



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2026

by H Miles BA (hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R3515/D/25/3373505

579 Felixstowe Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP3 8TE

- 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 Mrs Cook against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is IP/25/00437/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of carport and timber entrance gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area is characterised by detached houses located back from the wide Felixstowe Road, behind generous front gardens. Even though many are hardstanding, they remain open. There are generally low level walls and fences to front boundaries, some with planting, with openings wide enough for vehicles. This results in a setback front building line and a spacious character. No 579 makes a positive contribution to the pattern of development with its large open front garden which is mainly paved, and a front boundary wall with an evergreen hedge behind and an opening for access. The Ipswich Urban Characterisation Study North East Character Area places the appeal site within The Heaths character sub area. It identifies the locality as having a spacious character and the characteristics of this part of Felixstowe Road including the houses being set back from the highway by generous front gardens. This broadly reflects my findings above.
4. There are examples of buildings in front gardens in the wider area, with some further along Bucklesham Road and Warren Heath Road. These are not intervisible with the appeal site. In the immediate surroundings, between Warren Heath Road and the roundabout, there do not appear to be any buildings to frontages. As such, this feature does not form part of the overriding character of the surroundings of the appeal site. Many forecourts are laid to hardstanding and used for car parking, however they remain free from buildings. Consequently, they make a positive contribution to the sense of openness.
5. The appeal scheme proposes a single storey timber building within the front garden. It would be between 2m-2.4m high and has a footprint designed for use as a double carport. Entrance gates are also proposed to the front boundary which

the plans show would be 1.8m high, sunk into the ground by 0.3m and set back into the plot with a 5m gap from the kerb edge. The scheme would retain the front boundary wall and planting behind.

6. The proposed development would introduce a large outbuilding to the open front garden. Whilst the carport would be single storey, it would sit above the height of the front wall, the side fences and would be close to the street. There is a hedge to the frontage and there is no indication that the present occupiers would remove it. However, the evidence does not satisfy me that it would be reasonable to require the maintenance of a domestic soft landscape feature in perpetuity by condition. Therefore, the hedge would not be secured to screen the development from the street permanently. In any case, the carport would be visible from the front gardens and windows of neighbouring properties and also likely in glimpsed views from the pavement over the side fences. In addition, the proposed tall gates would provide further enclosure to the frontage. Taken together, the appeal scheme would unacceptably undermine the important open and spacious character of the site and its surroundings.
7. The proposed development is smaller than a previously refused scheme (20/00651/FUL), however that does not alter the merits of the appeal before me now.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to policies DM12(g) and DM16(a-c) of the Ipswich Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review (2022). These require that ancillary buildings respect the character of the existing dwelling, its curtilage and the surrounding townscape and seek high quality design which reinforces attractive characteristics of the local area and the appearance of the streetscene.

Conclusion

9. The material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR