



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/D/25/3368619

43 Jannys Close, Aylsham, NR11 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 Miss Samantha Colyer against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0657.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene; and
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at number 45 Jannys Close (number 45).

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling, which is situated in a residential area. The appellant's garage (and those of neighbouring properties) sits between the front of the dwelling and the highway. House types in the locality vary in terms of their age, scale and appearance and a number have been altered and extended since they were originally built, particularly at ground floor levels. There is, however, a uniformity in the streetscene at first floor level, as no others have been extended in the manner proposed by the appellant.
4. The proposal is to construct a two-storey extension that would cover almost half the width of the dwelling and project out by approximately 5m. It would have a gabled roof which would be lower than the height of the existing roof of the property.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would be out of character with the existing dwelling and streetscene, because of its size and the extent of its projection into the front garden. It argues that the extension would conflict with Policy GC4 of the adopted Development Management DPD 2015. Amongst other things, the policy seeks to ensure that new development has regard to the character and appearance of the area and reinforces local distinctiveness. This policy accords with paragraph

135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF), which contains similar provisions.

6. Whilst the proposal would enhance the living conditions for the appellant, by providing additional space within the dwelling, I agree with the Council that the overall scale and height of the proposed extension would be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the streetscene. It would stand out as an unduly prominent feature that would fail to reflect the existing form and scale of built development along this section of Jannys Close. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy GC4 of the DPD and with the NPPF, as referred to above.
7. In reaching my decision I have taken into account other two-storey and first-floor extensions in the locality, including an extension at 49 Holman Road. However, I am not persuaded that these are comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of their effect on the streetscene. Consequently, they do not create a precedent for my decision.

Living Conditions

8. The side wall of the proposed extension would be set-in from the shared side boundary with number 45. I noted at my site visit that number 45 has a single-storey front extension and, as a result, its front garden is relatively small. I have also been informed that planning permission has been granted for a single-storey extension at the appeal property, which would occupy the same footprint as the appeal proposal.
9. Whilst the appellant has demonstrated that the appeal proposal would not encroach beyond a line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest window of number 45, I consider that the height and overall mass of the two-storey structure would have an unacceptably overbearing and overly dominant impact on the front garden area of number 45, making it a less enjoyable space in which to be.
10. Policy GC4 of the DPD also requires proposals to consider the impact on the amenity of neighbouring property. Whilst the appellant considers the impact to be acceptable, I do not share that view and I consider that the proposal conflicts with Policy GC4 for the reasons I have given above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR