



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2021

by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/D/20/3252050

159 Plumstead Road East, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich NR7 9LD

- 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 and Mrs J and G Shipley against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20191949, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is First floor extension to the side. Rear Two storey extension. Single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for First floor extension to the side. Rear Two storey extension. Single storey rear extension at 159 Plumstead Road East, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich NR7 9LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20191949, dated 18 December 2019, 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: Location Plan Site Plans Drawing No 01; As Existing Floor Plans & Elevations Drawing No 02; As Proposed Drawing No 03 Rev.B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted 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, 159 Plumstead Road East, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached, hipped roof dwelling with an attached, flat roofed, single garage to the side. It is situated within a slightly staggered row of semi-detached and detached two storey dwellings, of mixed design. The properties are quite close knit at ground floor level due to the prevalence of single storey side extensions or original attached garages occupying part of the space between the main buildings and the side

boundaries. This group of dwellings is set back from the main Plumstead Road East frontage, and is accessed from a dedicated spur road, which is separated from the main thoroughfare by a wide grass verge which also contains a small number of semi-mature trees.

4. The proposed extensions would result in a substantial addition to the existing dwelling. Nevertheless, the enlarged house would have a cohesive design which would be respectful of the existing dwelling and its attached neighbour in its scale and detailing. The resultant building would have a hipped roof that would maintain symmetry within the pair when viewed in the street scene. This would be akin to that seen at No 155 Plumstead Road East. The proposed side extension would not include a break in the elevations or roof line. However, because of this, the imbalance that would be created within the front elevation of the pair would not appear obvious in, nor out of keeping with the general street scene.
5. The two-storey element would extend to the rear of the dwelling by approximately 3.5 metres, creating an "L" shaped roof. This element of the proposal would have a lower ridge line and be fully hipped. In this way it would be subservient to the main dwelling and the overall scale of the proposal would be well-proportioned in relation to the original dwelling and its immediate surroundings. No concerns have been raised with the single storey element of the proposal and I have no reason to disagree.
6. Whilst there would be a reduction in the gap between the appeal building and its neighbouring property at first floor level, a gap of approximately 1.2 metres between the side elevation and the common boundary would be maintained. Further, the hipped roof form would provide a sense of space at roof level. I do not consider that the reduction in space between the properties would cause unacceptable harm to the street scene, given the varied pattern of development in this part of the street.
7. The Council has referred to an appeal against refusal of a similar proposal, at a different property within the same street, which it considers offers support to its refusal of the appeal scheme. That appeal was dismissed. The Inspector was concerned with reducing the visible space at first floor level between properties and the consequent erosion of the prevailing spacious and regular pattern of development. The Inspector also considered that proposal to be large and bulky in comparison to the adjoining house and other nearby properties. Whilst I accept some similarity between that proposal and the scheme before me, I do not consider it to be directly comparable.
8. This is because the site in that case was situated within a section of the street that is remote from the appeal site, where the character is somewhat different. The dwellings within that part of the street directly front Plumstead Road East and are more uniform in their design than is the case within the immediate surrounds of the appeal proposal. In addition, the two-storey rear projection element of the dismissed appeal scheme, would have extended some 12 metres back and would have joined with a single storey element. This would have resulted in built form across the majority of the depth of that site. This is markedly different to the scale of the appeal proposal. As such, I find any comparison with the referenced appeal to be of limited relevance in this case, and I necessarily determine the appeal on its own merits.

9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Thus it would comply with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2014 and Policy GC4 of the Broadland District Council Development Management Development Plan Document 2015 which, together and amongst other matters, require development to be of a high quality that respects and contributes to the character of the surrounding area. The proposal also accords with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure good design that is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary to ensure the development is in keeping with the existing property.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above the appeal is allowed.

S Tudhope
Inspector