
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020

by Andrew Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/20/3255542

1 May Crescent, Holbury, Southampton SO45 2GS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dennis Goddard against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/10167, dated 17 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is replace wooden fence with brick wall (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to replace wooden fence with brick wall (retrospective) at 1 May Crescent, Holbury, Southampton SO45 2GS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/10167, dated 17 February 2020, and the submitted plan GODD103.

Preliminary Matters

2. The wall has been erected and I am therefore considering this appeal retrospectively.
3. I have taken the description of the proposal from the Council's decision as it describes the development proposed adequately, and is simpler than the description on the application form.
4. Since the Council made its decision the New Forest District Council Local Plan 2016-2036 Part One: Planning Strategy has been adopted. Both parties have had opportunity to comment on this matter relevant to this appeal and I have taken into account comments received.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property sits within a spacious residential area. Most properties are detached and set back from the road, predominantly behind low walls and hedges. However, there are some examples of high walls and fences fronting the highway. As well as No 12 and No 41 May Crescent there are also two similar corner plots to the southwest of the appeal site, at the junction with Hobson Way, with high fences and walls. Although none of these examples are so close that they can be viewed at the same time as the appeal property they are all nearby. There is no difference between the character of the area

immediately surrounding the appeal site and the areas relating to these other examples that mean I should not take these examples into account. All four demonstrate how occupiers of corner plots have secured an improved level of privacy to areas of garden, and are similar to the appeal proposal.

7. Although the brick wall is prominent, it only forms part of the appeal property's road facing boundary. The hedges that make up the plot's remaining road facing boundary are lower than the wall. They give the rest of the plot a more open appearance, lessening the impact of the wall to the extent that it cannot be considered over dominant or incongruous.
8. In summary, the wall does not harm the character or appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy ENV3 of the New Forest District Council Local Plan 2016-2036 Part One: Planning Strategy adopted 2020, which seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve a high quality of design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Tucker

INSPECTOR