



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by **M Tandy C.WEM MCIWEM MIoL**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/25/3371795

37 Meadow Road, Costessey, Norfolk NR5 0NF

- 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 Clive Want against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0110.
 - The development proposed is part change of use of agricultural land into residential use for a garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modest agricultural plot to the rear of No. 37 Meadow Road and part of a green corridor demarked by a well-established boundary fence line with adjoining residential development. The appeal site benefits from direct views towards the River Tud and its distinct wooded valley sides and intimate vistas of sparsely developed neighbouring agricultural land. Collectively these contribute to the local distinctive landscape as described in the South Norfolk Local Landscape Designations Review (2012) for the A3 Tud Rural River Valley character area, where the appeal site is located.
4. The proposed extension of the residential garden land would be a discernible departure from the existing development boundary lines in the immediate area, and physically and visually encroach on the river landscape. Residential use of the appeal site would reduce the pastoral valley floor and the locally important green corridor, which both provide a strategic break between Costessey and New Costessey and enhance the immediate landscape.
5. It was evident from my site visit that other developments in the area are closer to the River Tud and there are very limited public viewing points of the appeal site. Whilst the width of the green corridor varies in the surrounding area due to local developments, each generally has a distinct boundary fence line and pattern which are cohesive across the properties in those developments. As discussed above, this would not be true of the proposed development. Furthermore, the existing nearby closeboard fence, extending perpendicular from the rear gardens on Meadow Road to the River Tud, I consider detracting on the character and

appearance of the surrounding area. Nevertheless, this carries little weight in the consideration of the effects of the proposed change of use.

6. For the reasons above, I find that the proposed development has not fully taken account of the landscape character assessment and there would be considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (2024) or Policies DM2.8, DM3.8 and DM4.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2015), which seek to ensure proposals are of a high quality design, that conserve and enhance the landscape character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

7. My attention has been brought to matters in relation to preapplication advice provided by the Council, and the commercial fishing activities on land adjacent to the River Tud. Regarding the latter, the Council has confirmed an extant planning permission exists for the land use on the opposite side of the River Tud, however I am unaware of the considerations of that case when it was determined. Based on the information before me, neither of these matters would be grounds to allow the appeal.
8. I have considered the Council's argument that the proposed development would set a precedent for similar developments in the surrounding area, regardless of whether that includes the erection of buildings or other structures. Whilst each application and appeal must be treated on its individual merits, I can appreciate the Council's concern that approval of this proposed development could be used in support of such similar schemes. I consider that this is not a generalised fear of precedent, but a realistic and specific concern for land in the A3 Tud Rural River character area. Allowing this appeal would make it more difficult to resist further planning applications for similar developments, and I consider that their cumulative effect would exacerbate the harm which I have described above.
9. The proposed garden extension and scale of associated planting would likely yield a low-level biodiversity enhancement which attracts very little weight in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Tandy

INSPECTOR