

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2026

by **A Hickey MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/W/25/3373038**

**Nerries Farm, Norwich Road, Kennet, Suffolk**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
  - The appeal is made by Mr Brian Rutterford against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00497/ARN.
  - The development proposed is conversion of one building into two dwellings.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the site address above from the decision notice as it more accurately describes the site location.

### Background and Main Issue

3. As the appeal proposal relates to a prior approval notification made under 'the GPDO, development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') can be considered relevant, but only insofar as they relate to the development and prior approval matters. I have proceeded on this basis.
4. In accordance with transitional arrangements, the appeal proposal will use the permitted development right under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO as it stood prior to 21 May 2024, and I have determined the appeal on that basis. The local authority found the proposed development to constitute permitted development under Class Q, subject to the prior approval of certain matters in Paragraph Q.2 and I have no basis to conclude otherwise.
5. Having regard to the requirements of paragraph Q.2(1)(e), the main issue is whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellings).

### Reasons

6. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that impractical or undesirable are not defined in the regulations, and an authority should apply a reasonable ordinary dictionary meaning in making a judgment. Impractical reflects that the location and

siting would “not be sensible or realistic”, and undesirable reflects that it would be “harmful or objectionable”<sup>1</sup>.

7. The appeal site comprises an isolated agricultural building with an L-shaped curtilage. It lies in close proximity to the A14, a busy dual carriageway separated from the site by a planted embankment. Railway lines are located a short distance to the south. The proposal is to convert the building into two dwellings.
8. A Noise Impact Assessment<sup>2</sup> identifies that sound affecting the building is predominantly derived from transport sources, namely the A14 to the north and the railway line to the south, affecting all façades. During my site visit, noise from both sources was clearly audible.
9. To mitigate the identified noise sources, windows and doors would need to be kept closed. Mitigation would include windows of enhanced laminate glass types and mechanical supply ventilation.
10. In my view, future occupiers would be harmed as a result of them being unable, or potentially unwilling, to open windows as a result of experiencing relatively high levels of noise and disturbance, which would also be present at night. Moreover, I find that reliance on mechanical ventilation to obtain fresh air, rather than opening a window, would not be a desirable choice for future occupiers.
11. Additionally, future occupiers would have no dedicated private amenity space, which would be a reasonable expectation in this location. Even if future occupiers choose to use the external space outside, this would not provide satisfactory living standards, as it would be a shared space for vehicular parking/turning and subject to unacceptable noise impacts from the A14.
12. The appellant refers to other dwellings located adjacent to dual carriageways, including examples along Snailwell Road. However, I do not have full details of those developments, and in any event, each proposal must be assessed on its site-specific circumstances. The presence of other dwellings close to dual carriageways does not outweigh the identified harm in this case.
13. Whole house ventilation mitigation may be acceptable in certain circumstances, such as high-rise locations. However, it is not adequately justified for the purposes of the appeal proposal. Therefore, the proposal would fail to provide a suitable standard of living conditions for future occupants in respect of noise exposure. It therefore conflicts with the Framework which states that planning decisions should ensure a high standard of amenity for future users,
14. Consequently, I conclude that the location and siting of the building make it otherwise impractical and undesirable to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses). As such, the proposal would fail to satisfy the condition at paragraph Q.2(1)(e) of the GPDO.

## Other Matters

15. The acceptability of other matters subject to prior approval under Class Q does not overcome the failure to satisfy paragraph Q.2(1)(e).

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph: 109 Reference ID: 13-109-20150305

<sup>2</sup> Noise Impact Assessment TECHNICAL REPORT 42599-R1 prepared by soundsolution consultants

## **Conclusion**

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

*A Hickey*

INSPECTOR

