



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **H Marriott MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/W/25/3373903

7 Gelding Mews, Ipswich, Sproughton, Suffolk IP8 3FT

- 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 Miss Thorney Carpenter against the decision of Babergh District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/25/02703.
- The development proposed is described as 'the proposal is to change the use of a garden room to run a small-scale home based beauty business'.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of an outbuilding to be used as a small-scale beauty business and relocation of the southern fence to the boundary line at 7 Gelding Mews, Ipswich, Sproughton, Suffolk IP8 3FT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/25/02703, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings labelled Location Plan, Site Plan at a scale of 1:200, Proposed Floor Plan at a scale of 1:50 and Elevations at a scale of 1:50.
 - 3) The use hereby permitted shall only take place between the following hours:
09:00 – 20:00 Mondays - Fridays
09:00 – 16:00 Saturdays
There shall be no working on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
 - 4) The outbuilding hereby approved shall only be used as a beauty salon and/or for purposes incidental to the residential use of 7 Gelding Mews, Ipswich, Sproughton, Suffolk IP8 3FT.
 - 5) The height, design, materials and alignment of the relocated fence hereby permitted shall match those of the existing southern boundary fence of the adjoining property.

Preliminary Matter

2. The evidence before me indicates that planning permission for the erection of a garden room was granted by the Council¹ (the previous permission). However, I observed during my site visit that this has not yet been implemented. On this basis, the Council's description which reflects that used on the appellant statement, more accurately reflects the appeal proposal. I have therefore used this revised description in the decision above.

¹ Council ref: DC/25/00733

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to noise and disturbance and the provision of parking in the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling (No 7) is located at the end of Gelding Mews, a cul-de-sac off Vale View Road, in a predominantly residential area. It is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, with its principal elevation facing towards a public footpath. Parking is provided to one side with a garden to the other, enclosed by close-boarded fencing.
5. The appeal proposal relates to an outbuilding within the garden to be used for a small-scale beauty business. Pedestrian access would be via a side gate adjacent to the footpath. The outbuilding would be sited alongside a repositioned boundary fence, close to the shared garden boundaries with 5 Gelding Mews (No 5) and 49 Vale View Road (No 49).
6. The application form proposed the hours of operation as 09:00 – 20:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00 – 16:00 on Saturdays. The appellants statement suggests they would be willing to reduce the hours of operation to 09:00 – 17:00 Tuesday - Friday and 09:00-13:00 on Saturdays, in order to mitigate the Council's concerns. The Council estimate that there could be 8 clients and 16 movements in and out of the site per day based on the longer hours of operation. Precise numbers would however vary in frequency depending on customer demand, the length of treatment and the availability of the appellant.
7. Even though the proposed use would result in additional comings and goings associated with client visits, the modest size of the outbuilding would be self-limiting. Therefore, it is unlikely that more than two people would be present in the outbuilding at any one time. Given the short distance between the garden gate and outbuilding, any external activity would be brief and at a low volume. The nature of the beauty treatments proposed are not inherently noisy, and the Council's Environmental Health Officer raises no objection. Overall, even with the longer opening hours, the activity would be unlikely to be materially more noticeable than the existing use of No 7, or the use of the garden building subject of the previous permission. For the same reasons, the proposal would not materially alter the residential character of the area.
8. While the number of vehicles associated with No 7 and the availability of visitor spaces cannot be controlled, similar circumstances would apply to visitors to the dwelling in any event. The appellant advises that No 7 benefits from two allocated parking spaces and that clients would be advised to utilise these spaces. Even if there are times when these spaces are not available, I observed on my site visit that Vale View Road contains a number of on-street parking spaces, including visitor parking bays, that could be utilised on occasion. Customers living locally may also choose to walk. It is acknowledged that the wider estate has been constructed to precise parking standards. However, given my findings in relation to likely activity levels, I am not persuaded that the proposal would give rise to undue parking pressure or harm to local parking conditions.

9. While the Council raise concerns within its statement regarding the loss of outdoor space and outdoor cycle storage, the evidence before me indicates that the existing permission would result in a similar loss. Furthermore, there is no reason why the outbuilding could not be utilised by the appellant for domestic purposes should the need arise, for example for cycle or other domestic storage purposes.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to noise and disturbance and the provision of parking in the area. In this regard, it would comply with policies SP09, LP09, LP24 and LP29 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan – Part 1 (2023) (LP) and policies SPTN 05 and SPTN 15 of the Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2037 (2023) which require proposals to safeguard existing character, demonstrate safe and suitable access, support the local environment, reflects local characteristics, supports new business development within the settlement boundaries and supports the change of use to small scale employment within a residential curtilage where this does not give rise to significant adverse impacts on health, quality of life or local amenity.
11. For the same reasons, even though the proposal is for a small-scale home based-business, it would comply with the support given in the Framework for economic growth and the provision of conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. I find no specific conflict with the specific paragraphs of the Framework referred to in the Council's decision.
12. The Council's decision additionally refers to Policy LP23 of the LP. However, this policy relates to sustainable construction and design and does not appear directly relevant to the Council's reasons for refusal nor does it alter my own conclusion.

Conditions

13. Various conditions have been suggested by the Council in the event the appeal is allowed. I have considered these against the tests set out in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance, amending the wording where necessary to ensure precision.
14. In addition to the standard time condition (1), I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans (2) in the interests of certainty. Conditions restricting use of the outbuilding (3) and limiting the hours of operation in line with those specified in the application form (4) are reasonable and necessary to protect the living conditions of nearby residents.
15. Similar to the previous permission, the appeal proposal includes the relocation of the boundary fence. A condition imposed on the previous permission requires further details of the fence to be submitted and approved by the Council. However, the appellant has confirmed that the relocated close boarded fence would be 1.8 metres high to match and align with the neighbouring fence along the south boundary of the site. While the approval of further details in advance is therefore unnecessary, Condition (5) is reasonable in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.
16. I have carefully considered the Council's and other interest party suggested conditions requiring a business management plan, restriction on delivery times, booking of appointments, parking management, signage, limitations on client

numbers and mechanical plant. However, in light of my findings above, such conditions are not reasonable or necessary.

17. The Council has suggested a condition requiring biodiversity enhancement measures in line with the previous permission and Policies LP16 and SP09. However, the nature and extent of the enhancements sought has not been specified. In the absence of this detail, I am not satisfied that such a condition would meet the tests of precision, enforceability or reasonableness, nor that it would be achievable or commensurate to the scale of the development.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

H Marriott

INSPECTOR