
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: 26 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/16/3154831

18 Moor View, Godshill, Isle of Wight PO38 3LL

- 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 Mrs Alison Bache against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref P/00106/16, dated 22 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The title of the appellant as used above is different from that entered on the planning application form. I have used the corrected title confirmed in correspondence sent following the lodging of the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area. The second is whether, taking account of local housing needs, any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits (the planning balance).

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located within Godshill which is a Rural Service Centre as defined in Policy SP1 the Island Plan Core Strategy¹ (CS). It is part of a modern residential estate which includes many dwellings of similar design from a similar era. Most of the dwellings are 2 storeys in height with pitched roofs sloping away from the estate road. There is some variety to the appearance of some dwellings and there are also a number of bungalows nearby. There are also dwellings with some individual design features such as gables breaking the sloping roof eaves line. Some side elevations with gable ends face the street where the estate road turns a corner.
5. The site currently accommodates a dwelling with a lean-to garage and

¹ Island Plan: The Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy (including Minerals and Waste) and Development Management Policies DPD adopted March 2012

driveway alongside, leading towards the rear garden. There is a substantial gap between the side of the existing semi-detached dwelling and the flat roofed garage and dwelling at No 16 (also semi-detached) which is in a higher position to the south west. The gap between these similar properties enables a view from the estate road of the backdrop of trees. This gap helps to break up the built form of this part of the estate and contributes positively to the street-scene.

6. The proposed detached dwelling would be of distinctly narrower proportions than the neighbouring pairs of semi-detached dwellings. The spacing between the proposal and existing houses would be much tighter than is generally the case within the estate. The dwelling would appear to be sandwiched between and cramped alongside the neighbouring properties. The proposal would include a pitched roof with a gable facing the road. It would look at odds with a line of significantly wider groups of dwellings which primarily have ridged roofs facing towards the road. The small gable feature of the dwelling further along to the west plays a less significant impact upon character of the area as do the side elevations of dwellings with gable ends that can be seen from the road. These do not provide a sufficient justification for the proposed design. The eaves and ridge height of the proposal would be similar to that of the existing dwelling but the narrowness of the plot would lead to the building having a steeper roof which would look out of place. Furthermore the substantial loss of the gap and view of the trees at the rear of the site would have a harmful impact upon the street-scene.
7. In relation to the first main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. This would not comply with CS Policies SP1 and DM2. This would constitute a poor design, not complying with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).

Planning balance

8. The appellant has raised concerns over whether or not the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Isle of Wight Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2014 (SHMA) has been referred to. This shows that 520 homes are required per year between 2011-2017, the same as required by CS Policy SP2. The appellant states that it may be arguable that a greater number of 589 should be required although taking account of population migration, this would reduce it to 525 per year.
9. The appeals relating to a site at Hazely Combe, Arreton² have been referred to. In those cases the Inspector who was also considering the SHMA concluded that the Council could show a 5 year supply of housing sites, taking account of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. That Planning Inspector went on to refer to the Core Strategy examining Inspector's report from 2011 which suggested that the prompt release or allocation of sites was necessary.
10. I am told that only draft Area Action Plans have been issued but that these do not allocate significant numbers of proposed housing sites in themselves. Housing supply is and will apparently remain reliant therefore upon windfall sites and the Framework allows for that. The Hazely Combe appeal decisions and the SHMA date from 2014 and I have not been provided with updated evidence of housing completions or what further planning permissions may

² APP/P2114/A/14/2213876 and APP/P2114/A/14/2219750

have been issued. It appears that the Council may just be able show a 5 year supply of housing but I have insufficient information to reach a firm conclusion on that.

11. There would be a particular benefit through the provision of a 2 bedroom dwelling within the Rural East Wight area. According to the SHMA 39.4% of future housing should be of this size. It is not clear what progress is being made towards this since the SHMA was published. The proposal would however make a small but positive contribution to meeting these housing needs, would help support local facilities and may also have some economic benefits. I give a moderate amount of weight to these positive factors.
12. The site is within an accessible location well related to the settlement where occupants would not rely upon private vehicles to reach a number of everyday facilities. A dwelling in this location would have a limited impact in these environmental terms and I consider this is a neutral, un-harmful factor within the overall balance.
13. There would be no adverse impacts upon neighbouring residents or upon the safety of road users. Again, these are neutral factors.
14. 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 as set out in the Framework. I give substantial weight to this harm including the conflict with CS Policies SP1 and DM2.
15. In relation to this matter, even if I were to conclude there is a shortfall in 5 year supply as suggested by the appellant and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The proposal would not be a sustainable form of development and would not comply with the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

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

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR