



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/D/23/3332919

41 Delane Road, Drayton, Norwich, Norfolk NR8 6DL

- 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 & Mrs Baker against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/2762.
 - The development proposed is front extension to form double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated on the western side of Delane Road within a modern, suburban estate. The appeal property is typical of surrounding dwellings which include detached bungalows of broadly similar scale and form with either one or two projecting front gables. The consistent appearance of dwellings is formative of the area's character, and the low building heights and density pattern of development provide a sense of spaciousness.
4. On this side of Delane Road, dwellings are set back by deep front gardens with driveways and low boundary treatments at the plot frontage. Dwellings are regularly spaced within plots of equal size and are oriented parallel with the road. Whilst there are small variations in the siting of dwellings, the overall visual effect is of a clear, defined building line which appears prominent within the street scene and contributes to the character of the area.
5. Some dwellings within the row have been extended at the front. However, such modifications are generally small in scale and there are no garages forward of the row of dwellings on the western side of Delane Road. Due to the open character of dwelling frontages, the proposed extension would appear highly prominent in the street scene.
6. The proposed garage would extend from the appeal property's front gable and would project significantly forward of the front elevation of the main part of the dwelling. The proposed extension would project beyond the extension at No 45 by 0.75m and the extension at No 39 by 2m. Through its scale and siting, the

proposal would interrupt the uniform appearance of the building line, and therefore would adversely impact on the character of the street scene.

7. Opposite the appeal site is a row of bungalows similar in scale and form to the appeal property. Nos 28 and 30 have detached garages forward of the dwelling's front elevations. However, on this eastern side of Delane Road, dwellings are positioned at an angle to the street and therefore the building line is less distinct. In addition, the garage at No 26 adjoins the dwelling's front elevation with the appearance of a front gable and differs significantly in design to the appeal proposal.
8. The appellant draws comparison to garages at Nos 30, 38 and 40 Bradshaw Road, which are two-storey detached dwellings and therefore differ in scale from the appeal property. Through its mix of two-storey houses and bungalows, Bradshaw Road is less uniform in appearance than the area surrounding the appeal property. Due to the building heights, the front elevations of Nos 30, 38 and 40 remain visible above the garages, and therefore the effects on the appearance of the building line are more limited. Consequently, the visual effects of the garages on the eastern side of Delane Road and at Bradshaw Road are not comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. The appellant suggests the proposal represents a visual improvement on a previous refused scheme and indicates the materials used would match the appearance of the existing dwelling. However, harm arises from the siting of the proposed extension in a prominent location forward of the building line, and the development could not be adequately assimilated into the street scene through use of complimentary external materials. For these reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. The proposal would conflict with Policy 1A of the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan, Policy GC4 of the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document, and Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, which together require proposals show how the development would achieve a high standard of design, pay adequate regard to the character and appearance of an area, and respect local distinctiveness and townscape.
11. In addition, the proposal would not comply with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR