
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/19/3236586

8 Curson Road, Tasburgh, Norwich, Norfolk NR15 1NH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr William Fisher against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0893, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is extensions and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development includes a front extension, two storey rear extension and extensions to the side. The reasons for refusal on the Council's decision notice indicate that the front extensions are the matters in dispute. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion that the rest of the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms. My reasoning below therefore relates to the front extensions.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling located in a residential area. The property has a catslide roof feature to the front and a single storey extension behind an attached side garage that extends approximately 2.5m forward of the main dwelling. There is a dormer window that extends across almost the entire rear roof.
5. The dwellings along the northern side of the road display despite some differences are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance displaying uninterrupted catslide roofs, meaningful gaps that provide a sense of openness between properties and subordinate single storey forward garages.
6. I acknowledge that the development would not increase the ridge height of the property. However, the front extension would increase the eaves of the

property to give it a full two storey appearance and would extend the study and hallway forward in line with the garage, which in turn would be extended to the side. The loss of the characteristic catslide roof feature and the scale and form of the front extension would unacceptably change the appearance of the dwelling resulting in prominent and incongruous feature that would be significantly at odds with the relatively harmonious appearance of properties either side which is characterised by catslide roofs and subordinate forward projections.

7. There are no other properties within the road that have similar extensions to that being proposed. I find that the raised eaves and forward projection would unacceptably draw the eye and represent a prominent and incongruous feature within the street scene. As such, I find that it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015) which state that residential extensions will be permitted provided they incorporate good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surrounding and refuse development that fails to take opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. It would also fail to accord with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011) which states that all development will be designed to the highest possible standards, creating a strong sense of place, supported by Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has suggested that the proposed development would improve the internal living accommodation. Whilst this is a personal benefit of the proposal, it is insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to the main issue.
10. The lack of opposition counts neither for nor against the proposal and does not overcome the harm I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR