



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/25/3359390

Annexe at Redenhall House, Bungay Road, Redenhall, Harleston, IP20 9QW

- 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 Frank and Mrs Jane Wolski against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2006/H.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to existing annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to existing annexe at Redenhall House, Bungay Road, Redenhall, Harleston, IP20 9QW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/2006/H, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, drawings Nos. 1090-00 and 1090-02.
 - 4) The living accommodation hereby approved shall be ancillary to the use of the main dwelling and shall not be occupied as a separate and unassociated unit of accommodation.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are: i) the effect of the proposed extension on the main dwelling; ii) whether the annexe as extended would amount to a separate dwelling.

Reasons

3. Redenhall House is positioned centrally within a generous plot of approximately 2.1 Hectares (5.2 Acres) and is a substantial, detached property of traditional design. The site is bordered by mature hedgerows, trees and open fields. The grounds include landscaped gardens and an in-out driveway off Bungay Road, providing adequate access and parking. The existing detached annexe is located in a forward position relative to the main house.

4. The appeal site is located adjacent to the curtilage of Redenhall Rectory, a grade II listed house. In my opinion the appeal proposal does not affect the setting of this listed building.

The effect of the proposed extension on the main dwelling

5. The appeal building is already an annexe to Redenhall House. As it stands, the annexe has a kitchen/living room, a bedroom, bathroom/wc, and 2 other rooms, one of which is an office. As I saw at my site visit, the accommodation is relatively cramped. Nevertheless, in its present form, it would be possible to use it as a separate residence, subject to any restriction that currently exists.
6. As background, I am told, that the annexe has previously served as an Air B&B and ancillary accommodation. I am also told that the appellants plan to occupy the annexe, as their son resides in the main house with his family, and that the property was chosen as an alternative to buying 2 separate houses. I am also told that the appellants will help with their son's family needs, and that, even with the size of main house, there is no available storage or spare rooms. The appeal proposal is for a new bedroom as an addition to the annexe.
7. It is also explained that a further need that the proposal seeks to meet is in relation to the appellant's (Mr Frank Wolski) brother who requires disabled access facilities, and the enlarged annexe would significantly increase the ability for him to stay. These are personal circumstances and normally carry relatively minor weight in the planning balance, but it appears to me that this sort of family arrangement is likely to be faced more frequently in the future.
8. The proposed extension would occupy an area that at present does not add any particular amenity to the residential curtilage. It would not detract from the appearance of Redenhall House due to the degree of separation and its assimilation into the annexe.

Whether the annexe as extended would amount to a separate dwelling.

9. As I have already noted, the annexe as it exists would be capable of serving as a separate residence, since all the requirements for day to day living currently exist. It is also the case that the in-out semi-circular driveway could enable 2 properties to be served. However, it is unlikely that the owner of Redenhall House would want an entirely separately owned dwelling in the front garden, irrespective of any condition or other control that would resist it.
10. Thus, the reality is that the annexe in its present form could be separated – I am not told of any current restriction in place, and therefore that possibility is not a strong reason for rejecting the current proposal. Indeed, this approval of the proposal, with the obvious restrictive condition, would bring control to the authority that does not currently exist.

Overall conclusions

11. The present situation is that the annexe in its present form could be used as a separate dwelling, and there is no restriction to prevent this. In fact it appears that it has been used as an Air B&B, with such use having little connection with the use of the main house. The grant of the appeal proposal would enable a restrictive condition to be imposed which would prevent the annexe being separated as a dwelling unconnected to Redenhall House. As I have already remarked, it seems

to me that the owner of a substantial residence such as Redenhall House would be unlikely to want an entirely separately owned dwelling in his/her front garden.

12. As to the personal circumstances that partly underlie the proposal, there is a generally aging population with a proportion with disability that means that a market demand for the combination of host dwelling and separate but ancillary accommodation will exist. This means that when the current personal circumstances cease to exist, it is likely that there would be a ready market for the host dwelling and its annexed accommodation.
13. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not erode the significance of the main dwelling to any greater effect than the existing annexe. Furthermore, the annexe as extended would not amount to a separate dwelling any more than the annexe as it exists. In fact, the permission would provide the opportunity to impose a condition which would require the future use to be tied to the host dwelling. It is clear that the appellants accept that such a condition would be applied.
14. In view of these conclusions, I will allow the appeal.

Conditions

15. The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. In addition, the council has suggested a number of conditions in the event that the appeal is upheld. I have considered these in the light of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). For clarity and to ensure compliance with the PPG, I have amended some of the text.
16. I consider that the conditions should be imposed for the following reasons: condition 2 is to ensure that the appearance of the development permitted integrates with the existing in a visually satisfactory manner; condition 3 is required for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted; and condition 4 is required to enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development which has been permitted where the occupation of the annexe as a separate dwelling from the main dwelling would be in conflict with settlement policy.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR