

## Planning Statement

### Alterations to existing 2 outbuildings to form family annexe for dependant

The existing 2 outbuildings are immediately adjacent each other and lawful.

The proposal is to enable the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] to stay close, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] per NPPF 126.

The proposed modifications by linking them together and revised design, are not considered to be disproportionate additions, or make any material difference to character or appearance, street scene, or neighbouring amenities. It will thus comply with Plan policy and NPPF.

It is trite law<sup>2</sup> that there is no material change of use of dwellinghouse land by virtue of a family annexe or caravan, provided it remains a single planning unit (for planning unit assessment this is also trite law<sup>3</sup>). This is despite the annexe containing the facilities for day-to-day living [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] family in the main dwelling.

The well-established factors taken into account will exist i.e. there will be no intervening means of enclosure between the annexe and the main house, plus shared single tax/utilities/postal address.

The usual adjustment to standard model<sup>4</sup> condition to control ancillary use is sufficient and meets the 5 NPPG tests.

As the proposal is in accordance with the development plan, pursuant to s38(6) PCPA 2004, planning permission must be granted. This is copper bottomed by the proposal being sustainable as defined by NPPF.

---

<sup>1</sup> See attached [REDACTED]

<sup>2</sup> Uttlesford DC v SSE [1991] 2 PLR 76

<sup>3</sup> Burdle v SSE [1972] 1 WLR 1207

<sup>4</sup> annexe to Circular 11/95 model 47