
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/D/25/3370516

Bonnetts Cottage, Attleton Green, Wickhambrook, Suffolk, CB8 8YA

- 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 Claydon against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/0528/HH.
 - The development proposed is a cart-lodge style extension with enclosed balcony from first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Bonnetts Cottage is a modest detached two storey cottage located in the small settlement of Wickhambrook. It is set back from the road behind a paved frontage but is clearly visible from the street. The evidence sets out that it was an historic building with a central lobby entrance, slate roof and rendered walls but that it has been extended and altered. In particular, it has a two storey side extension which is set back slightly from the frontage of the original dwelling and has a ridge height that is below the main ridge. This houses a double garage at ground floor with habitable accommodation above, illuminated by a semi-dormer to the front. Despite its width, this extension is generally in keeping with the original cottage which, from the front, maintains much of original simple character.
4. The proposed extension would project forward from the existing side extension. It would occupy the entire width of the extension and would project forward by about the same distance. It would have a timber framed construction with a solid, mainly flat roof with a pitched edge, rising to a balustrade around the proposed balcony. The balcony would be accessed by altering the existing window to provide a door from the first floor. Although single storey, the balustrade would finish just below the first floor eave. The open area beneath the extension would be used for vehicle parking and storage.
5. The proposed extension would be clearly visible from the highway and would obscure much of the façade of the existing side extension. It would project noticeably forward of the dwelling and the proposed balustrade would increase the

impression of height. The design, including the materials, would appear incongruous in the context of the original rendered cottage. Overall, it would be a significant, prominent and inharmonious addition to the modest host cottage that would materially detract from its original simple character and appearance.

6. The appellant suggests that the extension would be subservient in scale and massing to the host dwelling but I find that its position, width and forward projection would make it a visually dominant addition that would obscure and draw attention away from the host cottage. Its position, on the open frontage and in full view of the street would add to its detrimental effect since, notwithstanding the variety of architectural styles seen nearby, it would be out of keeping with neighbouring dwellings and appear alien in the street scene.
7. The appellant suggests that the materials and design would be in keeping with rural building styles and the locality and that similar extensions have been permitted nearby. However, whilst large open sided cart-lodge style timber framed structures may be associated with rural areas, these are rarely seen as front extensions but more often as detached outbuildings, which have a different character and limited effect on the host dwelling. Moreover, I did not see any similar extensions on dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site.
8. In consequence, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed cart-lodge style extension with enclosed balcony would result in a prominent and incongruous addition to Bonnetts Cottage that would materially detract from its character and appearance and that of the street scene. It would therefore conflict with Policies SP4, LP9 and LP17 of the West Suffolk Local Plan 2024-2041, adopted 2025. Taken together and amongst other things, these expect extensions to dwellings to be designed, based on an analysis of existing buildings, such that they respect the character, scale and design of the host dwelling and create or contribute to a high quality environment, including the historic environment and the immediately surrounding area.
9. Notwithstanding my conclusions on the main issue, I agree with the Council that, owing to the distance and visual separation between the two, the proposed extension would have no material effect on the setting of nearby Westlea Cottage which lies to the south of the appeal site and is a Grade II Listed Building.
10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR