



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/24/3346076

41 Waldorf Heights, Blackwater, Camberley, Hampshire GU17 9JH

- 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 Mr Harjinder Singh against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00168/HOU.
 - The development is a front garden wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The completed front wall was in situ at the time of the appeal site visit. The appeal has therefore been considered on the basis that planning permission is being sought retrospectively.
4. The 'description of proposed works' on the planning application form includes words that are not a description of development. I have therefore removed those words from the description for the purpose of the appeal banner heading.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. 41 Waldorf Heights (No 41) is a two-storey, detached dwelling faced in light and dark brown brick with some mock Tudor detailing. It also has an attached garage. The immediate area constitutes two-storey detached dwellings and terraced dwellings, some with similar mock Tudor detailing and others with a more modern appearance. Front boundaries on Waldorf Heights are predominantly open and generally devoid of walls. In the limited instances where front boundaries are enclosed, they are generally softened with planting. No 41 has a wide frontage and side fences that come to the front of the boundary next to the footpath.
7. Due to its height, expanse and position centrally at the front of the plot, together with its composition of red facing brick, stone moulded copings and

black spear-tipped railings, the front garden wall appears incongruous amongst the generally more open frontages on Waldorf Heights. Although the railings break up the expanse of solid form, this is not sufficient to assimilate the overall structure into its surroundings. Furthermore, a condition requiring soft landscaping on the grassed area behind the wall would not mitigate the wall's hard interface with the street.

8. I understand that the host dwelling previously had vegetation and a low stake and chain boundary to the front before the wall was erected. In addition, No.52 Waldorf Heights, which is located on the opposite side of the street, exhibits low level fencing and a gate set back from the pavement along with dense, tall vegetation. I am not aware of the planning history in respect of these limited examples of front boundary treatments on Waldorf Heights. In any case, due to the softer landscaped elements and the more understated appearance of the structures in those instances, they are not comparable to the stark appearance of the wall subject of this appeal.
9. The appellant has also mentioned an application that was approved by the Council in 2013 (ref:13/00805/HOU), for gates forward of a dwelling at 6 Waldorf Heights. However, that particular development related to a different site context at the end of a side road which is less visible from the main street frontage on Waldorf Heights.
10. In addition, general reference has also been made to several tall hedges, fences and walls within the local vicinity. However, these mainly relate to the side and rear boundaries of rear gardens on a different section of Waldorf Heights and they are visually distinct from the prevailing open character of property frontages. Whether or not planning conditions relating to boundary treatments on the estate have already been breached elsewhere, this does not alter my finding that the front boundary wall at No 41 is not sympathetic to the overriding open character of front boundaries on Waldorf Heights.
11. I conclude, the front garden wall is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, the development is contrary to Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) (2020) and Saved Policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) (2009). Together these Policies seek developments of a high quality of design which positively contribute to the overall appearance of the area and that are in keeping with the local character by virtue of their scale, design, height, prominence, materials, and siting.

Other Matter

12. The appellant suggests that the front garden wall has been designed as a deterrent for unwanted incursions by defining the private front garden. However, no objective evidence has been submitted for the need to provide extra security for this home.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that justify granting planning permission. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR