



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2026

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6009648

20 Norman Drive, Old Sarum, Wiltshire, SP4 6FP

- 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 Sarah Johnson against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2026/01489.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a garden room for use incidental to the enjoyment of the house and realigned rear boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a garden room for use incidental to the enjoyment of the house and realigned rear boundary fence at 20 Norman Drive, Old Sarum, Wiltshire, SP4 6FP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2026/01489, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development of the proposed garden room hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development of the proposed garden room hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Block Plan at scale 1:500 and Drg No 1619/01 Rev A.

Preliminary Matter

2. The planning application was made part retrospectively. At the time of my visit, I saw the realigned fence had been erected, comprising a 1.8m high close boarded and concrete post fence along the site's rear boundary.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached dwelling located within a residential estate constructed following a grant of planning permission (Ref 14/05623/FUL) in 2015 for development described as '*Erection of 38 dwellings comprising various types and sizes, car parking and landscaping*'. The north-east facing boundary of the residential development site, including the rear garden boundary to No 20, faces farmland set within open countryside. The Council's officer's report contains small, copied extracts from some of the originally approved plans. These show a 1.2m

high, post and two wire fence to the rear boundary of Plot C14 (now No 20), including also for plots C16, C17, C19, C20 and C21, together with an adjacent landscaped hedge and tree belt within the curtilages of these same dwellings. From the information provided by these extracts it is unclear to me the precise position of the approved fence line or the detailed form of the planting. Condition 14 of the original planning permission withdrew permitted development rights for these specific plots in relation to the erection of any other gates, fences, walls, or other means of enclosure along the north-western or north-eastern boundaries in order to control the visual impact of development when viewed from the surrounding open land.

5. I understand that the original fence line to the rear of No 20 has moved approximately 1m to the north. Notwithstanding, there is no suggestion by the Council that the position of the new fence encroaches beyond land within the appellant's ownership, as depicted by the planning application's site boundary edged red.
6. The Council accepts that the proposed outbuilding would not be detrimental to the character or context of the area in terms of its design, scale, or height. I have no reason to disagree. Their concern rests with the fact that its rear wall would be positioned fractionally beyond the line of the original fence and set in part of the appellant's garden which is described by the Council as the '*landscaping buffer barrier*'.
7. During my visit I observed that any original planting at the foot of the garden to No 20 had been removed but that new planting, in keeping with the rear garden's setting, had been undertaken. Given the private nature of the land and the time that has lapsed since the original development took place, I find this to be neither unusual nor unreasonable. I am unable to detect any harm that would arise from the siting of the outbuilding.
8. The new fence is entirely residential in scale, form and function appearing typical of many rear private garden enclosures. Furthermore, I observed from within the garden at No 20 the substantial amount of mature vegetation that is present within the adjacent field beyond the boundary of the appeal site, and which far exceeded the height of the new fence. Moreover, when viewed from land to the north, looking back towards the appeal property, the fence was imperceptible to me as a result of this natural field boundary. Any sense of a hard urban edge was clearly defined in my mind by the backdrop and visual presence of the large dwellings set along Norman Drive rather than by the low level rear boundary enclosures of any particular property.
9. Whilst the erection of the new boundary fence at No 20 does not accord with condition 14 of the original planning permission, I am satisfied that its presence has no impact that is visually harmful when observed from surrounding open land. In the absence of any harm to the character or appearance of the area, I can detect no conflict with any guidance set out within Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide 2024, which relates to householder extensions, or with Core Policies 51 and 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, adopted in 2015, as far as between them they seek to secure high quality design that is complementary to the locality, including the natural landscape character of an area. For these same reasons I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's policies for achieving well-designed places.

10. I am mindful that there is a planning application lodged for development on land immediately north of the appeal site, but that remains undetermined and has not been instrumental in my reasoning.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested four conditions in the event of the appeal succeeding. In relation to the proposed outbuilding, in addition to the standard time limit condition a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The materials proposed for the outbuilding are clearly set out as part of the application. No condition relating to these is necessary.
12. The proposed outbuilding would sit firmly within the property's rear garden setting and given its size and form I am satisfied that its occupation would be for purposes ancillary to the dwelling as intended. In the event of the structure being neither built nor used as proposed, or if there would be a future material change of its use, then another grant of permission would be required. A condition to control its use is therefore not necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR