



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 January 2024

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24TH January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/24/3353681

42 Clayton Drive, Castle Bromwich, Solihull B36 0AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Abida Nawaz against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/01151/MINFHO.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor rear and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached property, with its original design comprising a hipped roof and two-storey bay to the front elevation. The dwelling has been extended with a two-storey side and rear extension, and further single storey extensions to the front, rear and side. The dwelling is located on a corner plot at the junction of Clayton Drive and Cedar Avenue. The dwelling is positioned forward of the dwellings on the opposite side of Cedar Avenue, meaning that its flank elevation is prominent within the street scene from Clayton Drive. The position of the dwelling also means that its rear elevation is exposed in views along Cedar Avenue. It's semi-detached pairing, No.41 Clayton Drive (No.41), is located within a narrower plot and appears to be largely unaltered and, as such, retains much of its original character.
5. The existing two-storey and single-storey side extensions have added considerable built form to the side of the dwelling. The sense of symmetry with no.41 has been

eroded to some extent by these extensions and the change to original roof form. Nonetheless, the existing two-storey width appears proportionate with the original dwelling, while the single storey element beyond provides a degree of visual hierarchy to the dwelling, which helps to retain a visual gap on the corner, and ensures that the scale of the dwelling is not overly prominent from the Cedar Avenue boundary.

6. The proposed extensions would result in the provision of additional width to the dwelling across two-storeys. As such the width of the dwelling would be approximately doubled over two storeys. This additional mass would add significant horizontal emphasis to the appearance of the property. This would result in extensions which would dominate and subsume the original dwelling. Furthermore, the additional width and mass would result in the appeal dwelling visually dominating No.41, resulting in further loss of symmetry and harmony between the pairing. As such the semi-detached pairing would appear significantly imbalanced.
7. The exposed relationship of the flank elevation with Cedar Avenue would mean that the additional two-storey development would be sited closer to the street. The close proximity of the development to the street, along with the overall height and depth of the extension would result in a large extent of built form dominating the side boundary and, as such appearing visually prominent from Cedar Avenue. Furthermore, the extensions would erode the visual gap from the street on a prominent corner plot, resulting in the loss important open character.
8. There are views of the property along Cedar Avenue where the rear elevation is visible projecting above the boundary fence line. From here the disproportionate proportions of the dwelling created by the width across two-storeys would be very apparent. While the development would be seen as sited very close to the side boundary resulting in the loss of the visual gap from Cedar Avenue. Furthermore, from here the contrasting roof forms of the extensions, including small hip and flat roof rear extensions, would be clearly visible. These would visibly contrast with the design of the existing built form and would add further incongruity to the dwelling.
9. On my site visit I observed other extensions which had been carried out to dwellings within the surrounding streets. However, I found these to be more modest and proportionate additions which do not dominate the original dwelling or semi-detached pairing, nor are any extensions as prominently sited. I have also had regard to the development at No.41 Elmfield Road which has been cited by the appellant and I took the time to visit this site during my site visit. I do not have full details of the reasons behind that approval and note that the extension has not yet been constructed. Nonetheless, Elmfield Road is a more linear street and as such the context differs markedly with the appeal site, which has a more exposed and prominent junction location. Furthermore, it appears as though that approval would result retain an appropriate separation between two-storey development and the street to the side and, as such, would not be as prominent within the street. Finally, the overall design of those extensions differ. Therefore, I do not find this example to be directly comparable in context or form. In any event, I have considered this appeal on its individual merits.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan (2013) which, amongst other things, seeks to deliver development that is of good

quality design which conserves local character and streetscape quality. The development also fails to adhere to the guidance contained within the House Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which advises that side extensions should be in proportion to the existing dwelling and that a generous gap from the boundary should normally be retained to preserve the openness of the corner plot.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that there are some economic, social and environmental benefits associated with the extensions. However, these would be small-scale in nature and limited to those associated with extensions to a single dwelling. Therefore, these would not be so compelling as to outweigh the permanent harm that the development would have on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR