



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2025

by **A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3366858**

**77 Hawthorne Road, Castle Bromwich, Birmingham B36 0HJ**

- 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 M Imran against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref PL/2025/00228/MINFHO
  - The development proposed is Single and two storey side and rear extension with single storey garage to side.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr M Imran against Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site, 77 Hawthorne Road (No.77), is a detached house sitting on a wedge-shaped plot within an area of established suburban housing dating from the middle decades of the twentieth century. It is clear that the original building which, other than a rear single-storey extension, had retained its original form and appearance for many decades within a likely consistent street scene, was significantly changed by a hip to gable and box dormer roof extension. This was the subject of a Certificate of Lawfulness dated 6 November 2024, as provided by Section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Those works, which had been completed by the time of my visit, are an unhappy example of roof alterations which disproportionately unsettle the visual character of many suburban streets, in that the ubiquity of 'arts and crafts'-derived housing typologies found in most suburban family housing of the twentieth century relies heavily on the dominance of hipped clay tile roof forms for a consistency in character and appearance of the street scene.

5. The appellant points to other extended properties. Although neighbouring properties<sup>1</sup> to No.77 have been extended, some unsympathetically with poorly configured side extensions, even with such examples the hipped roof forms of the original dwellings largely remain, as do many character details such as oriel windows and chimneys. These are important components of the visual character of such suburban streets.
6. The proposal intends to increase a rear extension to two storeys in height and wrap the southern (side) elevation at the same height. The frontage/side treatment introduces a step out at the ground floor, seemingly to incorporate a ground-floor-only bay window, which creates an inharmonious partial symmetry. Whilst I am aware devices such as steps in surfaces are often suggested to retain the identity of an original building when extended, in this case they would further undermine the visual coherence of the original building in the street scene, the side extension seeming to be squeezed against the boundary with an unnecessary elevational set-back and roof set-down.
7. The north side would incorporate a ground floor extension with a garage extending to the boundary behind a very wide and spacious frontage, which results from the wedge shape of the plot. In terms of appearance, the introduction of this extension would widen the building frontage and, therefore, partly offset the clumsy top-heavy appearance of the building as found (extended). Overall, however, the proposal falls short of good design in that the crown roof introduced by the rear extension collides uncomfortably with the box dormer. The proposal would emphasise the visual incoherence of the combined proposals<sup>2</sup> rather than resolving it into a unified building (roof) form.
8. Finally, although I note the appellant points to commentary as to the design quality of the permitted roof extension as immaterial to the decision to be made, it is clear that good design would seek to minimise harms and generate a visually coherent design. For these reasons, I consider the proposed development would fall short of the guidance set out in the Framework at paragraphs 131 and 137, and would fail to conserve or enhance local character, distinctiveness, and streetscape quality which is sought by Policy P15(i) of the Solihull Local Plan 2013. Therefore, taking all matters raised into account, and for the reasons given, the appeal cannot succeed.

*Andrew Boughton*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Not necessarily adjacent to No.77 but in the locality

<sup>2</sup> Combined proposals meaning the recent extension with the proposal before me