



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by K Townend BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3371192

55 Castle Lane, Oulton, Solihull B92 8DE

- 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 Afzal Mirza against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is PL/2025/00637/MINFHO.
- The development proposed is single storey rear extension and two storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and two storey side extension at 55 Castle Lane, Oulton, Solihull B92 8DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/00637/MINFHO, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 11-2025-01-01_PL, 11-2025-01-02_PL, 11-2025-01-04_PL, and 11-2025-01-06_PL.
 - 3) The external materials of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. A single storey rear extension and two storey side extension has been constructed at the appeal site. Nevertheless, the proposal before me relates to a revised single storey and two storey extension. Therefore, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the proposed development, as shown on the plans as submitted, and the description of development which is set out in the application form.
3. The appeal proposal is for extensions to the side and rear. From the evidence before me there is no dispute between the parties as to the acceptability of the single-storey rear extension. I shall, therefore, confine my detailed considerations to the proposed side extension.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, located on the junction with Dene Court Road, and in a residential area. The host dwelling

and its attached neighbour are positioned at an angle and address the junction, occupying a prominent position within the street scene. The houses in the area are similar in scale, design, size and set back from the road. The pleasant character of the area is a result of the pairs of houses, including those which turn the corners.

6. The general uniformity of the houses makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Some have been extended with various shaped and sized extensions. However, these changes, in the main, have not substantially altered the character or appearance of the area and it is still possible to identify the houses as being from the same period and to appreciate the character of the area.
7. Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan, Shaping a Sustainable Future, December 2013 (the LP) expects all development to achieve good quality, inclusive, and sustainable design which, amongst other matters, conserves and enhances local character, distinctiveness, and streetscape. It also seeks to ensure development respects the surrounding built environment through scale, massing, layout, and materials.
8. The policy is supported by the Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council House Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD). For semi-detached houses, which the SPD notes are normally designed as a pair, it requires side extensions to be subservient. It is recommended that extensions are set back 440mm from the original front elevation and are provided with a lower ridge height. Moreover, for two-storey extensions it seeks to ensure that the width of the extension is significantly less than the width of the original dwellinghouse.
9. The host dwelling is part of a pair. Although the proposed side extension would be wider than the previously approved extension it remains narrower than the width of the original dwelling. It would also be set back from the front elevation and the ridge of the roof would be set down. It has been designed to be subservient, with a single window at ground floor and at first floor on the front elevation, ensuring that the original dwelling is still read as such.
10. I accept that the proposed side extension would unbalance the pair of houses. Nevertheless, this would occur with any two-storey side extension, including those indicated as appropriate within the SPD. The proposal would retain the original proportions of the dwelling and ensure that the original pair of dwellings could still be understood. It would, therefore, be subservient in width and design.
11. Furthermore, in addition to the extensions noted by the appellant, which I visited while on site, I also saw a two-storey side extension on a property on Knightsbridge Road which is similar in width to the appeal proposal, albeit not with the same depth. Consequently, there are other side extensions in the area which unbalance the associated pair of houses to which they are attached and the appeal proposal would not be substantially out of character.
12. The SPD advises that rear extensions should be designed to integrate with the style and character of the existing dwelling. I accept that the proposal would be prominent from the street scene due to the corner plot location. Nevertheless, it would not result in an unappealing street scene. Moreover, the side extension would not be read as part of the front elevation. In that regard the depth of the proposal would not contribute significantly to unbalancing the pair when viewed from the front. For the above reasons, I find that the width, height, depth, and

design of the side elevation would not unbalance the pair to an unacceptable extent.

13. The extension would be constructed with pitched roofs that are subservient to the host dwelling. The design, as a whole, follows the style, character, and appearance of the original dwelling in that it respects the window proportions, the roof pitch and hip, including on the rear projection of the two-storey extension. It would, therefore, harmonise with the host dwelling.
14. The extension which has been built is significant and not subservient to the original property. I am also aware of the previous appeal refusal at the site. However, the appeal before me proposes a smaller two-storey side extension which I find is subservient and acceptable.
15. Although the proposed extension to the appeal property would not comply with some of the requirements of the SPD it would accord with the general aims of Policy P15 of the LP. As such, the proposed two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. Therefore, taken as a whole, the proposal would not conflict with the development plan.

Conditions

16. The Council provided suggested conditions and I have considered these in light of the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying the time limit and approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition requiring the external materials used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building is also necessary.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 1 above.

K Townend

INSPECTOR