



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 January 2026

by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/G2625/Y/25/3373791

1 Town Close Road, Norwich, Norfolk NR2 2NB

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Boschi and Cowley against the decision of Norwich City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00534/L.
 - The works proposed are first floor level extension (over existing GF level) rear extension to existing residential dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/G2625/W/25/3373905

1 Town Close Road, Norwich, Norfolk NR2 2NB

- 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 and Mrs Boschi and Cowley against the decision of Norwich City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00533/F.
 - The development proposed is first floor level extension (over existing GF level) rear extension to existing residential dwelling.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. These decisions address both planning and listed building consent appeals for the same site and the same scheme. To prevent duplication and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals within a single decision letter. I have used the description of development from the relevant appeal forms and decision notices as these more accurately describe the proposal.
4. The appeals relate to a listed building within a conservation area. I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which require me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
5. The appellant has submitted an amended drawing, reference 1707-CAM-XX-XX-DR-A-PL03 Rev F with the appeal. The Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals – England is clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that what is considered at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and interested parties.

6. The amended plan shows one of the existing exterior windows being retained and the retention of the existing drainage goods. The scheme would be materially different from that considered by the Council. I have considered whether it would be appropriate to accept these revised plans, having regard to the guidance in the Procedural Guide.
7. The alterations would result in a material change to the scheme considered by the Council and on which neighbouring occupiers commented. However, as the internal alterations would not affect comments made by interested parties, and the external alterations are intended to address concerns raised by interested parties, I am satisfied there would not be prejudice to those parties were I to consider the appeal on the basis of the amended plans. I therefore determine the appeal with respect to the amended plans.

Main Issues

8. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building 1 and 2 Town Close Road and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Newmarket Road Conservation Area.
9. A further main issue for Appeal B is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Heritage Assets

Special Interest and Significance

10. 1 and 2 Town Close Road¹ is a pair of houses dating from the early-mid 19th century in yellow brick with a hipped slate roof. Fenestration is particularly important to the significance of the building, with the windows noted as having sashes with glazing bars in raised brick surrounds. There is a large, modern single storey rear extension finished in a white brick. The building is of an imposing scale and set in a commensurately large plot.
11. From the evidence before me, the special interest and significance of the listed building as it relates to this appeal lies in its architectural interest as an example of early-mid 19th century residential development in a polite architectural style. It also has historic interest as to the expansion and development of Norwich.
12. The site lies within the Newmarket Road Conservation Area (CA). Its character and appearance is that of a predominantly residential area with properties typically being well sized and set in commensurate plots displaying a range of architectural features and detailing. The appeal site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Appeal Proposal and Effects

13. The appeal proposes a first floor extension above the existing flat roof, single storey extension to the rear of the property. This would enclose two existing windows on the rear elevation of the property, alter the internal layout and create a

¹ List Entry Number: 1051815 Date first listed: 05 June 1972

new opening in the existing rear elevation to allow access to the proposed extension.

14. The proposal would result in a very large extension to the existing property. It would be clearly separate to the original dwelling due to its modern appearance, features and materials. Although it is proposed to retain the sash window as an internal window, the proposal would obscure the rear elevation which forms part of the polite architectural style which is one of the features of architectural interest of the building.
15. The plans do not accurately show the internal layout of the ensuite to bedroom 2 as there is no indication of the stairs and consequent level change. The evidence before me is not clear as to what works are proposed to provide the level floor shown for the utility room in the proposed plans. Nor is it clear what the proposed opening to this space would be. At my site visit, I observed a curved opening to the wall with corbels. It is wholly unclear from the plans what is proposed for this opening. There is no evidence before me as to the role this part of the house would have played historically. Consequently, I cannot be certain that this change to the plan form of the house would not have an adverse effect on the ability to appreciate the historic patterns of use in the dwelling. Nor can I be certain that there would not be a loss of historic fabric which adds to the special interest of the listed building.
16. The amended plans show dashed lines to indicate where the existing drainage goods will be retained. However, the plans are not at sufficient detail for me to be certain as to what is proposed. Not only does this mean I cannot be certain that the rainwater goods would be retained, I cannot be certain that appropriate provision for drainage would be made, ensuring the long term maintenance of the building.
17. It is imperative that proposals are accompanied by drawings and specifications of sufficient detail to illustrate and/or describe the proposed works in order to avoid any uncertainty over what is proposed and to allow a robust assessment of any consequent effects. The deficiencies in the plans and information cited above give rise to ambiguity. This is undesirable in general terms but more so when the property is a Grade II listed building of national importance. Consequently, I cannot be certain that they would preserve the listed building's special interest.
18. I note the Council did not request any further detail be submitted or raise concern with respect to these issues. However, the Act imposes duties upon me as the decision maker and the Framework requires that I give great weight to the conservation of these designated heritage assets. I have assessed the proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.
19. The proposal would be sited to the rear of the property. It would be visible in glimpsed views from Town Close Road. However given the distance the property is set back from the road, the depth of the property and the surrounding landscaping, the proposal would not be prominent in views from Town Close Road. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would have a neutral effect on, and so would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
20. I conclude that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building 1 and 2 Town Close Road, or any features of

special architectural or historic interest which it possesses or that it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

21. I therefore cannot be certain that the proposal would meet the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Act. Nor can I be sure that it would not harm the significance of the listed building and so comply with the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Nor can I draw conclusions against the relevant policies of the development plan.

Living Conditions

22. The proposal would result in a long extension immediately along the boundary of the appeal site with 2 Town Close Road. This would enclose the outlook from the two windows in the projection of the rear elevation. However, given the expansive outlook from those windows looking along with the length and width of the rear garden of No.2, this loss would not result in material harm to the living conditions experienced by occupiers when using those rooms.
23. The appellant has referred to a ground floor extension being granted permission at No.2. However I do not have the full details of this before me to understand the extent to which this would project into the rear garden. However, given the length and width of the garden, I am satisfied that acceptable living conditions would remain occupants given its length and width.
24. Given the position of the proposed extension relative to 82 Newmarket Road, there would not be a new relationship of overlooking as there are windows on the existing rear elevation. While the proposal would move those windows somewhat closer to the property at No.82, given the large scale of both plots, this would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking.
25. The proposal would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. It would therefore be in accordance with Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan (December 2014) Policy DM2 which confirms that development will be permitted where it would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants.

Other Matters

26. The Conservation Officer also referred to 3 & 4 Town Close Road², 5 & 6 Town Close Road³, 7 & 8 Town Close Road⁴, Town Close Preparatory School⁵ and Fernley⁶. However there was no assessment of the special interest of these properties, their relationship to the appeal site and any effect the proposal may have on them. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to explore this matter further.

² NHLE:1210845

³ NHLE:1051816

⁴ NHLE:1372531

⁵ NHLE:1372821

⁶ NHLE:1051921

Conclusions

27. Appeal A: For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
28. Appeal B: The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate the decision should be taken otherwise. For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

Jennifer Wallace

INSPECTOR