



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/25/3359030

37 Olive Road, Costessey, Norfolk NR5 0AS

- 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 Martin against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2488.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and internal changes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed loft conversion on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located in a residential road of similar dwellings. The surrounding area is residential in character.
4. Policy DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015) and Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (2024) require high quality design from development and protection and enhancement of locally distinctive character.
5. The bungalows along Olive Road are largely laid out on consistent building lines with a limited number of extensions to the side and front, including a front gable projection to the appeal property. As such, properties predominantly retain their original design and layout, providing a uniform character and appearance to the street scene. This uniformity is particularly apparent with regard to the height of buildings, which remain consistent and unaltered across the pairs of semi-detached bungalows.
6. The proposed extension would materially alter the appearance of the host dwelling by substantively raising the roof height across its full depth and changing the hipped roof form to gable ends with two dormer windows to the side-facing roof slope. Due to the extent of uniformity, the heightened and altered roof form would contrast unfavourably with the consistent height of all the other dwellings along the same side of the road, particularly due to No 37's prominent visibility within the street scene close to the open junction of Olive Road with Margaret Road.

7. These uncharacteristic changes would be particularly prominent in the street scene due to the existing forward projection of part of the front elevation beyond the consistent building line. The upward extension would also further unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Moreover, the additional bulk created by the heightened roof would be apparent along its full depth due to the gap with No 35, which would also enable views of the side-facing dormers, which would be uncharacteristic features within the street scene.
8. Most properties have brick or render finishes; consequently, the use of grey cladding for the extended roof and dormers would further add to the uncharacteristic and incongruous appearance of the extended dwelling. I note, however, that the appellants would be willing to change the materials and, as such, a condition requiring matching materials could be imposed.
9. The appellants refer to other properties that are considered comparable to the appeal proposal. However, these are not specified and based on the inspection there are no similar forms of development within the street scene. While neighboring occupiers might not have raised concerns about the proposal, this is a neutral factor in consideration of the appeal and, therefore, is not sufficient reason to overcome the harm found above.
10. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed loft conversion would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. It is, therefore, contrary to Policy DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document and to Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan, as described.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given the appeal is dismissed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR