



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3367675

17 Woodford Avenue, Solihull, B36 9BG

- 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 Mr N Ahmed against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/00006/MINFHO.
 - The development proposed is double storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double storey side/rear extension at 17 Woodford Avenue, Solihull, B36 9BG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/00006/MINFHO, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 002 Rev A; 003 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on a bend in the road. It angles away from the neighbouring house, No 15. Consequently, the gap between the properties is greatest at the front of the houses but narrows towards their rear. Houses along the street have hipped roofs, 2 storey projecting bays and attached garages. Most garages have half-hipped roofs, some are level with the main house and others project forward.
4. The proposal is to convert the garage and add a first floor above it, joined to a 2-storey rear extension projecting 5m from the rear building line of the house. It would comply with the council's House Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010), in that the side extension would have a lower roof ridge than the main house, the front wall would be set back from the main house wall at first floor

level and the side wall would be parallel to the original side wall of the house, rather than tapering in to match the angle of the side boundary fence. As a result, the proposed development would appear subservient from the street and retain a gap between it and number 15, preventing any terracing effect, albeit the gap would reduce where a corner of the rear extension runs close to the boundary fence.

5. The proposed development would not cause the host dwelling to appear unduly unbalanced with its adjoining neighbour due to its subservience and because the pair are not identical. The appeal property garage is joined to a front porch and projects forward of the house with a flat roof at the front whereas the neighbouring house has no front porch and its garage is level with the main house front wall. Also, I note that other houses within Woodford Avenue have been altered with 2 storey side extensions at Nos 35 and 39, and single storey side extensions and hip to gable extensions elsewhere. The rear extension would have a hipped roof, lower than that of the main house and thus appear subservient to it and would not be visible from the public realm.
6. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would integrate well with the main house and cause no harm to its character or appearance or that of the surrounding area and would accord with Policy P15(i) of the Solihull Local Plan (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seek high quality development that conserves and respects the local character and streetscape.

Other Matters

7. Representations raised concerns regarding noise and disruption during construction, parking and highway safety, the effect on house prices, and the living conditions of neighbouring occupants of No 15 in terms of light, privacy and outlook.
8. Although garage space would be lost, there would be no reduction in off road parking, which meets the council's requirements. I also note that the council's highways department have not objected to the proposal. Some level of noise and disturbance is to be expected during construction. There is no evidence that extensions on neighbouring properties have any impact on house prices. The orientation of No 15 is such that it would continue to receive similar levels of light as is currently the case and there would be no direct overlooking between rear windows at No 15 and the proposed development. Overlooking into No 15's garden would not be significantly greater than is currently the case and the proposed side window would face an obscured glazed window on No 15. Although the rear extension would taper in close to the boundary with No 15, it would not significantly harm the outlook from habitable rooms which would continue to have unrestricted views across its rear garden.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
10. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

P D Sedgwick INSPECTOR