
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2021

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/20/3264270
36 Ivry Street, Ipswich, IP1 3QW

- 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 Mrs Samantha Cass against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. IP/20/00700/FUL, dated 22 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed, and I have therefore used the one given in the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part, and the Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached Victorian dwelling located in the Park Conservation Area. The Council's published 'Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan' confirms that the significance of the Park Conservation Area stems from its development as a wealthy suburb, and that the area is notable for large Victorian and Edwardian villas and inter-war detached houses, many with fine architectural features. The CAMP notes that the area has a harmonious architectural style throughout the area. Within this context, the street scene in the Ivry Street Identity Area is mixed, with dwellings that vary in terms of their design, materials and detailing, and including large community buildings.

5. Despite this variety of building style, the symmetry of the front and rear elevations of the appeal property and the attached house is notable. A single- and two-storey range spans the rear of both properties, and this symmetry and 'mirrored' rear wings are characteristic of many of the dwellings in the vicinity. Although reasonably deep, the wing of the appeal property reduces in height from two-storey to single-storey, and with a gradual reduction in width this combines to create a subservient element to the main house.
6. The proposal would materially alter the scale and form of the rear wing and would destroy the symmetry of the rear elevation of the pair. Vertical 'articulation lines' shown on a proposed side elevation do not reflect the continuous wall shown on the floor plans, and would result in an overly long flank wall with little visual relief, the depth of which would be perceived in views across the driveways of Nos. 34 and 36 Ivry Street. The result would be a bulky addition that would not respect the form and architectural style of the original building or the pair, and this would be compounded by the untraditional form and detailing of the proposed flat roofed extension. Overall, the proposal would conflict with the design aims of Core Strategy¹ (CS) Policy DM12(d), which requires extensions to be in keeping with the original dwellinghouse and to have no adverse visual impact within the immediate street scene.
7. There is a requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area in exercising planning functions. In this case, the proposed extensions would dilute the character of the pair of buildings and would not be sympathetic to the special interest of the conservation area as a heritage asset. CS Policy CS4 seeks to conserve and enhance the Borough's built and heritage assets, and this is reiterated in CS Policy DM8(b), which further explains that matters including the position, height, mass and materials of a proposed extension shall pay regard to the character of adjoining buildings and the area as a whole.
8. The appellant advises that the proposed extension would be modest compared to others in the local area, although no specific extensions or related planning permissions have been identified. It is evident that properties in the vicinity have been altered and extended but generally semi-detached pairs of dwellings retain their symmetry. More individually-designed additions appear to have been added to detached dwellings.
9. I agree with the appellant that the proposal would not give rise to material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents, but that is only one aspect to be considered in this appeal. In addition, whilst I note the support of the Ipswich Design and Conservation Panel, I have also had regard to the more detailed assessment of the Council's Conservation and Urban Design Officer.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and this part of the Park Conservation Area. Having regard to paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the harm that would arise would be less than substantial, but it is not evident that this harm would be outweighed by public benefits. As outlined above, the proposal would conflict with CS Policies CS4, DM8(b) and DM12(d), and with CS Policy DM5(e), which seeks well designed and sustainable development which protects and enhances the special character and distinctiveness of Ipswich, including

¹ Ipswich Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review, 2017

significant views that are recognised as being important and worth protecting, and which helps to reinforce the attractive physical characteristics of local neighbourhoods and the visual appearance of the immediate street scene.

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR