



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/25/3371520

96 Catherington Lane, Horndean, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 9PB

- 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 Michael Murray against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application reference is 59515/001.
 - The development proposed is described as “to remove original six foot high fencing consisting of 6’ x 6’ fence panels and concrete posts which have become rotten and broken (posts concrete is cracking) and unstable and a section of hedging which is overgrown and become a hazard to pedestrians and replacing with a wall topped with composite fence slats and gates”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It was apparent at my site visit that works to construct a boundary wall had commenced on site but the appellant confirms that these have not been completed. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans and details submitted.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: -
 - Highway safety.
 - Character and appearance.

Reasons

Highway safety

4. The plans indicate that a section of the proposed wall would abut the public footway on Barton Cross. I note that the footway is used by students attending Horndean Technology College that lies at the other end of Barton Cross.
5. The proposed wall does not include any visibility splays for the existing driveway serving the appeal site. Drivers of vehicles exiting the appeal site would therefore have no sight of pedestrians approaching the access’s crossover of the footway from either direction, with consequent harm to highway safety.
6. The appellant has included photographs with their statement showing a fence, wall and hedge fronting Barton Cross, their case being that this combination was in situ for a considerable period before its removal and offered no better visibility than the

wall the subject of this appeal. Even if this were the case, I must assess the proposed development against relevant local and national planning policies. Paragraph 115b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) stipulates that it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Hence, a less than ideal pre-existing configuration would not be sufficient justification for a development that failed to provide a safe and suitable access.

7. I have considered whether the use of conditions could secure measures to provide the necessary visibility. This includes consideration of the use of mirrors as suggested by the appellant. However, I am unconvinced that such measures would overcome my concerns. My finding is reinforced by the views of the Highway Authority. Given their local knowledge and expertise, this carries considerable weight.
8. I appreciate that there are several properties in proximity to the appeal site which have circa 2m high boundary walls and fences abutting the public footway with either no, or what appear to be, substandard visibility splays. I also have noted the appellant's photographs of, and references to examples of boundary treatments in the wider area. I do not know the circumstances under which they were constructed, or their status with regards to planning permission. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal that would weigh in its favour with regards to highway safety.
9. As such, I find that the proposal would result in harm to highway safety and conflict with policy CP31 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014). Amongst other things, this requires highway design and development to meet the need for safety whilst also placing a high priority on meeting the needs of pedestrians.

Character and appearance

10. The appeal site is within an established, predominantly residential, suburban area. It is on the corner of Catherington Lane and Barton Cross. As a corner plot, both the front and side gardens adjoin a public highway.
11. I observed that there are several corner plots within the locality of the site. Boundary treatments include evergreen and deciduous hedges in addition to walls and fences or combinations of these features. There is a variety of designs evident. I also noted many examples where the heights of these boundary treatments on corner plots were in the region of up to 2m above footway level.
12. As I acknowledged with regards to highway safety, I do not know the circumstances under which other walls and fences were constructed or their status with regards to planning permission. However, the variety of corner plot boundary treatments, including those comparable in height to the proposal, are an established feature of the area and contribute to its overall character and appearance.
13. In this context, whilst the proposed wall would be visually prominent, I do not consider that it would be out of character with prevailing forms of boundary treatment in terms of design, materials and scale. It would not be incongruous or visually harmful in its setting. It follows that it would not run counter to the advice highlighted in the Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

14. As such I find that the proposal would accord with the provisions of policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) insofar as it relates to character and appearance considerations.

Other matters

15. In his statement, the appellant outlines instances of criminal activity, trespass and littering that he has experienced at his home. In addition, he considers the proposed wall would be easier to maintain than other boundary treatments. Understandably, one of the motivations for the proposed development is to improve security to prevent and deter the recurrence of such instances. These are factors to which I have given moderate weight in favour of the proposal but does not outweigh my concerns in relation to highway safety.

Conclusion

16. The level of harm to highway safety is determinative. For this reason, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Sharp

INSPECTOR