
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2025

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/W/25/3363636

Land At Summertime, Great Green, Thurston IP31 3SJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Sally Greenlees against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/00499.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1 self-build dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Sally Greenlees against Mid Suffolk District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal scheme relates to an outline proposal, with access to be considered at this stage, and with all other matters reserved for future consideration. I have considered the appeal accordingly. A Plan has been submitted as part of the appeal which indicates how a dwelling could be accommodated on the site. I have taken this plan into account for indicative purposes only.

Background and Main Issue

4. A Land Contamination Questionnaire was submitted as part of this appeal. Based on the information provided, the Council no longer have any concerns regarding contamination on the appeal site and have withdrawn their second reason for refusal.
5. As such, the main issue is whether the appeal site would be a suitable location for the proposed development, having regard to local policy.

Reasons

6. Great Green is made up of a group of sporadic residential and commercial development within the Countryside with large, open, verdant areas between the properties. The appeal site comprises an area of garden land, including a garage, to the west of Summertime with open countryside to the east.
7. Policy SP03 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan Part 1 (November 2023) (JLP) outlines how growth will be managed within the district, primarily focusing development within established settlement boundaries. However,

development outside of established settlement boundaries is supported by JLP Policy SP03 where a proposal is in accordance with other policies of the plan or relevant neighbourhood plan. The proposed dwellings would not be isolated; however, the appeal site is located outside of the defined settlement boundary of Thurston.

8. JLP Policy LP01 supports windfall infill housing development outside settlement boundaries where there are at least 10 well related dwellings, subject to certain criteria, including not being detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and usually being limited to only one or two dwellings. JLP Policy LP01 defines infill as the filling of a small undeveloped plot in an otherwise built-up highway frontage.
9. Whilst there are surrounding dwellings which could be considered well-related on plan, in this case, due to the large separation distances, areas of mature planting and sweeping bends within the highway, Summertime appears as a distinct and separate dwelling. As such, the appeal site does not comprise a small undeveloped plot within an otherwise built-up frontage. Consequently, the proposal would not meet the definition of infill and would consolidate the existing sporadic development at this edge of Great Green.
10. Policy 1 of the Thurston Neighbourhood Plan (October 2019) (TNP) seeks to focus development within the settlement boundary of Thurston Village, with support given to proposals for specialist housing on sites outside of the settlement boundary where it can be demonstrated that no available and deliverable site exists within the settlement boundary.
11. The proposal would contribute to the supply of self-build dwellings for which there is currently a shortfall. However, I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that there are no available and deliverable sites within the settlement boundary.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal site would not be a suitable location for the proposed development, having regard to local policy. It would conflict with Policies SP03 and LP01 of the JLP and Policy 1 of the TNP as set out above.

Other Matters

13. My attention has been drawn to several other recently approved schemes within Great Green. However, elements of their design, including their location and surrounding context are different from the case before me and every proposal must be considered on its own merit. Moreover, the existence of these recently approved developments does not justify the harm identified above.
14. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling. Whilst the Framework seeks to boost the supply of housing, the evidence indicates that the Council can provide for the required amount of housing in the area. As outlined above, the proposal would contribute one self-build dwelling within the district. Short term employment would be provided during the construction and in the long term the future occupiers would benefit the local economy and community by helping to sustain the vitality and viability of Thurston. That said the social and economic benefits of one additional dwelling would be limited and there is no indication that local services and facilities are in danger of closing. Overall, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

15. Consequently, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the provisions in the Framework and the benefits of the proposal, which indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR