



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3368921

75 Ferndown Road, Solihull B91 2AX

- 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 Xia Min against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/00543/MINFHO.
 - The development proposed is a window dormer to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a window dormer to the front elevation at 75 Ferndown Road, Solihull B91 2AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/00543/MINFHO, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: C1084/001, C1084/002, C1084/003, C1084/004 and C1080/005.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The Solihull House Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') advises that dormers should be modest, well-proportioned, set within the roof plane, and set away from the roof's edges. It continues that on a roof slope fronting a highway they will normally be resisted due to their prominence, unless they are an established part of the character of the streetscene, particularly well designed, proportioned and unobtrusive.
4. The properties on Ferndown Road, including No 75, comprise detached two storey houses which are set well back from the highway in long rows. Although in a broadly similar style, there are slight differences in their form, some having front facing gables or hipped roofs. However, their style, scale, siting, and palette of brick and render, give a cohesive quality to the streetscene.

5. Whilst most of the buildings have plain sloping roofs, I observed that some, such as Nos 34, 36, 65 and 99 have front facing dormer windows. Some of these are recent additions, and I understand that a dormer at No 65 was only recently granted planning permission. Others are historic and may have been erected at a time when planning legislation, policies and guidance were different, but they nevertheless form part of the area's character.
6. In its front facing position, the proposed dormer would be fairly prominent in the streetscene. However, it would occupy a relatively small proportion of the host's front roof slope, and it would be set up slightly from its eaves, and well in from its edges, thus giving it a reasonably modest scale. Moreover, its gabled form and the pitch of its roof would reflect the style of the host, and would respect the gable-fronted features on some other houses in the road. It would be faced in matching materials, and its window would align with the window in the floor beneath.
7. Consequently, it would be a reasonably unobtrusive feature, which would generally reflect the host's style and its balanced proportions, and it would not stand out as incongruous in the streetscene.
8. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would not therefore conflict with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013. Amongst other things, and in general terms, this requires good design which conserves and enhances local character, distinctiveness and streetscape quality, having regard to matters including scale, massing and materials. It would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') requirement for good design, and with the advice in the SPD.
9. I have considered suggested conditions against the Framework's tests. As well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, in the interests of good design, and to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be faced with matching materials.
10. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR