



---

## 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/K2160/D/25/3368048**

**36 Plumstead Road, Norwich, NR13 5AJ**

- 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 Justin Taylor against the decision of Broadland District Council.
  - The application Ref is 2025/1005.
  - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and detached garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two-storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the detached garage and planning permission is granted for a detached garage at 36 Plumstead Road, Norwich, NR13 5AJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2025/1005, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, insofar as they relate to the garage only: Location Plan at scale 1:1250; Site Block Plan at scale 1:500; Existing and Proposed Floor Plans at scale 1:200; Existing and Proposed Elevations at scale 1:200.
  - 3) Development shall not progress above slab level until details, including colours where required, of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the garage hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
  - 4) No doors / windows shall be installed until details of their colour and finish have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Thorpe End Garden Village Conservation Area (CA).

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling, which is situated in a prominent position on a corner of Plumstead Road and The Boulevard. The dwelling is within the CA, which, in the vicinity of the appeal site, is characterised by relatively large, detached dwellings fronting a grassed area of open space (The Village Green). Properties along this stretch of Plumstead Road vary in terms of their age, scale, and appearance and some have been extended and altered since they were originally built. This includes the neighbouring dwelling at number 34 Plumstead Road. During my site visit, I also noted that a number of dwellings occupy much of the width of their plots.
4. The scale and design of appeal property is typical of the era in which it was built and the spacious appearance of the site, particularly at the end of a row, makes a positive and significant contribution to the streetscene and to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The proposal is for two distinct and separate elements. A two-storey side extension would be constructed on the western side of the property, and a detached double garage is proposed on its eastern side. The extension would substantially enlarge the property, providing a kitchen/diner and utility space on the ground floor and additional bedroom space with an en-suite on the first floor.
6. The Council objects to the proposed extension on grounds of its scale and design. It considers that it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, the Council cites a conflict with Policies GC4 and EN2 of the Development Management DPD, Policies 2 and 3 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan, and Policy 2 of the Great and Little Plumstead Neighbourhood Plan.
7. The above policies generally seek (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of a high quality and reflects local character and that proposals ensure that the character and appearance of conservation areas are protected or enhanced. In my opinion, these accord with paragraph 135 and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF), which contain similar provisions.
8. Whilst I accept that the extension would be constructed of matching materials and that other details, such as the fenestration could match the existing dwelling, I share the Council's concerns. Although other dwellings along Plumstead Road and in the wider locality within the CA have been substantially extended and the amount of built development on the appeal site would be less than on some other properties, the scale and mass of the proposed extension would overwhelm the existing dwelling to the detriment of its existing character and appearance. In that regard, it would fail to protect or enhance the existing character and appearance of the CA. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the provisions of both the Development Plan and the NPPF, as referred to above.
9. I consider that the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, and, in that regard, I am required to consider whether any public benefits arising from the proposal would outweigh the harm that I have identified. I acknowledge that the proposal would bring significant benefits to the appellant through the provision of additional accommodation. However, these are private benefits to which I am unable to attribute any weight in reaching my decision.

10. Turning to the proposed double garage, the Council also considers this to be unacceptable, stating that it would be an incongruous addition that would have an adverse impact on the open character of the site, adjacent to The Boulevard.
11. On this matter, I do not share the Council's concerns. The proposed garage would be a relatively low-key structure, which would be set-in from the side boundary of the site. The existing verge along The Boulevard and the existing planting along the boundary would ensure that the verdant and open character of the area would not be unduly compromised and, overall, I consider that the impact on the appearance of the site and on the character and appearance of the CA would be acceptable. Consequently, the proposal for the garage would not conflict with the relevant policies of the Development Plan, or with the provisions of the NPPF, as referred to above.

### **Conditions**

12. In addition to conditions relating to the period in which to commence the development and the listing of the approved plans, the Council has also suggested conditions relating to the submission and approval of details relating to the external materials and doors and windows. Whilst most of these are mainly relevant to the extension, they also apply to the proposed garage. Therefore, to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, I have imposed conditions to that effect.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal is dismissed, insofar as it relates to the two-storey extension, and allowed insofar as it relates to the detached garage.

*Ian McHugh*

INSPECTOR