



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2020

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/D/20/3247000

Willow Cottage, Bury Road, Lackford, Bury St. Edmunds IP28 6HT

- 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 Mrs Louise Jones against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/2230/HH, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of 1N^o single storey outbuilding comprising annex and storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of 1N^o single storey outbuilding comprising annex and storage at Willow Cottage, Bury Road, Lackford, Bury St. Edmunds IP28 6HT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/2230/HH, dated 11 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: 19-006-01 P2 and 19-006-Plans P5.
 - 3) Development shall not take place above slab level until details of the external facing and roofing materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The annex hereby permitted shall be occupied only in conjunction with and for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the existing dwelling known as Willow Cottage to which it is associated and together they shall form a single dwelling house.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is whether or not the proposal would accord with development plan policy for residential annexes in the countryside.

Reasons

3. Willow Cottage is in the open countryside and adjacent to the main Bury Road. The proposed annex would replace two existing domestic outbuildings which are adjacent to a car parking area and separated from the house by an area of garden. The proposed annex would provide self-contained accommodation for occupation by family members.

4. The relevant development plan policy is Policy DM24 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015) (DMP). This allows for self-contained residential annexes in the countryside subject to three criteria. The Council's decision refers to criteria (d) and (f) which require the design and siting of any annex to allow for it to be reasonably integrated into the use of the dwelling once the need for it has ceased, and the size, scale, location and design to relate satisfactorily to the dwelling and the surrounding area.
5. The building would be of modest size and height and would be largely screened from view from outside the site by trees along the road frontage and within the site. It would not significantly add to the extent of development as it would replace existing buildings. The Council has no objection to the appearance of the building or in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the area and I see no reason to disagree.
6. I saw that the existing outbuildings are used for storage purposes in association with the house. The proposed building would be in a similar position, extending closer to the house. The Council's officer report states that the building would be about 11 metres from the house. This distance seems to me close enough to allow it to be integrated with the dwelling once the need for an annex has ceased. Taking into account the size of the garden, the building would be located quite close to the house. Its windows would face the rear of the house in close proximity. For these reasons the design and siting of the proposed building are consistent with its proposed occupation in association with the house rather than as a separate dwelling.
7. For the reasons given above I find that the design and siting of the proposal would allow its integration with the dwelling once the need for it has ceased. Its size, scale, location and design would relate satisfactorily to the existing dwelling, its curtilage and the surrounding area. For these reasons the proposal would accord with Policy DM24 of the DMP.

Conditions

8. I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty. A condition requiring approval of facing and roofing materials is necessary to ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable. A condition is also necessary to require the annex to only be occupied as ancillary to the host dwelling in order to prevent the creation of a separate dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR