
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by **C Cooper-Young MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/25/3371907

61 Botley Road, Southampton SO19 0NQ

- 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 Stephen Noke against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 24/00243/FUL, dated 02 March 2024, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2025.
 - The development proposed was described as “Erection of 2 metre high boundary wall to the front (part retrospective).”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of 2 metre high boundary wall to the front at 61 Botley Road, Southampton SO19 0NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00243/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted relates to the following approved plans:
Site location plan, elevation plan and block plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice, which more accurately describes the development carried out in relation to the boundary wall to the front of the appeal site. However, the Council described the development as being “part retrospective”. As this is not a form of development, I have removed this from my formal decision above.
3. The proposed wall has already been constructed. However, it varies slightly from the submitted plans insofar as the pier caps are comprised of ball finials on regency style caps, rather than the proposed pyramid style caps. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans rather than what has been physically carried out on site.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is located along a stretch of Botley Road which is characterised by residential dwellings of varying size, form and appearance. These dwellings have a relatively consistent linear built form along the road with a manifold variety of hard

and soft landscaping to their frontages. The linear pattern is interrupted on both sides of this section of the road by the developments at Gainsborough Close and Dawson Road. The site comprises a detached two storey dwelling of red brick, set within a spacious plot.

6. The appeal wall is in an area of transitional character, between that of a suburban residential setting and the playing fields and buildings of the adjacent Valentine Primary School, and the open fields opposite it. Beyond the site toward the school this section of Botley road becomes tree lined and more verdant. The boundary treatment of the adjacent school is comprised of concrete posts with chain link wire fencing to a similar height to that of the appeal wall.
7. The Council states that the appeal wall is contrary to section 3.11 of its Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2006 (SPD). The SPD seeks to ensure that boundaries fronting the street are in keeping with the treatment of other boundaries and that the design, materials and colours should be consistent with the predominant positive characteristics of existing boundaries.
8. Whilst I am unaware of the particular policy context or planning history, I witnessed numerous examples of hard landscape frontages along the length of Botley Road, eliciting no predominant characteristic in terms of design, materials, colour or height.
9. A variety of hard landscape features along Botley Road are comprised of red bricks, many of these are similar in terms of design, materials, colour and some in height to the appeal wall. Red brick is a common material to the built form of dwellings along Botley Road.
10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the design and scale of the appeal development respects the surrounding context and is neither an incongruous or dominant feature. There is no harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
11. The development therefore complies with the provisions of Policies SDP1 (i), SDP7 (iv), SDP9 (i) and SDP10 (i) (iii) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2nd Revision 2015) and Policy CS13 (1) (4) (6) of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (revised 2015) and as supported by section 3.11 of the Residential Design Guide 2006.
12. These policies require, amongst other things, development to respect existing buildings in terms of scale and layout and to respect its surroundings in terms of visual impact and the quality and use of materials.

Natural surveillance

13. The effect of the appeal wall on natural surveillance has also been cited by the Council in their reasons for refusal. The appeal evidence indicates that the former boundary treatment was comprised of a low wall with a hedge to approximately 2m in height. The host dwelling, and those in the immediate locality are set back from the highway by some distance where observation of the public realm is limited to driveways and views from first floor windows.
14. Given these facts, I conclude that the natural surveillance of the public realm is not diminished further by the appeal wall. This matter does not therefore justify the refusal of planning permission.

Conditions

15. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the LPA. I have considered them against the advice on conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Conditions imposed

16. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of clarity, I have imposed a plans condition.

Conditions not imposed

17. The development has commenced, as the wall is already in place I have not imposed the usual time limit condition.
18. I have not imposed a materials condition, this isn't necessary because I have determined that the materials used are compatible with the surroundings.
19. I have not imposed a condition regarding the access, based on my observations on site, the development maintains acceptable visibility and so a condition isn't necessary.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

C Cooper-Young

INSPECTOR