



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/D/19/3238877

Kiln Farmhouse, Kiln Farm, Melford Road, Cavendish, Suffolk CO10 8AA

- 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 P Dorrell against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/1149/HH, dated 24 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is replacement storage barn.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement storage barn at Kiln Farmhouse, Kiln Farm, Melford Road, Cavendish, Suffolk CO10 8AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/1149/HH, dated 24 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16/014 1, 16/014 2 Rev B, 16/014 3.
 - 3) No development above ground shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Kiln Farmhouse is a two-storey detached property in a traditional style and is generally surrounded by open countryside. There are other dwellings further along the road such that the area has a sporadic rural character and appearance. The appeal site lies adjacent to this property and from the evidence before me has a partially-demolished outbuilding to the rear.
4. The proposal consists of a two-storey barn with car and tractor parking at ground floor and storage at first floor. While the proposed building would be an outbuilding of considerable size, it would be generally in keeping with the scale and height of Kiln Farmhouse adjacent to the site. Its use as a storage barn and

proposed materials would also be appropriate given the rural countryside location.

5. I note the position of the building on the plot and design features such as fenestration layout and arrangement as well as roof form. However, the evidence indicates that the ground floor elevation would be dominated by large barn-style doors and a relatively blank rear elevation with a few windows at the upper floor. As such, the proposed development would not appear unduly residential in appearance and would not appear out of place given the traditional appearance of Kiln Farmhouse and the rural character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policies DM2 and DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document February 2015 (DMPD) which among other things seeks development that respects the character of the locality and that the size, scale, location and design relates satisfactorily to the existing dwelling and its curtilage, and to the wider surrounding area. The proposal would also not conflict with Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2001-2026 (with housing projected to 2031) Adopted May 2010 which among other things seeks to protect the character of the District's landscape.

Other Matters

7. I note that planning permission for a proposal at the site was approved in 2015¹ followed by approval of a Non-Material Amendment (NMA)². There is no dispute between the main parties that these permissions have expired and therefore do not form a fall-back position.
8. From the evidence before me, the overall visual appearance of the 2015 scheme is very similar to the appeal proposal and the approved schemes were determined under the same development plan as the current proposal. In addition, both the revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and the 2012 Framework place importance on high quality buildings. As such they are not significantly different in terms of their aims in this particular respect. Therefore, given the striking similarities of the proposed scheme with the development approved in 2015, this matter has not altered my overall decision.

Conditions

9. Conditions relating to the standard period for commencement and specifying the approved plans would be necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring the proposed materials to be submitted to and agreed with the Council is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

R.Sabu INSPECTOR

¹ Council ref: DC/15/2080/HH

² Council ref: NMA(A)/15/2080