



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2022

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/22/3293437

235 London Road, Horndean, Waterlooville PO8 0HN

- 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 Alex Cole against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 22617/008 dated 16 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is retain and complete partly constructed boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit boundary walls were in existence, and this reflects the description of development, which refers to the retention and completion of partly constructed walls. My decision is based on the proposed boundary walls shown on the plans before me, including in terms of the dimensions set out on the boundary wall plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling on the west side of London Road, which is a service road, accessed off the main road (A3). As a result, there are only properties on the western side of the road along this part of London Road, with dense planting between London Road and the A3. The local area is predominantly residential with a mix of housing styles and a variety of boundary treatments. However, whether demarcated by walls, fences or planting, and with few exceptions, the general pattern of boundary treatments, particularly to the front boundary, is relatively modest, providing an open character and verdant appearance to the local area.
5. There are examples of taller treatments, a number of which were referenced by the Appellant. However, a number of these relate to side returns enclosing rear gardens and do not interrupt the general pattern of boundary treatments to front gardens.

6. The proposal would introduce amendments to the front wall, as built, to introduce lower sections between higher piers but the wall would still remain significantly higher than those adjoining and in the vicinity. Furthermore, the solid form of the boundary treatment, including the side walls, together with the proposed height, would make it visually discordant and would detract from the more open and verdant forms of boundary treatments which are characteristic in the local area.
7. I have taken into account that the walls would be rendered to match the existing property, but this would not outweigh my concerns which primarily relate to the solid form and height of the boundary treatment.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area. This would conflict with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy; The East Hampshire District Local Plan: Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other things, require a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR