
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/16/3157762

Land rear of 53 Horsebridge Hill, Newport, Isle of Wight PO30 5TJ

- 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 Island Builders against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref P/00908/16, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new 3-bed bungalow and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A unilateral section 106 planning obligation (S106) has been entered into which is proposed to provide a financial contribution towards mitigating impacts from the proposal upon the Solent Special Protection Area. Given my overall conclusion I do not need to consider this.
3. The post-code was omitted from the address on the planning application forms. I have included the post-code set out on the S106 to more precisely describe the address of the site.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located behind an existing building at No 53 which fronts onto Horse Bridge Hill. This is a busy main road within the Medina Valley Key Regeneration Area as defined within the Core Strategy¹ (CS) where it is agreed that residential development is acceptable in principle. The proposal would involve the construction of a single storey dwelling in tandem with the building at the front subdividing the existing plot. The new building and effect of the subdivision of the land would be visible through the driveway that would lead between No 53 and from the adjoining building to the south.
6. The style of mainly 2 storey buildings varies on this side of the road. However

¹ "The Island Plan", Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including Waste and Minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document, adopted March 2012

most dwellings near to the site front onto the main road with long plots behind. The main exception nearby to this prevailing character is No 43 which is in a backland position. That property does not define the overall character of the area. It is an individual property in an unusual position.

7. The proposal would not complement the general character of the surrounding area due to its relationship with the building at the front. This would not provide an attractive built environment and would not comply with the sense of place. This would be very noticeable from Horsebridge Hill and also from surrounding properties particularly the flats at No 53 but also from the housing with the estate behind leading from Hogan Road.
8. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. This site is not suitable for the development which would not comply with CS Policies SP1 and DM2. Due to the proposed position of the dwelling, this would not constitute high quality design as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).

Other Matters

9. A similar proposal on the same site was dismissed at appeal in 2006 (APP/P2114/A/06/2014493). The Inspector in that case came to a similar view of the impacts of the proposal as I have. The appellant considers that the change in adopted national advice, local policy and supplementary guidance since that decision should make a difference now.
10. In the previous appeal there would also have been impacts upon the living conditions of occupants within nearby properties. Such impacts are not a concern of the council in the present case and I agree. This is therefore a neutral factor that neither ways in favour of or against the proposal.
11. At a local level, I have identified conflict with the CS. CS Policy SP2 requires 1,350 dwelling by 2027 within the Medina Valley. I have no evidence to inform me about current progress towards meeting that target. The site is within an accessible location where occupants would not rely upon private vehicles for a number of everyday facilities. A dwelling in this location would have a limited impact in these environmental terms. However, the Framework makes it clear that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. The protection and enhancement of the built environment is also part of the environmental dimension of sustainable development.
12. The proposal would make a small but positive contribution to meeting housing needs, would help support local facilities, is in an accessible location and may also have some economic benefits. However, overall I consider that the conflict with CS and the Framework outweighs these benefits. The proposal would not be a sustainable form of development which would not comply with the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR