
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Mr S Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/21/3273657

1 The Old Orchard, Nash Meadows, South Warnborough, Hants, RG29 1TR

- 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 M van Gerven against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00060/HOU, dated 7 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of new garden walls to boundary of site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a wall, which would enclose much of a landscaped area to the side of the road. There is already a wall, but this is set back behind this landscaped area adjacent to the main garden of No 1. The proposed wall would be approximately 1.5m high and set back 2m from the roadside, with the use of bricks to match those seen on the site.
4. Currently, this open landscaped area contributes positively to the street scene character, with a similar landscaped area to the opposite side of the road. These landscaped areas provide an attractive approach to the 'Old Orchard' housing development. However, whilst the proposed wall would not be particularly tall it would erode the open landscaped quality of this area by enclosing it with this proposed walled boundary. Much of the existing landscaping may remain, but it would be largely screened from view from within the streetscene. I note that there is already a wall to the eastern boundary, but this does not front the highway as the proposed wall does.
5. Furthermore, this residential area is generally characterised by open frontages adjacent to the highway. Whilst the layout of the dwelling at No 1 varies from most others in that the main extent of private garden is to the side, the proposal would result in a walled enclosed area close to the roadside, which is uncharacteristic of this area and would therefore be an overly prominent and incongruous feature. There could be some planting to the outside of the wall to provide some additional new landscaping, but this is unlikely to have the same positive visual effect as the existing larger unenclosed area.

6. There is no substantive evidence of the depositing of rubbish or vandalism. There also does not appear to be any reason why the land could not be maintained as it is, without the proposed wall. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that the wall is necessary to ensure safety and security. As such, I give these matters limited weight in my conclusions.
7. As concluded by the Council, I am of the opinion that the proposed wall would not be detrimental to the setting of the nearby Conservation Area. The proposal is, however, harmful to the character and appearance of the area and is therefore contrary to saved policies GEN1, CON8 and Local Plan Policies NBE9. These policies require that development seeks to achieve high design qualities which should incorporate any on-site landscape features and respects views into the site, amongst other things.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr S Rennie

INSPECTOR