



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

by P Mileham BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/20/3245790

14 Gannet Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP2 9NR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Marsh against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref IP/19/00986/FUL, dated 25 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the covering over the existing decorated and facing brickwork to the front elevation of the dwelling (including porch) with Hardie-Plank cladding – colour Evening Blue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling which is finished with facing brickwork with light coloured rendering which covers the upper half and the right hand side of the property as it is viewed from the road. The area is characterised by pairs of semi-detached two storey dwellings similar to the appeal property which are also a mix of facing brickwork and render finishes, the majority of which are painted in light pastel colours. As such, the area has a regular rhythm with the pairs of dwellings having a symmetrical appearance.
4. The proposed development would cover the front elevation of the dwelling with the coloured cladding material, including the parts of the front elevation that are currently finished with facing brickwork including the porch. The result of this would be a significant change in the pallet of materials used in the area through the introduction of a finish that is not evidence on any other properties in the vicinity. The material would introduce additional horizontal line detail due to the planking's finish creating a stark contrast in styles to the flat render of nearby properties. As a result, it would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area which is of dwellings with rendering and facing brick detail.
5. The covering over of the parts of the front elevation that are facing brickwork would result in a dwelling that would no longer appear symmetrical with its neighbouring semi-detached dwelling. As a result, it would result in a

disharmony of design in the area jarring with the regular rhythm of the development that gives the area its sense of character. I consider that this contrast would not be a positive enhancement to the street scene and would instead be incongruous by virtue of its disruption to the rhythm of development. I consider that this disruption to the symmetry of the development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

6. My attention has been drawn to a similar scheme at Robin Drive which utilised the same cladding as the proposed development. However, that scheme differs from the appeal site as the neighbouring dwelling is completely rendered. Furthermore, the Council has also indicated that it did not have the benefit of planning permission. As such, this is only afforded very limited weight.
7. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy DM5 of the Ipswich Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2017) which states that amongst other things, development should reinforce the attractive physical characteristics of local neighbourhoods and the visual appearance of the immediate street scene.
8. The proposed development would also fail to accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Mileham

INSPECTOR