



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) Bsc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/24/3357755

10 New Road, Clanfield, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 0NS

- 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 Harry Phelan against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 60077/001.
 - The development proposed is retrospective consent for erection of boundary fence adjacent to highway over 1 metre in height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of boundary fence adjacent to the highway over 1metre in height in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 60077/001 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - (i) within three months of the date of this Decision the panels facing New Road and Windmill Close shall be treated with a colour stain in accordance with details first submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;
 - (ii) in the first planting season following the date of this Decision climbing plants shall be planted against the two fence panels facing New Road in accordance with details first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any plants which within a period of 5 years from the date of this Decision die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the fence on the character and appearance of the street scene of New Road and Windmill Close.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the street scene at junction of New Road / Windmill Close is mixed in character with some areas open plan and others enclosed with hedges. I have compared the existing situation with Google images and the appellant's photograph of the site before the erection of the fence and consider that the principle of the enclosure of the relatively small area is acceptable. The recent relocation of the entrance door to the front and the presence of the large bay window in the side wall also supports the case for some additional privacy to this part of the property curtilage.

4. However, the erection of the wooden fence panels in its present form is overtly utilitarian and 'harsh' in public views and out of character with the more verdant surroundings. On the other hand, enclosure through planting would take a considerable time to be effective and would not provide security for the rear garden.
5. On balance I consider that the enclosure could be made acceptable by the outside of the fence being stained with a darker wood colour and the introduction of climbing plants against the front two fence panels. This 'softer' appearance would ensure that the development would not have an unacceptably harmful effect in conflict on the character and appearance of the street scene of New Road and Windmill Close.
6. As such, it would no longer conflict with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy 2014; Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan Second Review 2006, and the Council's Residential Extensions & Householder Development SPD.
7. I have imposed conditions to require the implementation of these measures and on this basis I allow the appeal.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR