



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2023

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/23/3319957

75 Heath Lane, Ipswich, Suffolk IP4 5RS

- 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 Daniel Baldry and Miss Kirstie Hayman against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref IP/22/00810/FUL, dated 15 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision notice indicates a revised plan was submitted prior to determination of the planning application. I have therefore considered the proposal on the basis of the revised drawing on which the Council made its decision which proposed an extension with a hipped roof.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 75 Heath Lane, (No 75) is the end terraced dwelling of a group of 4 dwellings, sited on a corner plot at the junction of Heath Lane and Lyndhurst Avenue. There is a regular pattern of inter war terraced properties found on this side of Heath Lane and a spacious character and appearance found at the area around the junction. This gives the area as a whole a sense of coherence and balance.
5. The Council's Space and Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (the SPD) states that extensions at the front or side of a dwelling will have the most impact on the appearance of the existing dwelling and the character of surrounding streets, particularly if they are corner properties. It provides that 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 dwelling.

6. No 75 has been previously extended, and the proposed single storey side extension would be set back from the existing front elevation and extended to the rear level with the back of the existing rear extension. Rather than being a modest addition, it would result in a significant extension which would add bulk and mass to the existing dwelling. Notwithstanding that it would not project beyond the existing front and rear elevation as extended and would be set in from the pavement edge, the proposed extension would dominate the side garden. By infilling most of the gap at the side, it would result in a cramped and discordant addition to dwelling dominating the streetscene in this location.
7. I do not accept the view of the applicant that the proposed extension would offer no more enclosure of the space than the existing fence and shed does. The latter is set well back from the front elevation and neither it nor the fence unduly dominate the corner plot in views of No 75. Further, whilst the proposed extension would be viewed in the context of the backdrop of trees to the rear of No 75 and the properties of Lyndhurst Avenue that “book end” the views in this location, this would not mitigate the harm caused by the extent of the length and bulk of the proposed extension.
8. Notwithstanding that the roof form has been revised to better reflect the hip of the existing roof slope, the front elevation of the proposed extension would remain unduly wide and the fenestration proposed would not align with the existing style or form of the host dwelling. I acknowledge that the development management policies quoted by the Council do not set out specific criteria for corner plot locations. Nonetheless these policies require development to have regard to the local context and to respect the character, scale and design of the existing dwelling. Overall, the proposal would represent a bulky addition to the host dwelling and would be unduly noticeable from the surrounding roads. As such it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
9. My attention has been drawn to other developments within the locality where corner plot extensions have been allowed. Although some alterations to corner plot dwellings were observed during my site visit, these examples are not within a similar street scene. Nor do I have the full details of the circumstances in which these extensions have been accepted and so direct parallels with the present proposal are not easily drawn. In any event the existence of these extensions does not justify development which would otherwise be unacceptable.
10. I note also that the Council has no objections to the proposal with regard to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, the absence of harm in this respect does not weigh in favour of the proposal. I acknowledge too that the proposal would provide for additional living accommodation. Nonetheless, on the information before me, I am not convinced that this is the only scheme available to achieve this.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such it would be contrary to Policies DM12 and DM16 of the Ipswich Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review (2022) which together require development to be, amongst other things, respectful in terms of character, scale and design to the existing building and established townscape. It would also be contrary to the National

Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR