

Appendix A – Summary of Appeal Decisions.

During the current period (1 September 2025 and 27 November 2025), the following appeal decisions have been received. The full reports are available on the Council's website using the unique application reference.

The appeal decisions summarised in this appendix are categorised and set out in the following sections (click on a bullet point to jump to that section):

1. [Appeals against Refusal of applications for Planning Permission for 'Major' developments](#)
2. [Appeals against Refusal of applications for Planning Permission for 'Minor' developments](#)
3. [Appeals against Refusal of applications for Planning Permission for 'Other' developments](#)
4. [Appeals against conditions on a Planning Permissions](#)
5. [Appeals against the refusal of Variation or Removal of Conditions](#)
6. [Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. Householder rear or upwards extensions\)](#)
7. [Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. changes of use with and without physical works\)](#)
8. [Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. agricultural works\)](#)
9. [Appeals relating to applications for Advertisement Consent](#)
10. [Appeals relating to applications for Listed Building Consent](#)
11. [Applications relating to Certificates of Lawfulness](#)

[Link back to contents list on first page of this appendix](#)

12. [Applications for Permission In Principle \(PIP\)](#)
13. [Applications relating to Enforcement Notices](#)
14. [Appeals against High Hedge Notices](#)
15. [Appeals against Community Infrastructure Levy \(CIL\) Decisions](#)
16. [Applications for the award of costs](#)

Within each section the appeal decisions are listed in date order based upon the date of the appeal decision issued by the Planning Inspectorate.

Appeals against Refusal of applications for Planning Permission for 'Major' development

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

Appeals against Refusal of applications for Planning Permission for ‘Minor’ development

This section relates to appeals against the refusal of Planning Permission for ‘Minor’ developments, that is applications for up to 9 dwellings, up to 1,000sqm of floorspace, site area less than 1ha.

Application number	DC/24/3806/FUL
Appeal number	APP/X3540/W/25/3366924
Site	Holly Tree Farmhouse, Bell Green, Cratfield, Suffolk, IP19 0DN
Description of development	Construction of Agricultural Storage Building and all associated works.
Committee / delegated	Delegated

ESC Decision Date	18 December 2024
Appeal decision date	10 October 2025
Appeal decision	Dismissed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations

Main issues

- Introduction of new information
- Need for Building
- Impact on Heritage & Character

Summary of decision:

- **New information** - A business plan was introduced within the appeal including different uses in addition to the agricultural storage use initially applied for. The inspector confirmed that the appeal was being considered based on the original proposal applied for.
- **Need for Building** – The inspector agreed that hay cutting occurs on site and that the existing building was inadequate and there was therefore a reasonable need for the building for hay storage. The proposal complies with Policy SCLP4.5.
- **Impact on Heritage & Character** – Farmhouse is Grade II listed; historic farmstead setting. The proposed building is large, utilitarian, prominent in undeveloped field. Conflicts with historic clustered layout. Harm assessed as “less than substantial” under NPPF. Benefits: modest (construction jobs, potential diversification). Would not outweigh heritage harm.

Learning point / actions:

It did not appear that there was a need for a building of this nature/scale, it is difficult to argue that it is not necessary for the purposes of agriculture. The Inspector did agree with our concerns relating to the siting of the building so although it was deemed necessary, within any future application the building will need to be better located to avoid heritage/landscape impact.

Application number	DC/24/3595/FUL
Appeal number	APP/X3540/W/25/3360615
Site	Lowestoft Lifeboat Crew Association, Links Road, Lowestoft, NR32 4PQ
Description of development	Demolition of an existing single storey building previously used as Lowestoft RNLI Lifeboat Crew Association social club. This is to be replaced with a new build detached private dwelling.
Committee / delegated	Delegated

ESC Decision Date	17 October 2024
Appeal decision date	31 October 2025
Appeal decision	Dismissed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations

Main issues

- Whether the site represents an appropriate location for the proposed development; and
- The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Summary of decision:

The Inspector concluded that:

- The appeal site does not comprise an existing gap between built development and does not contribute to a continuous built frontage and is broadly concealed from views from the road by the existing landscaping. The development would not constitute the infilling of a clearly identifiable gap in a built-up frontage. It would introduce a discordant built form to the locality that would not be reflective of the pattern of development within the surrounding built up area, contrary to policies WLP1.1, WLP1.2, WLP7.1 and WLP8.7 of the LP which seek to ensure appropriate development within the Countryside.
- The introduction of development in this location, would lead to an intrusion into the countryside, failing to recognise the intrinsic coastal character of the countryside, in conflict with policies WLP8.29 and WLP8.35.
- The Inspector concluded that the site is previously development land, but previous permissions on the site for commercial and tourist development pre-date current Development Plan policies and only attract limited weight.
- The Inspector attached limited weight to the provision of a self-build dwelling, as there was no evidence supplied by the appellant to demonstrate they are on Council's Self-Build Register, or how the proposal would meet the definition of self-build/custom housebuilding. Of importance, no mechanism was identified to secure such a form of housing.

- The Inspector attributed moderate weight to the delivery of housing in this instance, having regard to its conflict with the policies of the framework in respect of character and setting (paragraph 129d) and failing to integrate with local character and landscape setting (135a; 135c).

Learning point / actions:

The importance of securing high quality design appropriate to the landscape setting. The limited weight afforded to the provision of a self-build dwelling and only moderate weight to housing delivery, in spite of the lack of 5 year housing land supply.

Appeals against Refusal of applications for Planning Permission for 'Other' developments

This section relates to appeals against the refusal of Planning Permission for 'Other' developments, that is applications for changes of use with no physical works and/or householder applications_

Application number DC/25/1902/FUL
Appeal number APP/X3540/D/25/3372685
Site Swiss Cottage, Aldeburgh Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe, Suffolk, IP16 4QH
Description of development Proposed double garage and small workshop
Committee / delegated Delegated

ESC Decision Date 14 August 2025
Appeal decision date 16 October 2025
Appeal decision Dismissed
Appeal Procedure Written Representations

Main issues

The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Summary of decision:

- The proposed building is large and would be visually out of place detracting from the character and appearance of the street scene.
- Whilst screening vegetation would soften what is proposed, this factor is insufficient to overcome the harmful effects.
- The examples given by the appellant do not establish a binding precedent, nor define the prevailing character and appearance of the street scene in this particular location.

Learning point / actions:

This decision confirmed our assessment and application of policy SCLP11.1.

Application number	DC/25/1285/FUL
Appeal number	APP/X3540/D/25/3368269
Site	13 Manor Gardens, Saxmundham, Suffolk, IP17 1ET
Description of development	Two-storey extension on the north west side of the property, within the internal corner of the current 'L' shaped dwelling footprint. Raise the first-floor wall height under the existing lower height mono-pitched roof area, after removing the roof, in order to construct a twin, dual pitched, hip-ended roof structure to span the area including the area of the two-storey extension created above. Install insulation within the roof space and two banks of solar P.V. panels on the south south east roof slopes for energy self-sufficiency. As a result of the works, the extra space created plus the existing space, will be configured as detailed on drawing 601-02
Committee / delegated	Delegated
ESC Decision Date	19 May 2025
Appeal decision date	16 October 2025
Appeal decision	Dismissed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations

Main issues

The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Summary of decision:

- Inspector found that the proposed bulky hipped roof extension would overwhelm and spoil the currently well-proportioned form of the current 1960s houses. Due to the location of the dwelling, the extension would be prominent within the area.
- Despite matching materials, the scale, massing and proportions of the proposed extension would detract from the character and appearance of the existing house and that of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy SCLP11.1 and NP Policy SAX1.
- The inspector noted that whilst the proposed extension provides space for insulation and the optimal roof orientation for solar panels, they were not persuaded that this could not be achieved by alterations that preserved the character of the building.
- The harm to the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area would not be outweighed by the energy efficiency of the scheme.

Learning point / actions:

- The decision gives confidence to refuse overly large extensions which fail to preserve the character of the original property.
- Highlights that the benefits of low-carbon and renewable energy provision do not override the harm caused by poor design.

Application number	DC/25/0756/FUL
Appeal number	APP/X3540/W/25/3365102 (there is a related decision in Applications for the award of costs)
Site	Barsham Rigg, Bungay Road, Barsham, Suffolk NR34 8HE
Description of development	Annex Building
Committee / delegated	N/A (appeal against non-determination)
ESC Decision Date	N/A (appeal against non-determination)
Appeal decision date	11 November 2025
Appeal decision	Dismissed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations
Main issues	

Whether or not the annex would be suitably subordinate and well-related to the dwelling and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, site and area

Summary of decision:

- The inspector considered that there was limited weight for a detached outbuilding under permitted development rights at Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). The annex would provide primary living accommodation and therefore would not comply with the restriction that such a building is for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse.
- It was acknowledged by the inspector that the annex is intended to provide accessible accommodation with provision for live-in care for an older person. The NPPF highlights the importance of providing housing for those with specific needs including older people. It was also acknowledged that dismissing the appeal could result in uncertainty and delay around accommodation and care arrangements which would be detrimental to the occupier. Therefore, in this context the provision of an annex would be an important benefit. The inspector also noted the requirements under the Public Sector Equality Duty (the PSED) and Human Rights Act 1998. However, they concluded that there was no substantive evidence to show that the annex was the only realistic means by which these needs could be met.
- The proposal would not be suitably subordinate and well-related to the dwelling. There would be harm to the character and appearance to the host dwelling, site and area which results in conflict with the development plan.

- Although the proposal would be beneficial in providing accessible accommodation for an older person enabling family support and care, the submitted evidence does not demonstrate that this would be dependent on development of the scale and design proposed. These are key aspects contributing to the identified harm. While the inspector was sympathetic to the appellants' personal circumstances, this matter was considered to carry moderate weight and would not outweigh the harm.

Learning point / actions:

- The appeal decision highlights that the benefits of the provision of accessible accommodation, does not outweigh harm caused through the scale of an annex or its relationship with the host dwelling.
- This decision is also useful for appeals where infringements upon the Public Sector Equality Duty or Human Rights Act are referenced by the appellant in their statement of case. The appeal decision sets out that while there could be adverse effects on those with protected characteristics and interference with rights under the Human Rights Act, these are mitigated by the possibility of an alternative, less harmful scheme.

[Appeals against conditions included on a Planning Permissions](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

Appeals against the refusal of Variation or Removal of Conditions

Application number	DC/25/1051/VOC
Appeal number	APP/X3540/D/25/3371948
Site	Pike Cottage, The Street, Letheringham, Suffolk IP13 7QZ
Description of development	Variation of Condition No. 2 of DC/20/3495/FUL - Remove existing shed and erect two bay cart lodge and store - Conditions(s) Removal: Because a mistake was made in the height see statement. We wish the condition to be reworded by the submitted drawing number 25-19-100-B
Committee / delegated	Committee

ESC Decision Date	30 June 2025
Appeal decision date	13 November 2025
Appeal decision	Allowed with conditions
Appeal Procedure	Fast Track

Main issues

The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Summary of decision:

The inspector concluded once complete, the changes to the design would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore accords with Policies SCLP10.4 and SCLP11.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020, which collectively require that proposals are of a high-quality design that respects local character and responds to the scale and form of surrounding buildings and preserve the special qualities of the area.

Learning point / actions:

Although the committee decided to refuse the application contrary to the recommendation of officers, the application was refused on design grounds which is fundamentally a subjective matter and therefore the only learning point is whether minor changes to something acceptable would significantly harm the character and appearance of an area.

[Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. Householder rear or upwards extensions\)](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. changes of use with and without physical works\)](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. agricultural works\)](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 14 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. agricultural works\)](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Appeals relating to Prior Notification Applications under Part 20 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 \(as amended\) \(i.e. agricultural works\)](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Link back to contents list on first page of this appendix](#)

[Appeals relating to applications for Advertisement Consent \(i.e. signs/advertisements requiring consent under the Advertisement Regulations 2007 \(as amended\)\)](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Appeals relating to applications for Listed Building Consent](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Applications relating to Certificates of Lawfulness](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Applications for Permission In Principle \(PIP\)](#)

Application number	DC/25/1756/PIP
Appeal number	APP/X3540/W/25/3370762 (there is a related decision in Applications for the award of costs)
Site	Land to North of Lowood Lodge, Hasketon Road, Burgh, Woodbridge, IP13 6JL
Description of development	Erection of 1no. detached dwelling and garage (self-build), creation of new access on to Hasketon Road/Mill Lane and stopping up of existing access
Committee / delegated	Delegated

ESC Decision Date	30 June 2025
Appeal decision date	11 November 2025
Appeal decision	Dismissed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations

Main issues

The main issues are whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, land use and the amount of development proposed, with particular consideration to:

- the effect of the proposal on the integrity of European Sites; and
- the Council's spatial strategy and the site's location in the countryside.

Summary of decision:

The Inspector notes that the RAMS payment cannot be secured by Planning Obligation or Planning Condition. Although they did note that there is no legal reason why an alternative obligation could not be entered into at any time to secure the RAMS payment; they note that the S111 form refers to planning permission but note that there could be another way to provide an upfront payment for this purpose.

Nonetheless, the Inspector found that, in the absence of an effective mechanism through which the payment of the RAMS tariff could be secured and without any alternatives, the proposal would have a likely significant adverse effect on the integrity of the European Sites. Therefore, the proposal constitutes habitats development which is exempted from permission in principle under Article 5B(1) of the Order, and permission in principle cannot be granted.

The Inspector also found the proposal to be contrary to policy SCLP5.4 (b) and (c). Noting that *"the development would therefore extend beyond the land and landscape features that otherwise form a defined boundary to the existing cluster into the open and undeveloped land of which the appeal site is apart, resulting in a harmful intrusion into the surrounding landscape."*

Learning point / actions:

The Inspector upheld the council's reasons for refusal. However, their observations regarding potential alternative (non-planning) obligations or mechanisms to secure an upfront RAMS payment, and the feasibility of these options, should be looked into.

The decision also highlights the importance of considering landscape features that define the boundary of an existing cluster. Furthermore, the presence of residential development outside the cluster, even if nearby, does not negate the potential for new development to cause a harmful intrusion into the surrounding countryside.

[Applications relating to Enforcement Notices](#)

Enforcement Case Number	ENF/22/0158/DEV
Appeal number	APP/X3540/F/23/3314019
Site	11 Wharton Street, Bungay, Suffolk, NR35 1EL
Description of development	Without Listed Building Consent the unauthorised installation of an exterior door located in front of the original front door of the Listed Building (“the Unauthorised Works”).
Committee / delegated	Delegated
Date of Enforcement Notice	28 November 2022
Appeal decision date	17 September 2025
Appeal decision	The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld, and listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended (“the Act”).
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations
Main issues	

The appeal before the Inspectorate was on Ground (e) that listed building consent ought to be granted for the works, or that any relevant condition of such consent which has been granted ought to be discharged or different conditions substituted.

Summary of decision

The Council was of the view that the unauthorised exterior door attached to the Listed Building was considered to be harmful to the significance of the building and was unacceptable feature because it impacted negatively upon its character and historical importance. The unauthorised door was also considered to be inappropriate and incongruous, and a modern addition that did not in any way complement the character of the building and it was felt that it detracted from the overall appearance of the Listed building.

The Inspector agreed with the Council’s view and stated *“historic doorway and door, with its elaborate surrounding architectural embellishments previously described, was purposely designed and intended to be the key principal feature of the Wharton Street frontage. In this regard, it will inevitably be highly sensitive to any changes. Even subtle changes to the appearance of such features can have a harmful effect on the integrity and special interest of a listed building.”*

[Link back to contents list on first page of this appendix](#)

The Inspector found that the unauthorised exterior door subject to the Enforcement Notice adversely affected the character and appearance of the historic door and doorway and that it did not conserve or enhance the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

The Inspector concluded by saying *“the works carried out fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bungay Conservation Area, in conflict with the Framework and in conflict with the Council's Development Plan policies in so far as they seek to interpret and apply the provisions of the Act. For these reasons the appeal fails.”*

Learning point / actions

No Learning Points. The dismissal of the appeal and upholding of the enforcement notice means that the unauthorised works are required to be removed under the notice.

Enforcement Case Number ENF/23/0129/USE
Appeal number Appeal A Ref: APP/X3540/C/24/3342283
Appeal B Ref: APP/X3540/C/24/3342284
Site 88 Bridge Road, Oulton Road, Lowestoft NR32 3LR
Description of development Without planning permission, the unauthorised material change of use of the Residential Dwelling from a single residential unit to two residential units used for holiday letting purposes (“the Unauthorised Use”).
Committee / delegated Delegated

Date of Enforcement Notice 19 March 2024
Appeal decision date 22 September 2025
Appeal decision The appeals are dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.
Appeal Procedure Written Representations

Main issues

The appeals before the Inspectorate were on Ground (b) that those matters alleged in the Notice had not occurred as a matter of fact.

Summary of decision

The Council was of the view that the lawful use of the building was as a single residential dwelling. At the time when the Notice was served the dwelling had been subdivided into two separate flats, one on the ground floor and one on the first floor, which were both at the time used for holiday/tourism accommodation.

However, it was observed at the time of the appeal site visit that the building had been converted back to one residential dwelling was being used for this purpose, so the Notice had in fact been complied with before the appeal was determined. The Inspector also noted this and made the following comments in his decision *“I was able to view inside the property during my site visit and understand that there have been changes to the facilities provided within the building since the enforcement notice was issued. It appears to now be occupied as a single dwelling. I need to deal with the appeal on the basis of the internal layout at the time the enforcement notice was issued.”*

At the time when the appeal was submitted the Council was able to provide evidence that the appeal site was still being let out as holiday accommodation as separate apartments.

The Inspector agreed with the Council and concluded within his decision *“From the evidence provided and on the balance of probability, at the time the enforcement notice was issued there were two residential units used for holiday letting purposes at 88 Bridge Road. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal under ground (b) should fail.”*

Learning point / actions

None. There are no learning points, and the enforcement notice has been complied with.

Enforcement Case Number	ENF/20/0131/LISTL
Appeal number	APP/X3540/F/22/3297116
Site	6 Upper Olland Street, Bungay, Suffolk NR35 1BG
Description of development	Without Listed Building Consent the unauthorised installation of a metal roller shutter and surface mounted box attached to the building and the attachment of unauthorised advertisements to the windows and surface mounted box.
Committee / delegated	Delegated
Date of Enforcement Notice	17 March 2022
Appeal decision date	02 October 2025
Appeal decision	The appeal is dismissed, the listed building enforcement notice is upheld and listed building consent is refused.
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations
Main issues	

The appeal before the Inspectorate was on Grounds (e) that listed building consent ought to be granted for the works, or that any relevant condition of such consent which has been granted ought to be discharged or different conditions substituted.

Summary of decision

The Council was of the view that the metal roller shutter, surface mounted box and metal side channels attached to the building, along with the attachment of unauthorised advertisements to the windows were an unacceptable feature on the Listed Building because they impacted negatively on its character. Even though the current shopfront was modern, it was considered that it still retained the traditional elements of a shopfront, in the form of shop fascia, display windows and entrance door to draw customers in. The bulky utilitarian additions were viewed to distract from the overall appearance of the Listed building.

The unauthorised works were considered to be unacceptable and not in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Inspector agreed with the Council and stated within their decision *“The surface mounted box of the roller shutter projects above the shop front over the pavement, with the sides over the pilasters, dominating the ground floor of the building. The bright background colour of the box dominates. This exacerbates the harm arising from the modern appearance of the shopfront that appears incongruous in this area of traditional shopfronts and historic buildings. Its modern appearance and dominance of the building harms the special architectural and historic interest of the building.”*

The Inspector was of the view that the unauthorised development was an unacceptable addition resulting in harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building. Whilst he accepted that the shutters improved security of the building and reduced the risk of theft and other anti-social behaviour it did not outweigh the otherwise identified harm to the building.

The Inspector concluded that *“The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld. Listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).”*

Learning point / actions

No Learning Points. The dismissal of the appeal and upholding of the enforcement notice means that the works set out within the notice are required to be undertaken.

Enforcement Case Number	ENF/22/0247/USE
Appeal number	APP/X3540/C/23/3331692
Site	Part Land East of Mariawood, Hulver Street, Henstead, Suffolk NR34 7UE
Description of development	Without planning permission, the unauthorised material change of use of the land from a residential amenity use to a storage use, for the siting of a mobile home (“the Unauthorised Use”) and the laying of hardstanding (“the Unauthorised Development”)
Committee / delegated	Delegated
Date of Enforcement Notice	21 September 2023
Appeal decision date	30 October 2025
Appeal decision	Allowed – Notice Quashed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations
Main issues	

The appeals before the Inspectorate were on Ground (a) that planning permission should be granted for what was alleged in the Notice. However, The Inspector determined the appeal under a Ground (b) only that those matters alleged in the Notice had not occurred as a matter of fact.

Summary of decision

The Council was of the view that there had been a change of use of land from residential amenity land to a storage use for the siting of a mobile home and laying of hardstanding. The Inspector was of the view that the matters alleged in the Notice has not occurred as a matter of fact because the land was still being used for residential amenity purposes and had not ceased and therefore, a mixed use of residential amenity and storage has occurred.

The Inspector was of the view that *“that the material change of use of the land from a residential amenity use to a storage use is not correct as the residential amenity use has never ceased. At the time the notice was issued, as a matter of fact and agree the land was in a mixed use for residential and storage purposes, for the siting of a mobile home.”*

Whilst the Inspector could have amended the Notice, he determined that to do so could cause injustice the appellant and the Local Authority.

Learning point / actions

New information in regards to the use of the mobile home has been established through the course of the appeal and will need to be investigated further.

It is unfortunate that the enforcement appeal took so long to be decided. This was to the detriment of the Local Planning Authority's case. The Enforcement Notice was served on 21 September 2023, and the appeal 'start date' was 04 January 2024. However, the Inspector did not undertake their site visit until 03 September 2025, then determining the appeal on 30 October 2025. Unsurprisingly, the character of the land and use had evolved since the Enforcement Notice was served almost two years prior to the Inspector's site visit.

It is disappointing that the enforcement notice was quashed on legal grounds and, had the enforcement appeal been decided in a timelier manner, this may not have been the outcome. Unfortunately, the speed of enforcement appeal decisions is not a matter where the Local Planning Authority has any influence. Officers will review the enforcement position in respect of the site and consider next steps.

[Appeals against High Hedge Notices](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Appeals against Community Infrastructure Levy \(CIL\) Decisions](#)

There were no appeal decisions relating to this application type during this reporting period.

[Applications for the award of costs \(submitted alongside one of the appeals reported above\)](#)

Application number	DC/25/1756/PIP
Appeal number	APP/X3540/W/25/3370762 (There is a related appeal in Applications for Planning In Principle (PIP))
Site	Land to North of Lowood Lodge, Hasketon Road, Burgh, Woodbridge, IP13 6JL
Description of development	Permission in Principle - Erection of 1no. detached dwelling and garage (self-build), creation of new access on to Hasketon Road/Mill Lane and stopping up of existing access
Committee / delegated	Delegated

ESC Decision Date	30 June 2025
Appeal decision date	11 November 2025
Cost decision	Dismissed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations

Main issues

The applicant argues that the Council acted unfairly by adding a new objection about self-build housing in its Statement of Case, which was not raised during the original application. They believe this has unnecessarily delayed the appeal and caused extra costs in responding.

Summary of decision:

The Council's Statement of Case (SoC) does not introduce a new objection regarding self-build housing. It identifies no policy conflict or harm, but responds to the applicant's points on self-build as a material consideration and its weight in the planning balance. The Council accepts this as a benefit, though the weight is disputed. References to completing a template and securing a planning obligation are not presented as additional refusal grounds. While the officer's delegated report could have been clearer in explaining the position on self-build housing, the Council acted reasonably in explaining its position within the appeal timetable. There is no evidence of delay or unnecessary expense caused by the Council's conduct.

Learning point / actions:

Officers should ensure that, where a development proposes self-build housing, this is clearly and explicitly addressed within the officer's report.

Application number	DC/25/0756/FUL
Appeal number	APP/X3540/W/25/3365102 (there is a related appeal in Appeals against Refusal of applications for Planning Permission for 'Other' developments)
Site	Barsham Rigg, Bungay Road, Barsham, Suffolk NR34 8HE
Description of development	Annex Building
Committee / delegated	N/A – appeal against non-determination
ESC Decision Date	N/A – appeal against non-determination
Appeal decision date	11 November 2025
Cost decision	Dismissed
Appeal Procedure	Written Representations

Main issues

The Council did not determine the appeal application within the prescribed period.

Summary of decision:

- The inspector notes that they have been provided with copies of correspondence indicating that the Council advised the applicant of its intention to refuse the application within two weeks of the expiry of the prescribed period. Adding that while regrettable and noting that the Council has not offered any reasons for the delay, it was not an excessive period.
- It is not apparent that better communication with the applicant would have enabled the appeal to be avoided altogether, so even if the inspector was to find that the delay had constituted unreasonable behaviour by the Council, they do not find that this has caused the applicant to incur unnecessary or waste expense in the appeal process.
- The Council set out that amendments to the proposal would not have overcome their concerns. There is no statutory requirement to provide an opportunity for amendments. The NPPF highlights that early engagement has significant potential to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the planning system for all parties. The applicant has not disputed the Council's evidence that they did not undertake pre-application engagement. Against this context, the inspector does not consider the Council behaved unreasonably in not giving the applicant an opportunity to amend the proposal.

- The inspector found the proposal to conflict with policy WLP8.10 of the Development Plan which concerns residential annexes in the countryside. While they have not agreed with all aspects in the Council's assessment, including the inspectors finding that the actual annex would be generally subordinate in scale to the host dwelling, these reflect matters of planning judgement. The inspector does not agree with the applicant that the Council has been overly rigid in the application of this policy.
- It was acknowledged that it would not be expected for written communication from the Council of their intention to refuse an application to cover all relevant matters. The Inspector is not persuaded that the Council failed to have proper regard to relevant material considerations in the assessment of this proposal.
- The inspector concluded that they are satisfied that the Council's evidence sufficiently and reasonably justifies its case that planning permission should be refused, and this is not a case where there has been an unreasonably delay to a development which should clearly be permitted having regard to its accordance with the development plan, national policy or other material considerations. For these reasons, the inspector does not find unreasonable behaviour by the Council resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense (as described in the PPG), has been demonstrated. The application for a full award of costs is refused.

Learning point / actions:

- The decision is useful in its findings that the Council did not behave unreasonably through not providing an opportunity to amend the scheme.