore would not extend quite the full width of the dwelling. Though this would ensure that part of the corner post of the exposed timber framework would be visible and whilst the appellant states that the majority of the timber framework in the front elevation would be retained, it is not clear from the submitted drawings as to how much would be retained and which parts. Moreover, the width and height of the proposed front extension means that it would largely obscure from view, any retained historic fabric. In addition, it would result in the removal of a significant proportion of the existing front wall of the host dwelling in order to create the open plan living space. The proposed front extension would therefore cause moderate harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset due to the loss and obscuration of historic fabric.
 10. The proposed dormer window has been designed to reflect the two existing dormer windows that serve the neighbouring attached dwelling. Whilst the dormer window would add built form to the front roof slope, its modest size, design and siting is such that it would not be overly prominent. The space retained between the proposed dormer window and the nearest existing dormer window on the roof slope means that the original roof slope could still be appreciated. The proposed dormer window would therefore have a neutral effect on the significance of the host dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset.
 11. The design of the proposed front extension and dormer window would match that of the neighbouring attached dwelling in terms of their form, massing, scale and design. In addition, given the set back of the host dwelling from the road frontage, the proposals would not be overly prominent and would readily assimilate with the surrounding built form. The proposal would therefore respect the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area and would not be harmful to it.
 12. Whilst I have found that the dormer window would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, I have found moderate harm to the character and appearance of the host building resulting from the loss and obscuration of the historic fabric associated with the proposed front extension. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies P15 and P16 of the Solihull Local Plan Shaping a Sustainable Future (December 2013),

relevant policies in the Framework and to relevant guidance set out in the House Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (February 2010). These policies and this guidance states, amongst other things, that new development should preserve or enhance heritage assets as appropriate to their significance, conserve and enhance local character and distinctiveness and create or sustain a sense of place.

Other Matters

13. I note that the appellant identifies that the host dwelling is small, and that the proposal would provide additional living accommodation. However, this benefit does not outweigh the moderate harm I have found to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
14. Though my attention has been drawn by the appellant to previous permissions, extensions and alterations to the neighbouring attached dwelling including to the front elevation, this does not alter my findings in relation to the harm that would result from the proposal to the significance of the host dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset.
15. I note that there was a previous extension to the front of the host dwelling that was granted under a temporary planning permission. However, it has since been removed and is no longer present. It therefore has no bearing on my decision, and I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

16. The proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh the harm. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

G Dring

INSPECTOR