



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by **Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref. APP/P4605/D/25/3372637

10 Chartwell Drive, Sutton Coldfield B74 4NT

- 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 and Mrs Rutter and Roberts against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application ref. is 2025/03132/PA.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as *Rear Dormer Loft Conversion* but more accurately on the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as *Loft conversion with dormer window to rear and hip to gable roof extension*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with dormer window to rear and hip to gable roof extension at 10 Chartwell Drive, Sutton Coldfield B74 4NT in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. 2025/03132/PA, 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 numbered/titled: 01 Existing Plans & Elevations; 02 Proposed Plans & Elevations; 03 Location Plan; and 04 Block Plan.

Main issue

2. The Council's decision notice contains 3 separate reasons for refusal, but I find that there is a degree of overlap between them. The considerations they cover can be gathered under one main issue, that being the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. No. 10 is a detached dwelling within a residential cul-de-sac. Chartwell Drive is laid out around sweeping bends and serves about 2 dozen dwellings, many of which are chalet bungalows with rooms in their roof spaces. Set back from the road behind a paved parking area and with a garden at the rear, no. 10 has a hipped roof with an exaggerated slope downwards at the front within which is a prominent dormer with a mono-pitched roof. This built form gives the dwelling the appearance
-

of being a chalet bungalow when seen from the street but I agree with the appellants that it is a full 2-storey dwelling when viewed in the round. Given its scale and the reasonably-sized plot, it has capacity for extension in general terms.

4. I have been referred to the Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2022 (SPD). The SPD is not policy in itself but it carries weight as a material consideration in decision making. The most relevant design principle is that the design of household extensions must respond to, and complement the character of, their host building and its surroundings. More specifically, extensions that seek to change the style of an existing roof (from hipped to gable) will not be supported, due to the impact it will have on the character of the surrounding area. Exceptions may be considered, if the applicant can demonstrate there will be no character harm; or it will enable the creation of a high quality, exemplar design.
5. The Council's concern that the design of the proposed hip to gable roof extension would be out of keeping with the existing character of the street scene seems to me to be misplaced. During my site visit, I counted at least 9 examples of fully gabled main roofs along Chartwell Drive, 3 of which (nos 3, 7 and 9) are sited opposite and close to the appeal property. The rear elevation of the fully gabled house at 9a Edge Hill Road is also a prominent feature in the Chartwell Drive street scene and stands a very short distance to the north-east of the appeal property. However these gabled roof styles have come about, they are part of the existing local character and context. The hip to gable roof extension would successfully respond to the local area context and not result in harm to the character of this street scene.
6. Whilst the hip to gable roof extension would enlarge the appeal property and increase its visual impact on the surroundings, it would be an unremarkable feature in itself. The existing ridge height would be respected, a balanced and coherent built form would be created, the roof pitches would be consistent and matching plain tiles would be used. The hip to gable roof extension would be sufficiently complementary to the character of the parent building. The resulting dwelling would not appear overly bulky or discordant or be otherwise unacceptable in terms of design, character and appearance.
7. The SPD does not say that *dormer windows should be modest in size* as claimed in the officer's report. It states that dormer extensions must not dominate the roof. The design and proportions of any proposal must be in keeping with the house, with details such as the roof and windows aligning with lower floors. If dormers make a positive contribution to the surrounding area, these should be used to inform the design. The SPD gives no numerical guidance to define how a proposal might *not dominate the roof* and does not distinguish between front, rear and side roof slopes. It will be a matter of planning judgement for each individual case.
8. There are a number of box dormers along Chartwell Drive on front, rear and side roof slopes and some of those are prominent within the street scene. For instance, I saw that the roofs of no. 12 are populated with such features. The rear garden of the appeal property backs on to the longer rear gardens of the 2-storey houses located along the north-western side of Edge Hill Road. Trees and other planting in the rear gardens also offer a degree of screening between the dwellings. The rear elevation of the appeal property is therefore largely hidden from public vantage points on Edge Hill Road. From Chartwell Drive itself, only glimpses of the side of

the proposed rear dormer would be possible. I am satisfied that it would not appear prominently in its surroundings in private or public views.

9. Further to the above important considerations, whilst the proposed rear dormer would be sizeable, it would be set within the new rear roof slope, with its face and cheeks being finished in matching plain tiles. The ridge, eaves and edges of that rear roof slope would be very clearly legible. As such, the proposed rear dormer would not appear out of scale with the existing house and would not unduly dominate the roof or the appearance of the house as a whole.
10. I noted the planning permissions the appellants refer to at 1 and 7 Chartwell Drive. The latter received permission in 2004 under a different development plan regime. I could not see any reference to hip to gable extensions in either of the permissions or to a rear dormer in the permission at no. 7. Accordingly, I have attached very limited weight to these examples. In any event, it is an established planning principle that each case should be considered on its own merits.
11. Drawing these threads together, I find on the main issue that the proposed development would not give rise to any harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene. It would display the building and design qualities, with appropriate respect being shown for local character, context and place making, that are required by Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's aim of achieving well-designed places.
12. Potential conflict with Policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document 2021 was referred to by the Council but this seems to me to be misdirected since the policy is primarily aimed at promoting and protecting high standards of amenity for occupiers and neighbours. The officer's report, quite correctly in my view, found that the impact on residential amenity would be acceptable and that there would be compliance with the 45 Degree Code and other relevant numerical guidelines within the SPD.

Conditions

13. I have reviewed the 3 conditions suggested by the Council in its questionnaire. I shall impose conditions setting the standard time period in which the development is to commence and requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the relevant approved drawings to provide certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is unnecessary as the materials to be used are specified on the plans and the application form and have not attracted any specific objection.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR