



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2024

by B J Sims BSC (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/D/24/3340181

Cherrywood, The Tye, Kersey, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP7 6HB.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martin Crighton against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/03990.
 - The development proposed is the erection of detached garage/cartlodge and barn for storage of machinery.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The above description is taken from the refusal notice as most aptly describing the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed buildings on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, outside the defined settlement boundary of Kersey.

Reasons

4. Cherrywood is a detached bungalow within a substantial plot and forms part of a varied group of properties, some with outbuildings. The site is in an essentially rural area, outside any defined settlement, and there is open countryside immediately beyond its northern boundary.
5. Cherrywood already has two outbuildings associated with the dwelling house. The proposed development would add two larger, traditional, single-storey structures to the group, extending it substantially further away from the bungalow and into the open rear part of the site, thus intruding into the countryside. The cartlodge, illustrated as accommodating two cars and a tractor, would measure about 67sqm and the barn about 90sqm on plan, in excess of the scale of outbuildings typically associated with a relatively modest domestic dwelling such as Cherrywood.
6. Policy SP03 of the adopted Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan concerns the sustainable location of new development and, with some exceptions, resists built development outside settlements, recognising the importance of

- protecting the intrinsic character of the countryside, in line with national planning policy.
7. The exceptions to Policy SP03 include residential annexes or extensions but, notably, there is no policy covering additional outbuildings in rural areas, such as those proposed in this case.
 8. Whilst it is accepted law and practice that an extension does not need to be physically attached to its host dwelling, this appeal relates to outbuildings and not extended living accommodation. I consider the present proposals on their individual merits in any event.
 9. In doing so, I reach the conclusion that the proposed built development, due its scale and location, would have an unacceptably intrusive impact on the adjacent countryside, detrimental to its character and appearance, contrary to Local Plan Policy SP03 and national policy.
 10. I recognise that the appeal property and associated land extends over a substantial area and requires maintenance with the help of equipment which would the proposed buildings could accommodate. I also bear in mind that other local properties have outbuildings and find no fault with the individual design of those proposed in this case.
 11. In my judgement, however, these considerations fail to override the substantive planning objection on grounds of adverse impact on the countryside.
 12. I therefore conclude on balance that this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR