

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

**by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 4 January 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/21/3277199**

**33 Thackeray Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 6JA**

- 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 & Mrs Wayne & Araina Kelly against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
  - The application Ref IP/21/00112/FUL, dated 1 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
  - The development proposed is single storey front/side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential estate of similar property types.
  4. Policies DM5(e) and DM12(d) of the Ipswich Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review (2017) (the CSP) require this type of development, respectively, to protect and enhance the special character and distinctiveness of Ipswich; and to not have an adverse visual impact within the immediate street scene.
  5. The site is within the Whitton sub area of the Castle Hill, Whitehouse and Whitton Urban Character Area. The *Characterisation Study* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for this area says that proposals for extensions and porches should respect the general symmetrical approach to design through the semi-detached and terraced layout of the estate and avoid disrupting the established layout and proportions of houses in this area.
  6. Dwellings within the street scene of which No 33 is a part demonstrate a good degree of uniformity of character and appearance, with little change to the original design or layout. The existing wooden structure to the side of the appeal property is one of a small number of changes, which also include
-

examples of modest infill porches to the front. The majority of pairs of semi-detached dwellings have open areas to the side providing access to the rear gardens.

7. I acknowledge that the proposed extension seeks to respond to the angled side boundary. However, the extensive gap between Nos 31 and 33 resulting from their relative layout means that the extension's side profile would be readily visible from the public realm. From these views the flat roof to the rear and pitched roof form to the front would sit uncomfortably together, contrasting unfavourably with the simpler pitched roof forms of the appeal property and neighbouring dwellings. Moreover, seen from the front the extension would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings by introducing a more permanent and substantive built form of greater height and prominence than the existing wooden structure to the side of No 33.
8. While the extension would employ matching materials and fenestration and would retain the openness at first floor level, it would also result in a permanent form of development in a position which is uncharacteristic of the highly uniform estate design and layout. As such, it would be particularly prominent in the street scene due to its uncharacteristic and incongruous appearance, contrary to the SDP guidance. I note that the appellants question the distinctiveness of the Whitton estate in comparison to other public housing estates. However, this does not alter the guidance in the SPD or my findings with regard to the effects of the extension on the street scene.
9. I have had full regard to the appellants' contention that a side extension could be built as permitted development and that this represents a 'fallback' to the appeal proposal. I have no basis to doubt that the appellants may choose to exercise these rights in the event of the appeal's failure. However, the pitched roof form projecting forward of the existing front elevation makes the extension particularly prominent in the circumstances described. As such, I give limited weight to the fallback given that the additional development which forms part of the appeal proposal results in material harm, as described.
10. Accordingly, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policies DM5(e) and DM12(d) of the CSP, as described above.

### **Other Matters**

11. The appellants contend that the proposal will make effective use of land and provide multiple benefits, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, the Framework also requires that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment<sup>1</sup>. It has been found above that the proposal is in conflict with this requirement and with development plan policies that are consistent with it. As such, the matters raised do not overcome this policy conflict.
12. Reference is also made to the presumption in favour of sustainable development in Policy CS1 of the CSP. This policy requires that planning applications that

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 130c).

accord with the policies in the development plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the reasons given, such circumstances do not apply in this case.

13. The appellants also refer to the presumption in favour of sustainable development included in the Framework<sup>2</sup>. However, I am not aware of any substantive arguments that the most important policies for determining the application are out-of-date and I do not consider them to be so. Consequently, the presumption is not engaged.
14. While I note the appellants' contention that the Council did not undertake a site inspection, this does not have a direct bearing on my consideration of this appeal where a site inspection was undertaken.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

*J Bell-Williamson*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 11.