
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2017

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/D/17/3178987

Tayberry House, High Hall Road, Nettlestead IP8 4QS

- 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 S Bertolla against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 0488/17, dated 13 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is replacement garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the countryside.

Reasons

3. Tayberry House is an extended domestic property which lies on a generous plot within the open countryside on the edge of the dispersed settlement of Nettlestead. It is accessed from a narrow rural lane set within the gently undulating agrarian landscape of fields, hedgerows, standard trees and pockets of woodland.
4. Of the policies referred to me, I consider that policies GP1 and CL2 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan adopted 1998 to be the most relevant. Whilst they may be relatively old they are broadly consistent with the Framework as they seek to protect and enhance valued landscapes and to secure high quality design.
5. The appeal proposal would replace an existing wooden open garage with a structure whose ridge height would be marginally lower but whose footprint would be approximately six times larger. There is nothing before me to suggest that the proposed development, whilst large, would not be used for domestic purposes.
6. Nonetheless, the scale and design of the utilitarian, double pitched garage structure and its proposed location close to the house, would appear overly large and incongruous within the domestic setting, when viewed directly

opposite the drive to the house and from the viewpoint¹ on the road leading to Baylham Stone.

7. I am aware that there is an established laurel hedge along the frontage of the site with two attractive silver birch trees which could be retained and that I could impose a condition to require a detailed landscaping scheme to screen the development as much as possible and consequently, when viewed in isolation, the side elevation would have a limited visual impact. However, the extent of the width of the proposed development, its design and its proximity to Tayberry House would not result in a building which was subservient. As such, taken as a whole, it would appear not only incongruous to the setting of the domestic house and also within the immediate wider landscape.
8. In coming to this conclusion I am aware that due to the intimate landscape of narrow lanes and hedgerows that the appeal site is not widely visible. However, this does not undermine the importance of good design.
9. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to policies CL2 and GP1 of the LP.

Other matters

10. I took the opportunity to visit the nearby Westley Green Farm. However, in my judgement there is a clear difference, both in the character and appearance, of a traditional farmstead and a domestic property, and the style and scale of development that would be appropriate to each.
11. I am aware that the appellant has a large number of cars, and the advantages of housing these within a building, rather than being parked outside, and that the appellant has substantively reduced the height of the previously refused proposal which had been dismissed at appeal. However, these matters do not outweigh the reasons set out above.
12. I am also aware of the appellant's unhappiness at the way in which the application was considered by the local planning authority. Nonetheless, I must judge the appeal on the basis of the merits of the case before me.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR

¹ Previously identified within APP/W3520/D/10/2122731