



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by **B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/W/25/3370534

18 Whitefields Crescent, Solihull B91 3NU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Neil Carpenter against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/01783/PPFL.
 - The development proposed is described as outline application for the erection of a two storey, four bedroom detached house with all matters reserved.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal scheme relates to an outline proposal, with all other matters reserved for future consideration. I have considered the appeal accordingly. Plans have been submitted as part of the appeal which indicates how one dwelling could be accommodated on the site. I have taken these plans into account for indicative purposes only.
3. I have used the description of development contained within the appeal form and Council's Decision Notice in the banner heading above for clarity.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located adjacent to 18 Whitefields Crescent and is a piece of open grassed land. Whitefields Crescent (the Crescent) is predominantly residential in character, and a notable feature of the Crescent are the three areas of open grassed land around the highway junction. It results in an open setting upon entrance to the Crescent.
6. There is a clear building line established by numbers 18 and 19 Whitefields Crescent (Nos 18 and 19) and the appeal scheme would therefore be sited beyond this line and result in an incongruous addition. This would be especially apparent given the appeal site's prominent position in the Crescent when entering from Whitefields Road.
7. I acknowledge that 36 Whitefields Crescent has a single storey side extension which has eroded some of the open space on its boundary. However, I do not

know the full circumstances of the side extension and therefore cannot be certain it is wholly comparable to the appeal scheme before me. Moreover, each case is determined on its own merits. Nevertheless, the appeal scheme would result in a two-storey detached house which is markedly different to single storey side extension. Consequently, in my judgement, the appeal scheme would result in a significant erosion of the open space of the appeal site.

8. I note that in the evidence before me, it is highlighted that a dwelling could be accommodated that mirrors the density of the plots in the road and maintain a strip of open space of about two metres to the boundary with the Crescent. However, layout and scale are reserved matters and therefore reference to a possible two-metre strip of open space cannot be considered in the scope of this appeal. Nevertheless, irrespective of this, to my mind, given the clear building line established by Nos 18 and 19 the appeal scheme would result in an incongruous addition and result in a cluttered streetscape.
9. The topography of the appeal site slopes gradually and therefore the appeal scheme would be on a higher elevation than the immediate neighbouring dwellings. However, this reflects the surrounding topography of the Crescent. Consequently, given the wider topography of the immediate locality I do not consider that the appeal scheme would result in an overly dominant addition regarding this specific matter. Nevertheless, this does not alter my overall conclusion that the appeal scheme would result in unacceptable harm to the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area given the established building line and open verges which are prominent on the Crescent.
10. Given all of the above, in my judgement, the appeal scheme would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy P15(i) and P15(vii) of the Solihull Local plan 2013 insofar as it seeks to ensure that developments are of good quality design, assimilate with the local character of the area and not result in cluttered streets and public spaces.

Other Matters

11. The Council has stated that they are able to demonstrate a housing land supply of 2.14 years. This is below the housing land supply the Council is expected to deliver in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst the proposal would deliver one unit this would nonetheless boost the housing stock in circumstances where there is a shortfall.
12. Regarding concerns in relation to the amount of amenity space, given that the appeal relates to an outline application with all matters reserved including layout and scale, this is a matter which is not included within the scope of this appeal.
13. Additionally, given that appearance is a reserved matter, reference to the potential for the proposal to provide a dual active frontage is not a matter that can be included within the scope of this appeal.

Planning Balance

14. The conflict with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013 results in the proposal conflicting with the development plan when read as a whole. Thus, there would be

a conflict with Development Plan policies. Due to the Council's housing land supply position, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is engaged.

15. The appeal scheme would result in one residential dwelling in a Borough that is falling below the level of housing supply required by national policy. It would make a modest but important contribution as indicated by paragraph 73 of the Framework.
16. Additionally, the appeal scheme would provide a limited benefit to the local economy through the construction phase as well as future occupants of the development utilising local businesses and services. Furthermore, there would also be an increase in Council tax receipts albeit limited due to the small scale of the appeal scheme.
17. Nevertheless, these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified regarding the location of the development and the harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
18. Consequently, the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal when assessed against the Framework policies as a whole.
19. There are no other material considerations of such weight or significance to justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

B Astley-Serougi

INSPECTOR