



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2025

**by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 29 September 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3371122**

**1718 Warwick Road, Knowle, Solihull, B93 0HU**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Thomas Wood against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application reference is PL/2025/00732/MINFHO.
  - The development proposed is erection of a detached single storey garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a detached single storey garage at 1718 Warwick Road, Knowle, Solihull, B93 0HU in accordance with application ref: PL/2025/00732/MINFHO and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: site plan proposed – 2410-D2050-rev03, ground floor plan proposed - 2410-D2100-rev03, roof plan proposed - 2410-D2110-rev01, elevations 01 proposed - 2410-D2700-rev01 and elevations 02 proposed - 2410-D2701-rev01;
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those as stated within the application form and on the approved plans. The materials will be maintained for the lifetime of the development, and any changes shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to any alterations on site;
  - 4) The building hereby approved shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 1718 Warwick Road, Knowle, Solihull, B93 0HU.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the visual amenity of the streetscene.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a large, detached, dwelling with a large front driveway which is located within a run of established residential properties that are set back from

Warwick Road. The area is characterised by large, detached, houses which are varied in terms of character and appearance but are all positioned in good sized plots. The immediately adjacent dwelling, 1724 Warwick Road, benefits from a detached garage to the front of the property. The proposal which is the subject of this appeal seeks permission for a detached garage which would be located forward of the host dwelling with a mono pitched roof which, at its highest point, at the front of the proposal would be in the region of 2.5 metres high.

4. During my site visit I found that the host dwelling is itself very well screened, from the front, by established trees and vegetation which would, in part, obstruct/restrict views of the proposal within the general street scene. Views of the proposal would, however, be possible over the neighbouring driveway of 1724 Warwick Road on the approach towards the appeal site from the south but these would be against a backdrop of built form and trees and would not, for example, block any notable views or reduce openness looking through the appeal site. Despite this visibility I do not find that the proposal would appear overly prominent or visually intrusive causing demonstrable harm to the visual amenity of the street scene. Views of a gently sloping, mono pitched, roof against the shared boundary fence combined with materials and colours (which would be consistent with the host dwelling itself) I find to be appropriate for the site setting and this limited angle of visibility within the street scene would not be sufficient to warrant refusal.
5. Whilst I acknowledge the objection from the Knowle Society, in relation to the flat roof design, I find that, overall, the design has been purposeful in attempts to allow the proposal to integrate within the site context and indeed the provision of a pitched roof, as is the case with the immediately neighbouring property's garage, would result in a larger proposal at roof level and an overall increased height which would, by comparison likely appear overly prominent. I do not find that the proposal would represent an incongruous structure when the neighbouring property has a detached garage positioned in front of, and away from, the main dwelling as part of the character of the site setting and whilst I accept that a flat roof may not be characteristic within the vicinity I find that the choice of material (which would be consistent in finish with the colour and appearance of materials in the host dwelling), design rationale and location would be appropriate and would conserve and enhance the local character, distinctiveness and streetscape quality.
6. The proposal would be consistent with Solihull Local Plan 2013 Policy P15 which seeks to ensure proposals achieve good quality design and conserves and enhances the local character, distinctiveness and street scape quality and ensures the scale, massing, density, layout, materials and landscape of the development respect the surrounding built environment. The proposal would also be consistent with the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Plan 2019 Policy D1 which requires that new development shall demonstrate that it will be of a high standard of design and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area and Policy D3 which supports development within the curtilage of dwelling houses if the design would respect the dwelling and the character and appearance of the area and there would be no unacceptable harm to the living conditions of nearby occupiers.
7. The House Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) is noted to advise that the construction of garages and other detached buildings between the house and road are not normally acceptable unless the building can

be accommodated in an unobtrusive position that will not form a prominent feature or impinge on neighbouring amenity. As outlined above, within this decision letter, I do not find that the proposal would be in an unobtrusive position nor form a prominent feature or impinge on neighbouring amenity meaning that I find the proposal is consistent with the overarching objectives and guidance set out within the SPD.

### **Other Matters**

8. I note that the appellant has raised procedural concerns with regard to how the council determine the proposal with particular regards to not requesting amendments as well as failing to acknowledge the garage at the immediately neighbouring property. These comments are noted, however, this appeal is not accompanied by an application for costs and therefore the consideration of such matters within the scope of this appeal is limited albeit acknowledged.

### **Conditions**

9. The Council's questionnaire suggests four conditions in the event that this appeal is allowed which I have considered and applied as appropriate. A time condition is attached to comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent.
10. A materials condition is required to ensure an appropriate finish in the interests of visual amenity. The Council's questionnaire suggests that the condition should require the materials in the extension to match those within the existing dwelling, however, the annotation on the plans that are before me, as well as the application form, whilst they do suggest colours to match that of the host dwelling the materials (timber painting) do differ slightly. I have, therefore, amended the materials condition to require these to be in accordance with the details provided on the application form and approved plans to enable the appellant to construct the proposal as intended as per the basis for their submission.
11. A condition requiring the garage to not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the host dwelling is to ensure that the sub-standard unit is not established to the detriment of the character or amenities of the area.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

*Eleni Marshall*

INSPECTOR