

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17TH march 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/22/3291249

51 Derwent Road, Ipswich, IP3 0RQ

- 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 and Mrs D Papper against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref IP/21/01108/FUL, dated 22 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey, part two storey/part first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Derwent Road and Mersey Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a traditional inter-war detached house on a wide corner plot at the junction of Derwent Road and Mersey Road. It has a modest front garden and generous rear garden. The dwelling has an attractive two storey bay to the front with a feature gable above and an arched brick porch with set in front door. It is constructed in brick with the feature bay being painted render. There is currently a detached single storey garage in the gap between the side of the dwelling and the side boundary with Mersey Road.
 4. The surrounding area is characterised by similar properties of both detached and semi-detached design, and bungalows of a similar age. The layout is regular, including consistent building lines, spacious and verdant.
 5. The proposed development involves the demolition of the garage and its replacement with a two storey side extension. This would be about 5.1m wide at ground floor and 4.6m wide at first floor. It would be set back from the front elevation. The extension would occupy most of the width of the gap between
-

the existing dwelling and the side boundary, with its side wall facing Mersey Road in the same position as the side wall of the garage.

6. The extension would be approaching two thirds the width of the original dwelling. This, coupled with its height and corner location and despite the set back from the front façade of the dwelling would make it a dominant feature that would fail to respect the proportions of the host dwelling. In consequence, it would be an unsympathetic addition that would fail to be subservient to the original house. The garage door at ground floor and wide window above would add to its discordant character.
7. The prominent corner location would make the extension particularly visible in the street scene and its obvious breach of the well-established building line on Mersey Road, including its proximity to the side boundary, would make it a bulky and jarring presence.
8. The appellants point out that corner plots in the area are treated in a variety of ways and that there is thus scope for change. They also draw attention to a dwelling on a corner plot in a nearby street which has been extended over two storeys to the side. Whilst I agree that treatment of corner plots is variable there remains a generally consistent observance of the building line which contributes to the spacious and regular character of the area. It is therefore not readily comparable with the appeal proposal.
9. Moreover, the extension drawn to my attention, although breaching a building line, has a different relationship with the street. It also appears narrower than the one proposed at the appeal dwelling, keeping it further from the side boundary, and has been carefully designed with sympathetic fenestration and a two storey bay on the side elevation. This latter design feature is seen on other corner plots in the area and hence provides consistency as well as interest and helps the extension to assimilate into the street scene. It is therefore not readily comparable with the appeal proposal.
10. The appellants also suggest that as the existing single storey garage has already breached the building line the harm has already been created and the proposed extension would not materially alter that. However, I agree with the Council that the detached nature of the garage as well as its limited height means that it appears as a separate entity and an open gap remains above it which preserves the openness of the corner such that any harm is limited.
11. It is further suggested that the distance between the proposed extension and dwellings to the south would mean the breached building line was not materially noticeable because the extension would be viewed in the context of its own garden. However, even if this was so, it would be both noticeable and materially detrimental in the context of the entrance to Derwent Road and the dwelling on the opposite corner.
12. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed extension would fail to harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the host dwelling and would be materially harmful to its character and appearance, and that of the street scene of Derwent Road and Mersey Road. In consequence, it would conflict with Policies DM5 and DM12 of the Ipswich Borough Council Local Plan, Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review, 2017, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Space and Design Guidelines

Supplementary Planning Document, 2015. Taken together, these expect extensions to dwellings to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout such that they are in keeping with the original dwelling house, do not have an adverse visual impact on the immediate street scene and are sympathetic to local character and history in order to protect the special character and distinctiveness of Ipswich.

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR