
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2025

by **C Shearing BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/D/25/3373294

12 Cradock Avenue, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk NR30 4AL

- 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 Jack Mills against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application ref is 06/25/0457/HH.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey front and two storey extension to front side and rear of end of terrace with alterations internally'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During the course of the appeal the government published a consultation National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which sets out changes to the Framework along with other changes to the planning system and accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement. As the proposed reforms are in draft and may be subject to change before the final document is published, I have given them only very limited weight at this stage. Having regard to the determining issues of this appeal, it has not been necessary to consult the parties on the changes and, in reaching my decision, I have had regard to the Framework of December 2024.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. While the properties on Cradock Avenue have been subject to small scale alterations, they generally share a traditional character of consistent front building lines and pitched roofs with consistent eaves and ridge heights. The regularity in the building forms contributes positively to the character and appearance of the street and provides its local distinctiveness. No.12 shares these characteristics. When walking along the access to the side of no.12, the backs of the buildings in the surrounding area can be clearly seen, which similarly display an ordered appearance with a regular pattern of rear extensions.
5. The proposed front extension, due to the combination of its depth, width and height reaching the first floor window, would be more substantial than other front extensions in the area and would dominate the front of the building and detract from its traditional character.

6. The two storey rear extension would similarly dominate and entirely obscure the original rear elevation of the property and its original eaves level, and the large expanse of its flat roof would heavily detract from the traditional pitched roof form. These effects would be apparent from the road, from where the flat roof would be visible behind the lower parts of the side extension, and in views along the service drive to the rear. While the other two storey rear extensions in the area have flat roofs, these do not occupy the whole of the rear elevations and create a pattern of projecting elements that appear subordinate to the original rear elevations and roof slopes.
7. As a consequence, the proposed extensions would appear heavily at odds with, and harmful to, the character of the existing building, the terrace of which it forms a part and the wider area. The proposal would conflict with policies CS9 of the CS¹ and H9 of the LPP2² which together require development to maintain and respond to an area's distinctive character. It would also conflict with the Council's Design Code 2024, which states that in this area elevations should have a regular rhythm and building lines should ensure streets continue to have a consistent appearance.
8. While not referred to in its reason for refusal, the Council also cite conflict with emerging policy HOU11. The proposal would also conflict with that policy since it requires, among other things, that residential extensions be subordinate to the existing building, allowing the form of the original building to be clearly understood.
9. The proposal is described by the appellant as providing necessary family accommodation. However, it has not been substantiated that a more appropriate solution does not exist. This consideration therefore attracts limited weight.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are not material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Shearing

INSPECTOR

¹ The Great Yarmouth Local Plan: The Core Strategy, adopted 2015

² The Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2, adopted 2021