
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3371233

22 Hazlehurst Road, Solihull B36 0BH

- 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 Riaz against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/00413//MINFHO.
 - The development proposed is double storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

1. 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

2. There have been two sets of plans submitted as part of the appeal- the revised plans depict a reduction in mass of the proposed first floor side extension. I have determined this appeal on the revised plans, which are those referred to in the Council's decision notice, namely 002 Rev C and 003 Rev A.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is the left-hand property of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The property is in a traditional style, with a three-bay frontage; the end bay is a projecting gable with double height bow windows. The property shares a hipped roof with the attached dwelling. The appeal dwelling has previously been extended and now has a splayed single storey side extension which abuts the site boundary. It also appears that the integrated garage, which is a feature of similarly designed nearby properties, has been converted to a habitable room with a further bow window.
5. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area and is situated on a significant bend in the street; the angle of the bend is such that it gives the appearance of the property as being sited on a corner plot. The surrounding area is made up of predominantly semi-detached pairs interspersed with detached

dwelling. These are also of a traditional design, with prominent gables being a particular feature of the street. The properties are well-spaced, offering glimpses between the dwellings of the greenery beyond and the area overall has an open and spacious character. This is derived from the wide footways and property frontages which often have low, verdant boundary treatment. The appeal property in particular benefits from a wide frontage owing to its generous corner plot, which is bound by a low brick wall. This offers sweeping views along Hazlehurst Street in both directions. Properties in the surrounding area have had various alterations, however there is a generally consistent style and character within the street scene.

6. The proposed development would see a first-floor side extension built above the existing extension, and a two-storey rear extension added.
7. The proposed roof would sit below the main roof ridgeline, and the front wall of the first-floor extension would be set back by 0.9 metres, in excess of the 440mm recommended in the Council's House Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (the SPD). However, the SPD also requires that first floor extensions protect the spacious character of areas. In this instance, the proposed development would significantly increase the mass of the appeal property harmfully eroding the open and spacious character and appearance even given the space retained to the boundary. The scale of the proposal would be out of keeping with the existing street scene, the impact of which would only be exacerbated by the prominent location and high visibility of the appeal dwelling. Despite the appeal property's large plot, the scale of the proposed development would lead to the plot appearing cramped and overdeveloped.
8. Owing to the splayed design of the appeal proposal and the dwelling's location on a plot that has the appearance of a corner plot, the proposed development would have a convoluted roof design which is at odds with the simplicity of the existing rooflines within the street scene. It would also interact poorly with the attached dwelling and would exacerbate the appearance of the semi-detached pair being unbalanced. The overall loss of symmetry due to the proposed roofline and the large scale of the proposal would cause harm to the appearance of the host dwelling and surroundings.
9. The appellant has suggested that alterations to the property such as hip to gable extensions and a box dormer window could be built under the GDPO. which would unbalance the roof shapes of the pair of properties. However, in the absence of clear evidence that this is in fact the case and a Certificate of Lawfulness to demonstrate what precisely can be constructed under permitted development rights, I attribute limited weight to the suggested fall-back scenario.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and thus would conflict with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan (2013) which, amongst other things, requires all development to conserve and enhance local character and streetscape quality with regard to the surrounding built environment. It would also conflict with the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Personal Circumstances

11. Paragraph 12 of the Framework confirms, amongst other things, that the development plan is the starting point for decision making and where a planning

application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted.

12. I have given due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. I have also had regard to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.
13. In this regard, the appellant has referred to a family member with a medical condition. The appellant has indicated that the proposed development would make the property more accessible for the family member and enable them to engage in family life. I have no reason to doubt that that this would be the case and that, in this regard, the proposal has the potential to be beneficial to the dependants and family's quality of life. This is a personal circumstance to which I afford weight in favour of the appeal.
14. However, I have not been provided with any substantial evidence to suggest that this proposal is the only way of achieving this goal and that a suitable scheme could not be devised which provides the desired outcome, but which is more sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. In weighing the personal circumstances in the balance, this has to be considered against the unacceptable effect that the development would have on the character and appearance of the dwelling.
15. Overall, a refusal of planning permission is a proportionate and necessary approach to protect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering of the specified family members human rights and the personal circumstances put forward do not outweigh the unacceptable effects of the proposal.

Other Matters

16. The appellant has referenced planning permissions and appeal decisions within the wider area within their grounds of appeal. I have considered the contents of these decisions, and I note that the property at 679 Chester Road is a detached dwelling which is different to the proposal before me. The property at 39 Woodford Avenue is located on a large plot and does not have the prominence afforded to the appeal site.
17. The properties at 14 Southfield Avenue and 662 Chester Road are both situated on comparable plots; however, the proposed developments lack the splayed appearance that is proposed at the appeal site. The considerations and effect on character and appearance are therefore different to the proposal before me. Regardless, I have made my recommendation on the merits of the appeal before me.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR