



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

**by Helen Heward BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 28 January 2026**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/25/3362457**

**Glebe Field, Church Lane, Roydon, Easting 569833, Northing 323605, Kings Lynn, Norfolk, PE32 1AR**

- 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 Allison Paton against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01314/F.
  - The development is a wooden stable block, with 3 individual stalls, sitting on wooden skids placed directly on the soil surface.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a wooden stable block, with 3 individual stalls, sitting on wooden skids placed directly on the soil surface at **Glebe Field, Church Lane, Roydon, Easting 569833, Northing 323605, Kings Lynn, Norfolk, PE32 1AR in accordance with the terms of application, Ref 24/01314/F and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:**
  - 1) Unless within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for the full details of foul water drainage and a scheme for the management and disposal of all equine waste is submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval, and unless the approved scheme is implemented within 1 month of the local planning authority's approval, the use of the stable block shall cease and shall be removed from the site until such time as a scheme is approved and implemented. Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be maintained and remain in use.
  - 2) The stables hereby approved shall be used only for keeping of horses for private and recreational purposes.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The wooden stable block has been constructed. Section 73A of the 1990 Act allows for the submission of "retrospective" applications. Where the Council refers to "the stables" I have understood this to mean a single wooden stable block comprising three individual stalls as described in the application and as I observed on my visit.
3. I have used the site description given on the application. I have noted that the Council refer to it as being south of Church Lane and west of Station Road. The Appellant states that none of the structures are permanent. However, the planning

application is not for a time limited temporary permission. The Council considered and determined the application as a proposal for permanent development, and it is on the same basis that I have determined this appeal.

4. Since the Application was refused the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been revised. The Council agrees that whilst paragraph numbers have changed there is no change to the Government's planning policy advice as far as it relates to this appeal. I am content that the changes have no material bearing on the main parties' cases in this instance.
5. The King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan was adopted on 27 March 2025 replacing the Core Strategy (2011) and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016). The Council's Statement of Case addresses the change in policies. It states that Core Strategy (2011) Policy CS06 relating to development in the countryside has not been carried forward, Policy CS08 has been replaced with LP18, Policy CS12 has been replaced with LP20 and that Policy LP21 seeks to ensure that the natural and historic environment is conserved and enhanced, and development responds to the context and character of places.
6. All Saints' Church Roydon is a Grade II\* Listed Building (the LB). The Decision Notice included two reasons for refusal. The first states that the siting of the stables has caused a low level of less than substantial harm (LTSH) to the setting of the LB. It also states that in addition, the effect of the stables in accumulation with the other structures and paraphernalia linking to the keeping of horses has intensified the use of the land which has resulted in a change of use of the land from agriculture to the domestic keeping of recreational horses. This, it states, has caused a moderate level of LTSH to the setting of the LB. The second reason for refusal relates to the use of the land for the keeping of horses.
7. Appendix 2 of the Appellant's Grounds of Appeal provides evidence regarding the use of the land for the grazing for private and recreational uses on Glebe Field over time. At Appeal, the Council acknowledges that due to the passage of time the use cannot be disputed.
8. In the Neighbourhood Plan for Grimston, Pott Row, Roydon and Congham (2017-2036) (the NP) Glebe Field is designated as a Local Green Space (LGS), that is a space that is demonstrably special to the community and holds a particular local significance, which may include historic significance. A view of Roydon Church from the junction of Church Lane and Station Road, looking across Glebe Field is identified as a key view towards a landmark church within the NP.
9. After my site visit I sought clarification as to whether the stable block is within the LGS. In an email dated 17 November 2025 the Council confirmed that *"after assessing the location plan, site plan, site photos, and the neighbourhood plan (NP) for the map of the Local Green Space LGS1, it is considered that the siting of the stable block does not fall within the LGS itself. Notwithstanding this, the impact upon the Grade II\* listed church and key view, designated within the NP, remain"*.

## Main Issue

10. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the stable building on the character and appearance of the local area bearing in mind the special attention that should be paid to the desirability of preserving the special interest of the nearby Grade II\* listed building, known as the Church of All Saints Roydon (List Entry No 1077627).

11. In determining the appeal, I have had special regard to section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

### **Reasons**

12. In so far as is relevant to this appeal, the special interest in this LB is its semi-rural setting and its situation adjacent to Glebe Field, which is down to grass and has an open character. Glebe Field is owned by the Church who lease it to the Appellant. Glebe Land is often land that was provided by the Church to help support the minister. In history glebe land was often leased, or used by the parish priest, to graze horses or cows. The Glebe Field is an important part of the setting and makes a positive contribution towards an understanding of the special interest of the LB as a parish church set within a spacious and rural setting.
13. On entering Roydon from the north, the LB is ahead and to the right. It is observed set back from the highway behind Glebe Field, in a rural and undeveloped setting. The nave, chancel and tower are all visible to differing degrees. This view is recognised in the NP as a key view.
14. The defined LGS on Glebe Field lies to the east, beyond a churchyard boundary. The stable block is not within the defined LGS. It is tucked away, in a corner, under a background of tall mature trees and vegetation, between the churchyard and LGS. The dense vegetation and trees prevent intervisibility between the LB and stable block across the churchyard. I did not observe intervisibility between the LB and stable block more widely.
15. There is some limited co-visibility of the LB, LGS and stable block. Where this occurs, the stable block is seen to one side, behind the LGS, and out of the way of views toward the LB. The stable block is small in scale, low in height, does not break the skyline, and not highly visible. It is seen in front of and beneath large mature trees, which are mostly within the churchyard. The dark colour of the stable block make it recede into the backdrop of dark green vegetation.
16. The materials afford the stable block a low-key agricultural look. It is not highly visible and does not interfere with the available views of the chancel, nave, or tower of the LB. Nor does it interfere with or diminish the open rural setting, and views, of the LGS and LB. The stable block does not have any material impact upon the key view (view 5) depicted in the NP.
17. The Council does not disagree that a stable block would not go against a rural character seen in the countryside and has not harmed the openness of the LGS. I agree. I conclude that the stable block does not harm the character and appearance of the local area and LGS, nor does it harm the setting of the LB; the special interest of the LB would be preserved.
18. Framework paragraph 202 advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraph 212 requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Paragraph 219 advises that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal

its significance) should be treated favourably. I find no conflict with advice in the Framework.

19. I find no conflict with requirements of Local Plan Policies LP18, LP20 and LP21, which amongst other things require development to conserve and enhance the historic and natural environment; to protect existing natural environmental assets including green infrastructure; to conserve and enhance the historic environment in a manner appropriate to significance; to conserve and enhance the amenity of the wider environment and respond to the context and character of places. Nor do I find any conflict with requirements of NP Policy 14 Heritage Assets and Policy 10 Key Views, which require that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance and that development should be sensitively and appropriately considered with respect to the key views identified.
20. As the Council does not dispute the lawfulness of the stable block, and that the stable block is not within the defined LGS, not all the provisions of NP LGS Policy LGS11 are relevant. I find no conflict with this Policy including criterion b) which requires that new buildings/facilities do not conflict with the reasons for designation that make the LGS special to the community.

### **Other Matters**

21. Three letters of support were submitted. I have also noted concerns from the Parish Council relating to clutter, sheds, structures, and paraphernalia, some existing and some no longer there. However, my considerations have been limited solely to the stable block which I have assessed on its own merits.
22. The Appellant's animal welfare obligations are not material to my considerations, and the benefits of stabling are not a public benefit. However, as I have found no harm, the balancing exercise in paragraph 215 of the Framework is not engaged.

### **Conditions**

23. As the development has been undertaken, it is not appropriate to attach conditions for commencement of development and compliance with approved plans. I have attached an amended condition to reflect the retrospective nature of the application. In accordance with the terms of the application, it is reasonable to restrict the use of the building for private and recreational horse keeping. A condition requiring details for water disposal is also reasonable to protect against environmental pollution.

### **Conclusion**

24. For the reasons stated, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions set out.

*Helen Heward*

INSPECTOR