



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 March 2021

by Graham Chamberlain BA(Hons) MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/20/3264140

Juniper Lodge, Bruisyard Road, Rendham, Suffolk IP17 2AH

- 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 and Mrs Furness against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/3689/FUL, dated 17 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of detached double garage and store to be replaced with new 1 and half storey annex building. New two bay cartlodge'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the one and a half storey annex building.
2. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to the two-bay cart lodge. Planning permission is therefore granted for the erection of a two bay cart lodge at Juniper Lodge, Bruisyard Road, Rendham, Suffolk IP17 2AH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: DC/20/3689/FUL, dated 17 September 2020, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The two-bay cart lodge hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiry of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The two-bay cart lodge hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details set out on the following approved plan: Drawing 499.01 B.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
4. The appeal site encompasses a large bungalow set in an extensive plot in a rural area. The proposed annex would be smaller than the host property in respect of floor area, footprint and overall massing and would be located behind it. However, the annex would be the size of a small detached house and much larger than the existing garage. It would also be similar in height to the main property with a two-storey glazed porch that would accentuate the height and afford the building an assertive character. The building would therefore have the appearance of a separate dwelling positioned discordantly in the corner of the garden. This would harmfully disrupt the hierarchy of the built form on the plot. The annex would therefore lack a clear sense of subservience.
5. The hedge along the western boundary of the appeal site is currently maintained at a low height as is landscaping along the roadside. This, taken with the sloping nature of the land, which rises up from the road, results in

Juniper Lodge and the outbuilding proposed for demolition being clearly visible from the public realm despite the setback from the road. The proposed annex would likewise be very visible and, due to its scale, position, and design, discordantly so. The annex building would be cut into the bank and therefore would have a single storey appearance from the rear, but this would not mitigate for the harmful presence in views from the road.

6. In conclusion, the proposed annex would not appear clearly ancillary to the host dwelling by virtue of its scale and design and this would harm the character and appearance of the area. In this respect, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SCLP11.1 and SCLP5.13 of the LP, which requires contextually responsive design and that annexes are 'clearly' ancillary to the host dwelling.

Other Matters

7. The proposed two bay cart lodge would be located behind Juniper Lodge and would be single storey and functional in appearance. It would therefore be a subtle addition that would appear ancillary to the main dwelling. A couple of small trees would need to be removed but these are not of any particular amenity value. I therefore share the view of the Council and appellant that the proposed cart lodge would be acceptable.
8. The proposed annex would not result in the subdivision of the curtilage and would be accessed from the existing driveway. It would not harmfully impact on the visual amenity of the wider landscape and could function as an annex. A planning condition could be imposed to secure the latter so that an isolated dwelling was not created and the living conditions of the occupants of Juniper Lodge preserved. As such, the proposal would adhere to aspects of Policy SCLP5.13. However, the proposal overall would result in a harmful conflict with policy due to its scale and design and this is not outweighed by the neutral considerations outlined above. Similarly, whilst residential annexes can have benefits, substantive evidence has not been presented in this case to demonstrate there is a pressing need for the annex to be weighed against the conflict with the development plan.

Conditions and Conclusions

9. I have issued a split decision because the two parts of the proposal are severable. In permitting the cart lodge it is necessary to impose the standard condition relating to implementation, and a drawings condition in the interests of certainty. The drawings detail the materials to be used, which are acceptable, and therefore a separate condition in this regard is unnecessary.
10. The two-bay cart lodge would adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, this part of the appeal succeeds. Conversely, the one and a half storey annex would not adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Thus, for the reasons given, this part of the appeal fails.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR