



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 January 2024

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/24/3348061

27 Chalgrove Crescent, Hillfield, Solihull B91 3GG

- 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 Paula Brown against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2023/02439/MINFHO.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 27 Chalgrove Crescent, Hillfield, Solihull B91 3GG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2023/02439/MINFHO, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. On my site visit I observed that the development which is the subject to the appeal had taken place and was complete. Planning permission is therefore sought retrospectively. I am satisfied that the submitted plans accurately represent the installations in place. Consequently, I have assessed the appeal development based on the plans provided.
3. I have altered the description of development in the banner heading above, and in my formal decision, from that contained within the application form, decision notice and appeal form. This is because it more accurately and concisely describes the development.
4. 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

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

Reasons

6. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey detached property with red brick elevations and grey tiled roof. The dwelling is located off the head of a cul-de-sac along with No.29

Chalgrove Crescent (No.29) which is sited adjacent. To the side of the appeal site is Alderminster Road. Chalgrove Crescent is generally characterised by two-storey detached dwellings of similar age with a predominant use of brick and tile, although there is some variety in their overall design. No.29 fronts the turning head, and is positioned forward of the appeal dwelling, and has a two-storey projecting gable to the front with a detached garage of gable roof design located to the side. Opposite the appeal dwelling is the detached garage to No.25 Chalgrove Crescent. To the front of the appeal site is a footpath linking Chalgrove Crescent to Alderminster Road.

7. The extension projects forward of the dwelling and beyond the front building line of No.29. No.29 includes a two-storey gable to the front and, while the extension projects further forward, this adjacent gable due to its greater height remains a visually dominant feature in the street. Furthermore, the extension is set away from the highway and back from the footpath to the front, meaning it does not appear as a visually prominent feature from public vantage points. The single storey nature of the extension, along with its position back from the street, means that it appears as a subservient addition to the main dwelling, which remains dominant. Importantly, the immediate surrounding area includes detached garages which are of similar scale and have a gabled roof forms which are similar to the extension. Therefore, in this context the extension appears in scale and visually harmonious with those single storey components within the immediate street scene.
8. I acknowledge that the extension introduces the use of render which is not prevalent within the immediate surrounding street scene. Notwithstanding this, the single storey extension is relatively modest in scale when compared to the original dwelling and the use of render only relates to a small element of the overall property. Brickwork remains the dominant material for the dwelling and, as such, the addition of a rendered extension is not unduly harmful to the character or appearance of the dwelling or surrounding street scene.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, the development complies with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan (2013) which, amongst other things, seeks to deliver development which is of good quality design that conserves local character and streetscape quality. The development also adheres to the guidance contained within the House Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which allows for well-designed and subservient front extensions.

Conditions

10. Because the development is complete and planning permission is being granted retrospectively it is not necessary to attach standard conditions relating to time limit, plans or materials.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR