

Draft Local List (Buildings of Townscape Interest)
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
Consultation statement January 2021

In accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement Review (2018) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012, the Council's Executive agreed, at its September 2020 meeting, that the draft version of the SPD should be taken to public consultation for an 8-week period.

Public consultation ran from 06/10/2020 until 08/12/2020. 14 responses were received by the Council in relation to the consultation. The public comments, and the Council's responses to them, are summarised below.

Respondent	Comment	IBC Response
Private individual 1	I first became aware of the local list procedure in connection with the listing of 13 St. John's Road in 2016, and am pleased to learn that further buildings are being added. The scheme does seem to be effective in ensuring that, when planning applications are being considered, attention is drawn to buildings/structures (and their settings) which might otherwise be ignored or overlooked.	Noted.
Private individual 2	We thought this information might add interest to the description of our house. The house is called 'The Cottage' (this can be seen chiselled on the wall post). It was actually built in 1886, according to local research. It was built by a Captain Harrison on his retirement and the balcony was built so he could view the ships in the docks. Also every room was painted blue to remind him of his career. Captain Harrison was a rare character and I have enclosed his obituary, This was typed onto the 'Burma' paper by a subsequent occupier. I hope this may be of interest. <i>(PDF of obituary of former owner Captain Harrison included with email)</i>	Grateful for this interesting additional information which has been provided and assists our understanding of the property and original occupants of the building. The SPD has been amended to include information within the email and PDF attachments to help illustrate the social history of the site.
Private individual 3	Having looked at the local list I wonder why this property merits admission?	The Local List has been prepared to include a paragraph for each entry to illustrate how the site meets the criteria for Local Listing. The criteria is set on at the beginning of the document and the reasoning is clear within the text for each entry. Referred respondent to details within draft document.
Private individual 4	We are the current owners of the above property which is proposed for inclusion in the local list of Buildings of Townscape Interest. We have the original plans for which the	Grateful for this additional information which has been provided and assists our understanding of the property and original occupants of the

	architect was Munro Cautley in 1935. His client was Frederick Thompson whose initials are in some of the pargetting.	building. The SPD has been amended to include information within the email.
Private individual 5	<p>I recently received a letter telling me that the Barrack Walls were going to be added to the Local List (Buildings of Townscape Interest) SPD – which I totally agree with and think is a great idea.</p> <p>I have recently purchased a house on Berners Street which has this lovely red brick wall as the rear wall to my property.....However it was a difficult purchase because this said wall is not on my deeds and it seems that nobody can work out who actually owns the wall.</p> <p>I was just wondering if you had any information on this (as you are looking at the wall for the above). (...)</p>	The respondent was thanked for their positive response to the Local Listing and advised that on the question of ownership, all parties both sides of the wall were notified of the proposals based upon Land Registry information. There is no information in our records about ownership of the wall independent of the adjoining properties.
Private individual 6	I would like to inform you that we have no interest in our property being included on a local list and do not give you permission to enter our details without our consent now or at any time in the future.	93 Constable Road was added to the Local List in 2013. Inclusion on the Local List is at the discretion of the Council with regard to the criteria for selection. This property is considered to meet the criteria for inclusion for the reasons set out in the document and the Council maintains that the property should be included on the Local List.
Private Individual 7	We are the owners of 41 Valley Road Ipswich IP1 4EE (residential property formerly owned by Sir Alf and Lady Ramsey). We can confirm that we would be happy to continue to be included on the list. However, we noticed that the photo was taken before we finished our building work at the front of the house, where the extension had not been painted and there was also a Skip beside the house. I don't know whether it would be possible for you to take an updated photo, however we understand that it might not be a priority during these times.	The respondent was thanked for their comment and the information about the notable former owner included in the description. The photograph has been updated as requested.
Private Individual 8	Following the proposed inclusion of Framlingham Court on the IBC Local List, I notice the architect's name is missing. The architect was Frank M Dewing ARIBA, he had an office in Prince of Wales Road, Norwich. The plans for Framlingham Court are held at the Suffolk Records Office.	The respondent was thanked for their comment and additional information, and the name of the architect has been added to the local list record.
Private Individual 9	Please note that I would prefer that my house is not included in this proposed list. I take that it is my prerogative to deny this application.	73 Belstead Road was added to the Local List in 2013. Inclusion on the Local List is at the discretion of the Council with regard to the criteria for selection. This property is considered to meet the criteria for inclusion for the reasons set out in the document and the Council maintains that the property should be included on the Local List.

<p>Private Individual 10</p>	<p>I am strongly objecting to the inclusion of The Gardeners Arms, Fore Hamlet, Ipswich in the Local List. Our business has enough to contend with during the current Worldwide pandemic without the added bureaucracy and hinderance to any possible change of use for this building. The Pub has been shut due to Covid-19 since 24th March with very little prospect of reopening due to Covid-19.</p> <p>It's all very well for bureaucrats to add my property to this list because it does not affect them whatsoever. All this combines to make the task of running a pub very tough without this added headache of been added to this list.</p>	<p>The respondent was thanked for their comment. Whilst noting the objection, the Gardeners Arms is considered to meet the criteria for inclusion in the 2021 Local List, criteria which are based upon national guidance and are set out in the individual list entry for the property. It is important that such buildings are included within the list to ensure that the rich historic environment of Ipswich is documented. The entry into the list would not preclude the change of use of the building should it be progressed.</p>
<p>Suffolk County Council</p>	<p>I refer to you letter of 6 October 2020 inviting comment on the above document. Three additional buildings owned or managed by Suffolk County Council are proposed for inclusion for the first time, and this letter is the corporate view of the authority.</p> <p>Dale Hall Sports Dome This is the first of the timber sports domes designed by the Ipswich architect Birkin Haward and dates from 1967. These domes were an economical way of enclosing large spaces, and as innovative designs by an architect of regional note, they clearly meet the Local List criteria. The building is currently used for storage as it is no longer considered fit for its original purpose. Although a recent survey showed that the building could be repaired at relatively small cost (mainly the renewal of the roof felt), up-grading it to meet modern standards and legislation such as the 2010 Equality Act would not be economically sustainable. The up-graded building would not meet the school's needs and its historic interest would be compromised by the external changes required such as the addition of toilets and improved insulation. The school draw attention to the building's insufficient and costly lighting, poor energy performance and poor acoustics, making it expensive to run and unsuitable for pupils with sensory needs. The dome was not designed for longevity. In summary, while the architectural interest of the building is acknowledged, its inflexible form is unsuited to the school's needs and its retention on a constrained site would have a detrimental impact on the use of the site for educational purposes.</p> <p>Lindbergh Road Dome This is a large dome dating from 1972. Its structure is improved from the Dale Hall dome, making its construction more economical. It is however not energy efficient and</p>	<p>The respondent was thanked for their comments. Whilst the objections to the inclusion of both domes are noted, it is maintained that both structures merit inclusion on the 2021 Local List, a point acknowledged by the respondent.</p> <p>At least 9 domes of various types were constructed to designs by Birkin Haward and the limited Local List selection of only 2 sites reflects both the significance of the chosen structures, described in the list entry, and concerns by IBC that the choice should be realistic, and not impose undue constraints upon the County's schools estate. It is important that such buildings are included within the list to ensure that the rich historic environment of Ipswich is documented.</p>

	<p>was not designed to be long lasting. Local listing could restrict the development potential of the site and be a drain on the funds of the charity that leases it.</p>	
Historic England	<p>Thank you for your e-mail inviting Historic England to respond to the Draft Local List (Buildings of Townscape Interest) Supplementary Planning Document, which we support.</p> <p>Local lists play an essential role in building and reinforcing a sense of local character and distinctiveness in the historic environment, as part of the wider range of designation. They enable the significance of any building or site on the list (in its own right and as a contributor to the local planning authority's wider strategic planning objectives), to be better taken into account in planning applications affecting the building or site or its setting.</p> <p>The draft SPD amalgamates the Council's existing 2013 and 2016 Local List documents, and brings these up to the standards in the latest Historic England Local Heritage Listing guidance (Historic England Advice Note 7) – enhancing the descriptions and including the reasons within each entry as to how the building/structure meets the selection criteria. We further note and support the inclusion of 54 new entries proposed to be added to the Local List.</p> <p>Please note that we may still advise on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal(s) which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the documents subject to the consultation.</p>	Historic England were thanked for their supportive comments. The expanded list and improved presentational format will make the document more accessible to both public and planners and will enhance the SPD's effectiveness within the planning system.
Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>Thank you very much for consulting with Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG regarding the Draft Local List (building of Townscape Interest) SPD.</p> <p>The CCG would just like to make a comment on the proposed new inclusion of Barrack Walls, rear of Cecil Road and Geneva Road. This wall forms the boundary of the Barrack Lane Medical Centre and we would just like to be informed as to what implications this might have on the estate?</p> <p>The medical centre along with its branch Stoke Park Medical Centre are currently 413m2 overcapacity and there is more development proposed that will see the patient list size grow and them become more overcapacity. The CCG will be working with the Primary Care Network in the area around a strategy for dealing with the current capacity issues and for what is proposed in the local plan.</p> <p>We would welcome any dialogue from you regarding this matter.</p>	The respondent was thanked for their comments. They were reassured that, whilst the local listing is intended to protect the structure from demolition or insensitive alteration, it will not prevent future development on the site. The designation highlights the historic significance of the wall and ensures that it is taken into account during consideration of proposals which require planning permission.

<p>Private Individual 11</p>	<p>I live at 32 Kingsfield Avenue, Ipswich. We are happy for our house to be included in the Local list.</p> <p>This house is one of five in Kingsfield Avenue (Nos 26,28, 30, 32 & 38) which are all by the same architect who I believe was Munro Cautley as the designs are almost identical to other houses he designed and features such as The Walk in Ipswich. In the case of our house, Tudor era chimneys with Tudor Rose, thistle and oak leaf motifs from a demolished building have been reused as have Tudor bricks on the front.</p>	<p>The respondent was thanked for their comments and the additional information. The entries for Nos 26, 30 and 32 have been updated.</p>
<p>Private Individual 12</p>	<p>Comments received from the owner of a property in Corder Rd, concerned that his property had been incorrectly included in the draft 2020 Local List. This related to correspondence from himself dated 18th March 2013 objecting in detail to inclusion on the 2013 Local List, and a letter from IBC dated 11th June 2013 confirming that Nos 7 - 13 Corder Rd, which includes the complainant's property, would be removed from the 2013 List, having been assessed by a Panel against selection criteria.</p>	<p>This property, along with the neighbouring properties within the 7-13 Corder Road group, had been incorrectly included within the 2013 Local List following a Local List Panel recommendation to remove them. Because of the inclusion, the incorrect listing has remained part of the present consultation, based upon legal advice. The respondent maintains their original objection, and the conclusion of the 2013 Panel is still considered to be relevant, so it is therefore recommended that Nos 7-13 Corder Road should be removed from the 2021 Local List.</p>