



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/D/24/3354688

54 Russell Avenue, Sprowston, Norwich, Norfolk NR7 8XF

- 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 Edward Ives against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref is 20220475.
 - The development proposed is a side extension and alterations including first floor and front porch, front extension to garage and erection of fence along the south-east boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side extension and alterations including first floor and front porch, front extension to garage and erection of fence along the south-east boundary at 54 Russell Avenue, Sprowston, Norwich, Norfolk NR7 8XF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20220475, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing Nos. 1732-1-Rev D and 1732-2-Rev A.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the application process revised plans were submitted to include a front extension to the existing garage and to erect a timber fence along the south-east boundary. I have amended the description from that included on the application form to that included on the Council's decision notice as that better reflects the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located within an established residential area comprising a mix of house types including bungalows and two storey dwellings of predominantly the same period. Many of the bungalows have had significant extensions added, including front and rear flat roof dormers which are not an uncommon feature. Moreover, there is a mix of roof types with both hipped and gable end being evident in the street scene.

5. The appeal property itself forms one half of a semi-detached pair with hipped roofs and is on a corner plot. The existing property is set in from the boundary with Cromwell Road and its side elevation aligns with the front elevation of 100 Cromwell Road (No 100). I observed at the site visit that 98 Cromwell Road has had a single storey extension added to the front that sits forward of the front elevation of No 100 and other properties along the road and so there is not a uniform building line at ground floor level along this part of the road.
6. On the opposite corner, 58 Russel Avenue (No 58) has undergone significant redevelopment which among other things includes a significant gable end addition that faces Russel Avenue which extends back along its boundary with Cromwell Road. Although this element is set in from the side boundary, it nevertheless sits forward of the building line of the two-storey properties along Cromwell Road.
7. Consequently, there is not a uniform building line along Cromwell Road, nor is there a prevailing roof type and dwellings with significant extensions are a common feature in the street scene. This mix helps to define the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would involve a number of elements. The two front dormers would be appropriately spaced and would sit comfortably on the roof slope and would appear as a subordinate addition to the host property. The proposed side extension would involve a change from a hipped to a gable end roof. While ideally, a hipped roof would have helped to balance with the hipped roof on the attached bungalow, the proposed gable end would successfully address the Cromwell Road frontage and would be compatible with the prominent gable end elements at No 58. Therefore, on balance, I consider it would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. Similarly, I would have preferred it if the south-east elevation had been set in by a greater distance from the boundary. However, it would be set in by a small distance and bearing in mind the significant development at No 58, the fact that it would be single storey and there is not a uniform building line along Cromwell Road, overall I consider that this element would sit comfortably in the streetscene and would not appear unacceptably incongruous nor appear unacceptably cramped on the plot.
10. As outlined above, flat roof dormers are not an uncommon feature in the area. The proposed rear dormer would be set down from the ridge of the roof and would be set in by a small distance at either end of the roof slope. As a result, given the existing context of the area the rear dormer extension would be compatible with its setting and would not appear incongruous nor over dominant within the streetscene.
11. The existing flat roof single-storey garage would be extended to the front. This would sit further forward than the front elevation of No100. However, given the scale of this element which would have a flat roof, it would sit comfortably as a sub-ordinate structure next to this neighbouring property and would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
12. As outlined, there are certain elements of the proposed development where I would have preferred to see a different approach. However, overall, when considered as a total package the proposed development would be sympathetic to

local character and would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD 2015, Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan and Policy 2 of the Sprowston Neighbourhood Plan, which among other things seek to ensure development will be well designed to fit in and respect the local area and avoid any significant detrimental impact. The proposal would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council taking account of the advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
15. A condition is needed to secure compliance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The Council have set out that a matching materials condition is not required, and I agree. Some of the materials proposed although compatible will not match the existing materials and further, they are adequately shown on the approved drawings and therefore a separate materials condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR