



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/W/25/3371990

Aspasia, High Street, Stansfield, Suffolk CO10 8LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Cutts against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/1019/P1CAA.
 - The development proposed is to convert an existing bungalow into a two-storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Subject to limitations and conditions, Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO) grants planning permission for the enlargement of a dwelling through the construction of additional storeys.
3. The proposal seeks an additional storey to the existing single-storey dwelling house. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is whether the development would accord with the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is at the end of a row of detached dwellings on the eastern side of Upper Street and lies within the rural area. The appeal property is a mid-20th century, detached, single-storey, three-bedroom dwelling of simple design with a cream-rendered exterior. The pitched, gable roof has a rectangular form.
5. There is a recessed section at the centre of the front elevation which includes a bedroom window and a deep-set front door. The recess is an unassuming architectural feature providing shelter around the entrance. Nonetheless, the building's footprint is not rectangular but has a stepped front elevation.
6. For existing dwellinghouses comprising one storey, Class AA(b) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the GPDO permits one additional storey immediately above the topmost storey of the dwellinghouse, together with any engineering operations reasonably necessary for the purpose of that construction.
7. The proposed first-floor storey would accommodate bedrooms, bathroom, and en-suite facilities, and the ground floor would be used as an open-plan living area. The additional storey would sit atop the existing ground floor storey at the rear and side elevations. However, the proposed storey would have a rectangular form that

would not follow the stepped arrangement of the front elevation. Rather, the additional storey would be above the inset section of the front elevation.

8. The submitted plans show works to the ground floor storey, with the recessed section infilled and the front door brought forward in line with the main front elevation. This would create a flat front elevation across both storeys.
9. As set out in their statement, the appellant has chosen to include the additional external walling and re-sited front door in the interests of achieving a visually cohesive and attractive front elevation. Therefore, the infilling of the recessed section is for aesthetic reasons and would not comprise an engineering operation reasonably necessary for construction of the additional storey.
10. Since the ground floor works are not necessitated by the proposed additional storey, they are outside the scope of Class AA. I cannot grant approval for works which fall outside the remit of the prior approval procedure.
11. The appellant asserts that infilling the inset section would not extend beyond the principal elevation and could be carried out under other permitted development rights. However, being outside the scope of the prior approval application, I have no mechanism to ensure the ground floor works would be carried out.
12. GPDO Part 1 paragraph AA.1(i) provides further guidance on the siting of additional storeys and expressly states that development is not permitted if any storey is constructed other than on the principal part of the dwelling house. If I were to disregard the proposed ground floor works on the basis of being outside the scope of the prior approval procedure, the additional storey would project over the ground floor void and would thus exceed the principal part of the dwelling.
13. For these reasons, I must conclude the proposal would not be immediately above the topmost storey of the dwellinghouse and would therefore fail to comply with Class AA(b) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the GPDO, and the proposal would not be permitted development.
14. Paragraph AA.3 to Part 1 of the GPDO requires the decision-maker establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions specified in paragraphs AA.1 and AA.2. However, since the proposal would not comprise permitted development, in my decision it is not necessary to consider the conditions, limitations and restrictions imposed by Class AA.
15. For the avoidance of doubt, my conclusions do not relate to the planning merits of the scheme and should not fetter the judgement of any future decision-maker. Rather, I have assessed the proposal to ascertain whether it would fall within the rights afforded by the GPDO and have found that it would not. Consequently, the proposal would not be permitted development.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR