
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/22/3305666
51 Derwent Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP3 0QR

- 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/22/00344/FUL, dated 20 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is part single storey/part two storey/part first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The current proposal follows an earlier one also for a side extension at the appeal property that was refused permission and subsequently dismissed at appeal¹. While the current proposal is intended to respond to the reason for refusal of the previous scheme, I have considered the proposed extension on its individual merits. However, given the same location of the two proposals, I have had regard to the earlier appeal decision where relevant.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Derwent and Mersey Roads. It is of traditional design and appearance for an inter-war dwelling and is located within a residential area of similar detached and semi-detached dwellings and some bungalows. I agree with the Inspector in the earlier appeal that the character of the area is spacious and verdant with a regular layout of dwellings on consistent building lines.

¹ APP/R3515/D/22/3291249 dated 17 March 2022.

5. 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.
6. The *Space & Design Guidelines* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) says that extensions to dwellings that are at the front, or side of a dwelling will have the most impact on the appearance of the existing dwelling and the character of the surrounding streets, particularly if they are corner properties. Therefore the design of these types of extensions should be sensitively undertaken so that they relate well to the scale, form and appearance of the existing dwelling².
7. No 51 retains its original two storey built form and in this regard is consistent in character and appearance with the neighbouring detached dwelling on Derwent Road. It has a single storey extension to the rear and detached garage to the side. The garage would be replaced by the proposed extension. Due to their limited height these are relatively discreet additions to the dwelling that do not significantly alter the original built form or harmfully compromise the open aspect between the dwelling and side boundary.
8. The height of the side extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling. However, it would result in a materially wider frontage to the appeal property, including a shallow pitched roof form with a long, flat top. Given the steeper pitched hip roof of the original dwelling, this would result in two substantively different roof forms across the extended dwelling. Consequently, the extension would appear as an incongruous and contrived addition that would not integrate visually with the original two storey built form, contrary to guidance in the SPD for extensions to corner properties to relate well to the scale, form and appearance of the existing dwelling. It would also contrast unfavourably with the original appearance of the neighbouring detached dwelling. Given the prominence of the corner location, the uncharacteristic and incongruous addition to the side of the property would be readily apparent.
9. The extension includes a small single storey element to the side elevation, which provides some set-back of the two storey part from the side boundary. Nonetheless, the bulk of the extension would infill the majority of the open aspect to the side. Despite the single storey garage, there is a consistent building line between the two storey properties on opposite corners, the appeal property and No 11 Mersey Road. The proposal would harmfully undermine this uniformity by extending the two storey built element into the characteristic open aspect to the side. I accept that there would be no substantive visual effect behind the property to the south due to the separation provided by the relatively long garden. Nonetheless, the principal visual relationship of properties most directly related would be harmfully undermined.

² Paragraph 5.18.

10. The appellants draw attention to a number of examples of extended dwellings on corner plots in the surrounding area. The Inspector in the earlier appeal considered this matter and found that while the treatment of corner plots may be variable there remains a generally consistent observance of the building line which contributes to the spacious and regular character of the area. Based on the inspection I agree with this finding. Moreover, these other examples are not within the same street scene and I have found that the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, as well as the street scene. As such, these other examples of extensions do not provide a sufficient basis to overcome this harm.
11. I acknowledge that the proposed extension is intended to create additional living space. However, these personal circumstances do not overcome the harm and conflict with relevant guidance that I have found would result from the proposal.
12. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would have 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 and to the SPD, as described above.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR