

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/22/3299356
32 Eustace Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 5BT

- 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 S Richardson against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref IP/22/00111/FUL, dated 11 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'retrospective application for change of exterior finish from brickwork and render to Hardieplank to existing house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the cladding that has been installed on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential road of similar properties and terraced dwellings.
 4. Policy DM12 of the Ipswich Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review (2022) (the CSP) concerning design and character includes the requirement that design should help to reinforce the attractive physical characteristics of local neighbourhoods and the visual appearance of the immediate street scene. Policy DM16 of the CSP requires that alterations to existing dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal respects the character, scale and design of the existing dwelling, and respects and preserves the established townscape of the surrounding area.
 5. No 32 is located in a prominent position in the street scene on a bend in Eustace Road. As a semi-detached dwelling it shares a common built form with the paired dwellings to the east, while those to the west comprise terraced dwellings. There have been some limited changes to the semi-detached dwellings in the form of varied fenestration, the addition of porches and different treatments of the upper front-facing gables, including some with timber cladding. Nonetheless, the overall built form and the use of render as
-

the predominant external material provides a good degree of uniformity to the character and appearance of the pairs of dwellings and to the street scene as a whole. As such, this largely reflects the original planned layout, built form and character and appearance of properties. From the photographs provided, the appearance of the appeal property before the cladding was installed broadly reflected these wider characteristics, including in relation to the appearance of the adjoining dwelling.

6. There is some variety in the colour of the rendered semi-detached dwellings and, as such, the colour of the cladding that has been installed is not of itself harmful. However, the extent of the coverage across the whole of the dwelling is in marked contrast to the predominant use of render on other similar dwellings and to the brick-faced terraced dwellings. In particular, the addition of this amount of a substantively different facing material, with horizontally-orientated overlapping boards standing out from the external walls, is incongruous and uncharacteristic, particularly in relation to the adjoining dwelling as well as the street scene as a whole. The prominent position of No 32 means that it is highly visible from both the public realm and neighbouring dwellings, from which views the incongruous appearance of the cladding in relation to the general character and appearance of the street scene is readily apparent.
7. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the cladding that has been installed has an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policies DM12 and DM16 of the CSP, as described above. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR