



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 June 2025

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3363718

Proposal: Two storey side extension at 703 Old Lode Lane, Elmdon, Solihull B92 8NE.

Application Ref: PL/2025/00152/MINFHO.

Decision – dismissed

Preliminary Matter

1. The appellant's agent has confirmed that the description of the development on the decision notice and the appeal form reflects the development subject of this appeal. Excepting the words 'retrospective planning application' - which do not describe acts of development, I have no reason to reach another view. I therefore proceed on the basis that the development is that in the banner above. As such, any other elements of the original description of development are not for me to consider as part of this appeal.
2. Because I cannot be certain that the development undertaken accords with the submitted plans, the appeal is dealt with as a scheme for a proposed development.

Reasons

Issue - effect on the character and appearance of the area

3. The dwelling on the appeal site is one of a pair of semi-detached properties. When viewed from Old Lode Lane, this pre-existing dwelling and its pair would have been well-balanced. The wider building is part of a frontage of similarly sized and spaced buildings that are close to the junction between Old Lode Lane and Hatchford Brook Road. Notwithstanding that some nearby dwellings appear to have been subject of alterations and extensions, these buildings generally retain a pleasingly regular rhythm and balance.
4. At ground-floor level the extension would project further forward than the main part of the house and the pre-existing garage. Moreover, the pitched roof over part of the front kitchen would be both taller and deeper than the roof/canopy that would be constructed over the main entrance and the front part of bedroom 1. As such, and despite not being as wide as the front canopy, this part of the extension would be prominent and it would detract from the simpler form of the pre-existing dwelling.
5. Those parts of the first-floor wall, eaves, ridge, and upper roof plane of the extension that would address Old Lode Lane, would align with those that pre-existed. These elements would not therefore be subservient. Furthermore, and due to its design, scale, and width, the development would reduce the balance between

the house on the appeal site and that which it adjoins, and it would erode the distinctive pattern of development close to the site. Given the prominent location of the dwelling close to a junction, and even if the development were to be finished to a high standard, this would be especially harmful.

6. The development would widen the pre-existing flat-roofed dormer to the rear of the dwelling. It would also result in other extensions to the rear of the building which would have both flat and shallow-pitched roof forms. Collectively, these would give the rear of the property a bulky and boxy appearance. This would be at odds with the simpler and more modest form of the building shown on the existing elevations plan, and that of the nearby houses on the same side of Old Lode Lane as the appeal site.
7. For the reasons given, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. In this respect, it would be contrary to the development plan policy cited in the decision notice.

Other matters

8. My attention has been drawn to several other properties where extensions and alterations have been undertaken. I have no reason to doubt that these works either had planning permission or were 'permitted development'. However, while some examples are in Old Lode Lane these are some distance from the appeal site, and all cases have differing site contexts from that in this appeal. Moreover, based on the evidence before me, the designs of the cited schemes all appear to differ from the development subject of this appeal. For these reasons, these other developments do not lead me away from my previous findings.
9. I do not doubt that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that the development subject of planning permission ref PL/2024/00189/MINFHO might take place. However, and although I have not been provided with full details of that scheme, the evidence indicates that its scale is smaller, and its design is different, from the development subject of this appeal. Moreover, that previous scheme was deemed to be acceptable to the Council, whereas both the Council and I have found that the appeal scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, I attribute very little weight to this fall-back position.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and nothing outweighs this.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR