
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by **N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 October 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/D/25/3369941

24 Farnworth Grove, Castle Bromwich, Solihull B36 9JA

- 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 Mohammed Bilal against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/00210/MINFHO.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side and rear extensions, single storey front extension and loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey side and rear extensions, single storey front extension and loft conversion with rear dormer at 24 Farnworth Grove, Castle Bromwich, Solihull B36 9JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/00210/MINFHO, 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 numbers: A100 Rev A; A101 Rev A; A106 Rev A; A107 Rev B; A108 Rev B; and A111.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling or those specified on the approved plans.
 - 4) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows to be installed at first floor in the side elevations of the extensions which face number 23, and 25 Farnworth Grove have been fitted with obscured glazing. No part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. The windows shall thereafter be permanently retained in that condition.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner heading above and my formal decision, I have used the description of development taken from the Council's decision notice, as opposed to the application form, as it more accurately and succinctly describes that for which permission is sought. However, in doing this I have also had full regard in my reasoning to the description on the application and appeal forms. I have removed wording that does not refer to acts of development.

3. The appeal property benefits from an extant planning permission (the extant permission) for a first-floor side and two storey rear extension¹. The extant permission has not been implemented but given that it is similar to the appeal scheme, apart from the addition of the proposed rear dormer, I consider that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that it might take place should the appeal be dismissed. Accordingly, the extant permission represents a fallback position and is a material consideration of substantial weight.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a two-story semi-detached dwelling located within a street scene of similar houses. The houses are tightly spaced together but they have long rear gardens, as do properties beyond the rear which front Blandford Avenue.
6. The surrounding area has a suburban residential character and many of the houses retain their original appearance. However, I observed during my site visit that a number of houses in the wider area had roof alterations which included rear dormer windows.
7. The proposed development would markedly increase the size of the dwelling, particularly to the side and rear. Even so, from the street, the proposed extensions would appear as subordinate additions to the property. Indeed, similar extensions have already been approved by the Council as part of the extant planning permission.
8. While the proposed dormer extension would further increase the size of the dwelling, spanning the width of the roof and extending over the side and rear extension, it would largely have a traditional appearance. It would also not be prominent from the road due to its size, as well as its position on the rear elevation. As such, although it would be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties it would be viewed within the context of the other extensions at the rear. Consequently, the proposed dormer would not result in the appeal scheme being an overdevelopment of the host property. It would also not be incongruous or out of keeping within the area.
9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan 2013 which aims, amongst other things, to conserve and enhance local character, distinctiveness and streetscape quality.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that there were a number of representations, including those by Castle Bromwich Parish Council and the occupiers of neighbouring properties, in respect of the proposal. In addition to the main issue, the concerns included parking and highway safety, as well as the impact on neighbouring residential

¹ Council reference: PL/2024/01634/MINFHO

amenity, including loss of daylight and privacy. These factors are not in dispute between the main parties and were addressed in the Council's Planning Committee report, with the Council concluding that there would be no material harm in these regards. No substantiated evidence has been submitted that leads me to any different view. Indeed, three off street car parking spaces are shown on the plans which would be appropriate for the proposed development. Furthermore, adequate separation distances between the proposals and neighbouring properties would be achieved. Given my findings above, and the suggested conditions by the Council, I have found no justification to dismiss the appeal.

11. Reference is made to the effect of the proposed development, in particular parking and highways safety, on children with autism residing at the adjoining property. I have therefore had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty arising from Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 and the Human Rights Act 1998 and Article 3(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, which provides that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions by public authorities concerning children. In reaching my decision, I have kept these interests at the forefront of my mind. Nevertheless, they are qualified rights, and interference may be justified where in the public interest. The concept of proportionality is key and for the reasons stated above, the proposals would not lead to inadequate parking provision or have a materially harmful effect on highway safety. Accordingly, taking into account the best interests of the child as a primary consideration, the appeal proposal would not have a materially harmful impact upon the neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested conditions, some of which I have amended for the sake of clarity and precision. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have also, in the interests of certainty, attached a condition specifying the approved plans. A condition to secure that the proposed external materials match those of the original building or are those shown on the approved plans, is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
13. I have also included the suggested condition which seeks first floor side facing windows to be obscure glazed and non-opening unless the parts of the window that can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room, in order to protect neighbouring living conditions. These conditions largely reflect conditions imposed by the Council on the extant permission.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR