



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/R3515/W/25/3367182

158 Norwich Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 2PT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Terry Bird against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/24/01013/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear single-storey extension on a grade 2 listed building.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R3515/Y/25/3367302

158 Norwich Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 2PT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Terry Bird against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is IP/24/01014/LBC.
 - The works proposed are the erection of a rear single-storey extension on a grade 2 listed building.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A:** The appeal is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B:** The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. These decisions address both planning and listed building consent appeals for the same site and the same scheme. To prevent duplication and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals within a single decision letter.
4. The appeals relate to a listed building within a conservation area. I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which require me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Main Issue

5. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building 156 and 158 Norwich Road.

Reasons

Special Interest and Significance

6. The appeal property forms part of a Grade II listed building 156 and 158 Norwich Road¹ which dates from circa 1840 and lies within the urban area of Ipswich. It is effectively a mid-terrace property, with two storeys and a basement to the main property, and a carriage house to the side, likely in the position occupied by the service wing noted as demolished in its list entry. No.158 has previously been extended with a modest single storey projection which has a mono-pitch roof and French doors.
7. The building is of an imposing scale with a slate roof with overhanging eaves. There is a clear differentiation between the status of the front and rear elevations. The front elevation is constructed from white brick, with stairs leading to the doorways at either side, each with a fanlight above. Otherwise the level of detailing is quite reserved. The rear elevation is constructed in red brick. The rear elevation contains large windows set out in a regular pattern, with brick feature lintels. Although there is a small amount of contrasting brick detail, the rear elevation is simple and elegant in form, highlighting its subordinate status in relation to the front elevation.
8. From the evidence before me, the special interest and significance of the listed building as it relates to these appeals lies in its architectural interest as an example of residential development in the mid-19th century in a polite architectural style with a clear hierarchy of elevations. It also has historic interest as to the development of Ipswich.

Appeal Proposal and Effects

9. The proposal would see the removal of the external wall and roof of the existing single storey extension and the construction of a larger extension to form a conservatory. This would be grand in appearance, with a moulded cornice, pilasters between the French doors and windows and a substantial roof lantern.
10. While cornices and pilasters may echo common classical forms found on many buildings, they are not features of interest of this building, which is derived from its largely unadorned architectural style. The elaborate detailing to the proposed conservatory would be at odds with the elegant simplicity of the rear of No.158 and its pattern of fenestration. It would also weaken the distinction between the primary front entrance which displays the restraint in detail that informs the special interest of the listed building and this rear elevation.
11. The proposed roof lantern would be viewed in close proximity to the window above and this would detract further from the pattern of fenestration. Consequently, the proposed extension would not complement the building, but rather would appear as an incongruous addition. This would disrupt its unadorned form. Its position to the rear elevation and the fact the development and works may be reversible does not mitigate the harm that would arise from a poorly related addition.
12. The proposal is for a single story structure of modest proportions in comparison with the much larger scale of the designated heritage asset and so it would not be a dominant feature in terms of its scale. The plan form of the property would

¹ List Entry Number: 1247751 Date first listed: 4 August 1994

remain legible. Quality materials are proposed and could be secured by condition. However these are to be expected of any proposal designed with appropriate consideration of the special interest of the listed building and so would be neutral.

13. I note the appellant's interest in architectural history. However, there is no substantive evidence before me that the Hayward family designed 156 and 158 Norwich Road or that the properties were customised to the original occupiers. The relationship between the appeal property and 156 Norwich Road is inevitably part of the significance of the heritage asset. However, the service wing to No.156 has the simplicity of detail that informs the significance of the listed building. There is also no evidence to support the assertion that grand individual extensions were likely a trait of the architect. It may be that classical forms were found on garden pavilions and service wings of period properties, however that is not evident at Nos156 and 158. While there may be similarities in appearance and detailing with other properties in other locations, it cannot be assumed that any findings in relation to those properties would apply to the appeal site.
14. I therefore find that the proposal would not preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building 156 and 158 Norwich Road. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act. As a result, the proposal would harm the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Public Benefits and Balance

15. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether this would amount to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to significance. Paragraph 213 further advises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
16. I find that the harm to the significance of 156 and 158, Norwich Road would be less than substantial and at the lower end of that range. Nonetheless, this harm carries considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework confirms that any harms should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.
17. There would be economic benefits during the construction and occupation stages of the development and works. However these would be very limited given the small scale of the proposal to extend an existing property.
18. The principal benefits from the scheme would be private benefits to the appellant with respect to their living conditions. Their wish to alter the dwelling to reflect their personal wishes is understandable. However, the development and works would not conserve the asset in a manner appropriate to its significance.
19. There were no objections to the proposal other than from the Conservation Officer. It may be that in principle, an extension to the property would be acceptable. No adverse effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers have been identified by the Council. From my observations at my site visit, I have no reason to disagree. Any adverse effects of the construction process could be controlled by a condition. However, these are to be expected of any well designed proposal and so would be a neutral factor in my assessment.

20. There is no substantive evidence before me that the development and works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the asset as a dwelling. Nor is there a clear and convincing justification for the development and works where I have found harm. Overall, in giving considerable importance and weight to the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, I find that this would not be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the proposal.
21. The proposal would not preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building 156 and 158, Norwich Road. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act, and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. It would also be in conflict with Ipswich Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review (23 March 2022) Policy DM13 which require less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Other Matter

22. The appeal site is located within the Norwich Road/Anglesea Road Conservation Area (CA). The CA is predominantly residential with properties dating from all periods of the 19th century but still displaying a unity of scale and materials. The appeal site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset. Bearing in mind the scale and position of the proposed development and works, the character and appearance of the CA as a whole would be preserved. I note that the Council raised no objection in this regard either. This lack of harm would be a neutral factor and so does not amount to a consideration in support of the appeals or alter my overall conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

23. **Appeal A:** The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate the decision should be taken otherwise. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
24. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

Jennifer Wallace

INSPECTOR