
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by A Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3369700

123 Widney Road, Bentley Heath, Solihull B93 9AN

- 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 Jake Shingler against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/02951/MINFHO.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension, rear dormer and front skylights to facilitate loft conversion, front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council's substantive concerns relate to the first-floor side extension and not the remainder of the proposal which includes a rear extension, rear dormer and front porch extension. I have therefore defined the main issue on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings both featuring catslide roofs. The surrounding area is primarily residential with a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings. To the left of the appeal site, there is a row of semi-detached dwellings which feature hipped roofs. While these dwellings differ in architectural style, the side sloping hipped and catslide roofs together establish a distinct character and appearance to the street scene on this section of Widney Road, specifically in terms of roof scape.
6. To the other side of the appeal dwelling, there is a detached dwelling featuring a catslide roof which creates a notable 'V' shape between the dwellings. The Solihull House Extension Guidance SPD (2010) recommends that where such formations exist, side extensions should retain the proportions and be set back behind the main front wall and roof. The proposed extension would align with the main front

wall and roof and as such the distinctive 'V' shape between the dwellings would be lost.

7. Furthermore, the added scale and mass to the front elevation would not be proportionate to the appeal dwelling therefore appearing as an incongruous addition. The gable end design of the roof would unbalance the symmetry between the pair of semi-detached dwellings with the loss of a side sloping roof which is characteristic on this section of Widney Road. Consequently, this would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. Further along Widney Road on the other side of the junction with Milton Road, the character and appearance of the street scene changes. While the semi-detached dwellings share similar original design features to the appeal dwelling, I observed on my site visit that several have been altered and extended which has unbalanced the appearance of some of the semi-detached pairs. These examples have been highlighted by the appellant in support of their case.
9. I have not been provided with detailed planning history of these examples, however from my site visit, I saw that in many cases, the roof alterations are either set back behind the catslide roof or, where they do align, they do not extend fully to the gable end which retains some form of appearance of a side sloping roof.
10. Another example provided due to its similarities with the appeal proposal is at 195 Widney Road. I appreciate that the gable end roof results in a loss of a side sloping roof and loss of symmetry with its semi-detached pair. However, the adjacent detached dwelling has a lower ridge height and therefore there would not have been the notable 'V' shape that the Housing Extension Guidance seeks to protect.
11. Having considered all matters, the proposed side extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the street scene and would therefore conflict with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan (2013) and Policies D1 and D3 of the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Plan (2019). These policies, among other things, require development to conserve and enhance local character, distinctiveness and streetscape quality and ensure that the scale of the development respects the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A Walker

INSPECTOR