

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/W/24/3337498 48 Chilton Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP3 8PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Dr & Mr Ann & Kevin Matthews against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref IP/23/00708/FUL was approved on 14 December 2023 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is erection of front, side and rear extensions and extension of existing outbuilding and raising of roof to provide increased first floor accommodation.
 - The condition in dispute is No 1, which states that: 'The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans Reference Numbers:- 001 rev. 11, 003 rev. 12, 005 rev. 12, D01, D04, D05'.
 - The reason given for the condition is: 'For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that varying the disputed condition would have on the character and appearance of the street scene, with particular regard to the appeal property's front elevation.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow in an interwar residential suburb in east Ipswich. This part of Chilton Road includes bungalows on the same side of the street as the appeal property, with two storey dwellings opposite.
 4. The appeal proposal involves varying condition No 1 so that the approved drawings are replaced by those originally submitted with the application. The principal difference is that the original drawings show the extended front elevation as a gable end rather than the hipped roof form with a central dormer window in the approved scheme.
 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. No 48 is part of a group of bungalows of similar original design and appearance within this part of Chilton Road. The most prominent common features are a hipped roof with a front projecting gable at a lower height than the principal roof form. The only exception is No 46, which retains a hipped roof, but has a central dormer window. The group of dwellings also feature ground floor bay windows. As such, the dwellings display a good degree of uniformity, reflecting the original design and layout of the group of bungalows. Moreover, the articulation of the frontages due to the windows, gables and roof forms provides visual interest as well as a coherent character and appearance within the street scene.
7. The approved proposal largely reflects the changes to the front elevation to No 46 and retains a number of the features of the group, including the hipped roof and bay windows. By contrast, the appeal proposal involves the forward projection of the heightened roof to create a gable end to the front elevation. Seen in isolation, this change would be proportionate to the host dwelling and would not be an unusual design feature. However, it would result in the loss of the hipped roof form and bay windows that are characteristic of the group of dwellings. The altered frontage would be particularly prominent due to its position within the wider group of dwellings and the contrast with the otherwise uniform design of the other dwellings. The loss of the common features and lack of articulation to the front elevation would appear incongruous within this setting and would harmfully undermine the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. The appellants draw attention to a number of other examples of similar designs to the appeal proposal within the surrounding area. However, these are not part of the same street scene and I have considered this case on its merits and found that it would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the street scene within Chilton Road. Consequently, the existence of these other extensions does not overcome or otherwise justify the harm in this particular case. Similarly, the fact that neighbouring residents did not object to the appeal proposal, which formed part of the original application, is not sufficient reason to set aside the harm that has been found. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal may have some environmental benefits over the approved scheme, but this is not sufficient reason to outweigh the above findings.
9. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed variation of condition No 1 would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policies DM12 and DM16 of the CSP, as described.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellants' request that should the appeal succeed the second condition concerning the roof windows should not be re-imposed. Given the above conclusion on the main issue I have not considered this matter further.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR