



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/25/3369844

112 Yarmouth Road, Broome, Norfolk NR35 2PA

- 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 T Smith against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1493.
 - The development proposed is extension and alteration of main dwelling, extension and alteration of garage, materials.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension and alteration of main dwelling, extension and alteration of garage, materials at 112 Yarmouth Road, Broome, Norfolk NR35 2PA. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2025/1493, dated 15 May 2025, 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 the following approved plans: 3328.25.1A (plans and elevations) and 3328.25.2A (site plan and elevations). The windows in the front elevation to include half obscured glass, as shown on the approved plans, shall be installed prior to first use of the room they serve and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the changes to the fenestration on the front elevation of the appeal property on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with regard to privacy.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling located on a residential road in a village setting. Dwellings in this part of Yarmouth Road are laid out on varied building lines, with the appeal property positioned well back from the road frontage with a number of neighbouring dwellings in front of it.
4. The proposal involves raising the roof ridge of the appeal property and creating two front gable features with new windows. The existing upper floor window to the right, seen from in front of the property, originally served a bathroom and included

obscured glass. The Council's and interested parties' concern is that the two new replacement windows to serve a bedroom will enable overlooking of properties to the front of No 112 and so will cause a harmful loss of privacy.

5. At the inspection I saw that the obscured glass in the former bathroom window had been replaced with clear glass and, therefore, it was possible to compare existing views from the room with the proposal in terms of possible overlooking. The two properties that are closest to the position of the current and proposed windows are Nos 108 and 114. Other nearby properties would not be affected due to the separation distances and lack of direct views towards them.
6. The existing window enables indirect, angled views towards the rear garden and windows of No 108, the closest property. However, the boundary hedge between the properties and the oblique angle of views means that there is no harmful overlooking or loss of privacy from the normal domestic use of this room. More direct views are possible to the rear garden of No 114, with some degree of overlooking of this private amenity space.
7. The proposal for the two replacement windows is to raise their sill height and reduce the width compared to the existing window, and provide obscured glazing to the windows' bottom half. It is clear from my viewing inside the appeal property that these measures will effectively obscure existing views of the neighbouring properties. Despite the raising of the floor level, due to the raised window level and half obscured glass the principal view from the top half of the windows will be of the sky.
8. The windows are shown as including half obscured glass on the submitted drawings. However, for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure they are retained as such, the standard plans condition should include an additional requirement to provide this form of glazing prior to first use of the relevant room and to retain the windows in this form.
9. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not harmfully affect the privacy of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties. Consequently, there is no conflict with Policies DM3.13 and DM3.4b) of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015), which require that development, including residential extensions, should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, including from overlooking.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the representations made by interested parties. The appeal property is set well back from the road frontage and so the increase in height will not result in it becoming unduly prominent in the street scene. Moreover, the pair of semi-detached dwellings, Nos 116 and 118, are relatively tall two storey dwellings closer to the road frontage. In this context, the proposed alterations would not result in a dwelling of uncharacteristic or incongruous size.
11. The principal material for the extended dwelling is brick, in keeping with the surrounding area. The black cladding to the front gables will not be so extensive or prominent that it would harmfully affect the character and appearance of the appeal property or surrounding area.

12. No 112 and surrounding dwellings are located on relatively generous plots, with a good degree of separation between dwellings and with boundary hedges and other vegetation in rear gardens. Consequently, there is no basis to find that the extended dwelling would be a dominant or overbearing feature in views from surrounding properties or that it would result in material harm to the amount of natural light available to those properties.
13. The bathroom windows to the side elevation closest to No 108 would include obscured glass to maintain privacy for use of these rooms. Due to their position and small size these windows would not enable direct views towards the neighbouring property and, therefore, there is no reasonable basis to require them to be non-opening. The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so¹. I find that there is no such justification in this case.
14. I acknowledge that construction activity may be unwelcome to existing residents. However, this will occur for a temporary period and assumptions about noise levels cannot have a determinative effect on the appeal. Therefore, while I have had full regard to all the matters raised, for the above reasons they do not lead me to reach a different conclusion.

Conclusion and Conditions

15. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should succeed.
16. Of the Council's suggested conditions I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of the proposal, one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, with the addition of the matter concerning the front windows.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph 55.