



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2026

Appeal Ref: Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/25/3374408

Land At E554449 N308752 School Road, Marshland St James, Norfolk

- 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 Simon Greenhalgh against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00163/F.
 - The development proposed is described as install new access and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At my site visit I observed an access and gates to be *in situ*.
3. In my banner heading above I have used the address from the Council's decision notice as this provides an address for the site whereas the application form provides a description of the site location.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The gates are of a decorative black metal design, and of considerable height. They are flanked either side by wooden fencing and hedges, set back from the highway verge.
6. School Road is a long, narrow road with no pavements. In the vicinity of the appeal site the road is rural in character with a drain and open fields north of the highway. Sporadic residential properties in the vicinity of the site have a variety of boundary treatments including hedges, wooden 5-bar gates and post and rail fences.
7. The combination of the height, ornate design and materials of construction result in a pair of gates of a domestic appearance which contrasts starkly with the open rural character of the land to which they relate and the wider locality. Consequently, the gates appear incongruous within its rural setting.
8. Whilst I did observe a pair of metal gates to Marshland Villa Farmhouse, these gates are lower in height than the proposal and relate to a domestic property. Although proximate to the appeal property, the circumstances differ.

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal results in unacceptable harm to character and appearance. This draws the proposal into conflict with Policies LP18 and LP21 of the West Lynn & Norfolk Local Plan 2021-2040 which amongst other things requires development to conserve and enhance the amenity of the wider environment by responding sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting through high quality design and use of materials. Conflict also arises with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it requires decisions to respect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other Matters

10. The appropriateness of a shingle access driveway is not in dispute between the parties. Having regard to the evidence before me, and my observations on site, I have no reason to reach a different view on this matter.
11. I note the representations from nearby residents citing a lack of objection to the proposal. However, this does not overcome the harms identified.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention to other nearby developments that they advance provides support for the proposal. Whilst there may be some similarities in terms of the gates being metal and of a similar height and design their contexts differ substantially. In particular gates at nos. 9, 11-15, 23 'The Trundle, and Westfields, School Road, Marshland St James, Wisbech all relate to residential properties located within a suburban context. Furthermore, in some of these instances the gates were of a lower height and more open design. Consequently, they are not comparable to the appeal scheme before me. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
13. Interested parties have raised concerns including a lack of privacy, increase in noise and traffic and the potential for a workshop or another business. These concerns did not form part of the Council's reason for refusal. As I am dismissing the appeal there is no need for me to consider these matters further.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no other material considerations which lead me to determine the proposal other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Gee

INSPECTOR