



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/W/25/3369692

Ardley House, Lavenham Road, Great Waldingfield, Sudbury, CO10 0SF

- 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 P Edwards against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/01951.
 - The development proposed is retention of outbuilding/carport serving existing holiday accommodation units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of outbuilding/carport serving existing holiday accommodation units at Ardley House, Lavenham Road, Great Waldingfield, Sudbury, CO10 0SF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/25/01951, 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 drawings: Site Plan and drawing Nos. 2634-11A and 2634-12.
 - 3) Prior to development above slab level, a scheme of biodiversity enhancement measures shall be submitted to the local planning authority and have been approved in writing. The biodiversity enhancement measures shall include the following: a) detailed designs and/or product descriptions for biodiversity enhancements; and b) locations, orientations and heights of biodiversity enhancements on appropriate drawings. The approved measures shall then be implemented in full prior to first use of the building hereby approved and shall be retained thereafter.
 - 4) No external lighting shall be installed unless a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" in accordance with Guidance Note 08/23 (Institute of Lighting Professionals) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such strategy shall: a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to be caused disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through provision of appropriate lighting technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the these species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places. All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with

the specifications and locations set out in the scheme and maintained thereafter in accordance with the scheme. No other external lighting shall be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Preliminary matter

2. Reason 2 of the refusal notice concerned the need for a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. However, following the receipt of additional justification on ecological matters as part of this appeal, the council's ecologist has confirmed that a preliminary ecological appraisal is no longer considered necessary based on the types of fish present in the pond that have now been identified. The Council therefore no longer wishes to defend this reason for refusal as it has been resolved.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the setting of Ardley House, a non-designated heritage asset, and the open character of its setting.

Reasons

4. Ardley House is a detached two-storey farmhouse situated on the northern side of Lavenham Road, at its junction with The Street, within open countryside to the north of Great Waldingfield. To the rear of the farmhouse is a group of holiday accommodation units known as Ardley Cottages, beyond which lies a complex of agricultural buildings. The domestic grounds of Ardley House, located between the farmyard and the road, contain a Grade II listed crinkle-crankle wall.
5. Vehicle parking for the holiday accommodation units is located to the front of the farmhouse and comprises six spaces. An outbuilding/carport has been partially constructed - up to framing stage - in the south-eastern corner of the plot, sited forward of the main dwelling. The farmhouse is not listed but is identified in the Great Waldingfield Neighbourhood Plan as a 'Building of Local Significance', that is a non-designated heritage asset. The site adjoins, but is outside, the Great Waldingfield Conservation Area.
6. In terms of planning policy, the officer's report mainly refers to those policies that relate to locations for development, such as within defined settlement boundaries. Since the appeal proposal is for a service building connected with the existing development, these are not helpful. However, Policy GWD1 which permits development outside settlement boundaries where, as is relevant in this case, they would not have a detrimental impact on heritage and landscape designations.
7. An important material consideration is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, at paragraph 203, states "*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset*".
8. Ardley House is indeed a substantial and attractive building not untypical of houses in the countryside of the mid-19c, deserving of its non-designated heritage asset status. When travelling from the north-east, along B1115, roadside vegetation and trees on the boundary of the site largely obscure any view of Ardley House until beyond the northern boundary. In the other direction, the situation is similar, with roadside hedges allowing only glimpses until almost abreast of the house. Opposite

the south-east corner of the curtilage of Ardley House is the junction of the B1115 with The Street, from which a good view of the front of the house is available. However, generally the house is not prominent in most views until in close proximity.

9. At the time of my site visit, the partially erected outbuilding/carport was a skeleton consisting of the major members of the structural framework. Therefore, it did not have the visual presence that the completed building would have. However, it did provide me with a precise understanding of its location in relation to the house and the general site.
10. For the reasons that I have given in paragraph 6 above, Ardley House is not a feature that will be appreciated by most occupants of passing cars, and the proposed cartlodge type building would be of little significance. Its siting to one side but in front of the house would be unusual in this area, although perhaps quite common on a rural road with linear development. Nevertheless, a cartlodge structure is not one that would be entirely alien in this location. The fact that its materials do not reflect those of the house - traditional Suffolk white brick, means that it would not stand out in the streetscene. Rather, the natural timber weatherboarding proposed would tend to diminish its impact and on the house itself.
11. From my appraisal at the site visit, I came to the conclusion, as a balanced judgement, that the harm to this non-designated heritage asset would not amount to 'less than substantial'. Certainly, if there were an obvious viable alternative location for a cartlodge on the site, that would be a reason to resist the appeal proposal, but it is accepted that there is not an alternative that could be argued for.
12. There is a feature on the site that is listed, as mentioned in paragraph 4 above. This is in the domestic grounds of Ardley House, located between the farmyard and the road: the Grade II listed crinkle-crankle wall. However, I mention this just to reaffirm that the proposed cartlodge is at a sufficient distance that the appeal proposal would not be harmful to its significance. Nor would it be harmful to the character or appearance of the Great Waldingfield Conservation Area.
13. The cartlodge, with an electric vehicle charging point, secure cycle storage and a covered bin area will improve and enhance the holiday accommodation facilities at the site that it would serve. Whilst these factors would not be sufficient to justify any material harm to the heritage asset, these improvements, especially the electric vehicle charging point, would make the holiday accommodation more attractive to a wider number of potential guests while at the same time making the development more sustainable by helping to reduce carbon emissions. These factors stand in favour of the proposed development.
14. In light of these conclusions, the appeal will be allowed.

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. I consider that the conditions, with minor amendments, should be imposed for the following reasons: condition 2 is required for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted; condition 3 is in the interests

of enhancing biodiversity on site; condition 4 is to allow for the discharge of duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR