



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/25/3368825

1 Thornberry Grove, Spooner Row, Wymondham NR18 9UL

- 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 Mr and Mrs Steve and Cressida Rushmer against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0166.
 - The development proposed is erection of 6ft wooden fence along side and front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 6ft wooden fence along side and front elevation at 1 Thornberry Grove, Spooner Row, Wymondham NR18 9UL. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2025/0166, dated 21 January 2025, 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 the following approved drawings: site layout, fence location, and fence panel and support.

Preliminary Matter

2. The original description of development is provided in a more succinct form in the decision notice. Therefore, the above description reflects this amended description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed fence on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a cul-de-sac of similar properties with open countryside opposite.
5. Policy DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015) and Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (2024) require high quality design from development and protection and enhancement of locally distinctive character.

6. The hedge that runs along the front boundary of Thornberry Grove adjacent to Station Road mirrors the field boundary hedgerows opposite. As such, the hedge is a positive feature which reflects the semi-rural character and appearance of this edge of settlement location.
7. The appeal property is, however, laid out differently to the other two properties with boundaries adjacent to Station Road. The two dwellings on the other side of the junction face towards the main road, while No 1 faces into Thornberry Grove with its side boundary running parallel to Station Road. The side boundary facing the road is where a boundary fence is typically located to maintain privacy and security in use of private amenity space.
8. There is an example of this type of fence opposite No 1 at No 9, where the rear garden is enclosed by a boundary fence of similar appearance to the appeal proposal. Consequently, the proposed fence would not be incongruous in terms of its location in relation to the typical layout and use of residential development or uncharacteristic of the type of boundary treatment that already exists nearby.
9. I acknowledge that the proposed fence would be more prominent due to its position on the road frontage. However, it would be seen in the context of the orientation of No 1 where a fence to the side and rear boundaries is typically located. Moreover, the fence would be positioned behind the line of the existing hedge. This would have the effect of partially screening the fence and softening its appearance, largely maintaining the characteristic verdant appearance of the boundaries in the street scene.
10. I note the Council's concern that the current proposal could set a precedent for further similar fences. However, the two properties on the other side of the junction face towards Station Road and their rear gardens are already enclosed by boundary fences. Any proposals for similar boundary treatment within the area would need to be considered on their merits against policies and circumstances pertaining at the time. However, current concerns about such proposals coming forward are not of sufficient weight to lead to a different overall conclusion in this case.
11. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed fence would not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, there is no conflict with Policy DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document or with Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan, as described.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should succeed.
13. Of the Council's suggested conditions I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of the proposal, one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR