
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/17/3167397

19 Mountfield Road, Wroxall, Isle of Wight PO38 3BX

- 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 Mr T Fineran against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref P/00988/16, dated 14 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2 bed bungalow to the rear of No 19 Mountfield Road, Wroxall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is to the rear of No 19 which spacious grassed area, enclosed by timber fencing, the gate alongside No 19 and on one side by the dwelling at No 21. The surrounding area is residential with a range of dwelling types and styles although most are set back in a conventional position a similar distance back from the road and No 19 is no exception to that.
4. The access into the site runs alongside No 19 and the proposed modest single storey dwelling would be set back towards the rear of the main rectangular shaped part of the site. The dwelling would be out of view from the street as it would be in tandem with the 2 storey dwelling at No 19. The proposed dwelling and its position would be similar to the adjoining dwelling at No 21 albeit with a reduced size. That adjoining dwelling is in an unusual position relative to the road and most other dwellings nearby.
5. Unlike the adjoining dwelling at No 21, the proposed dwelling would be set behind another dwelling. This would be in a similar position as a proposal which was considered in a previous appeal decision¹. My colleague considered that a single storey dwelling could be developed without unacceptably harming the street scene as it would be behind the existing 2 storey dwelling at No 19. However, it is clear in that decision that the Inspector considered the sub-

¹ APP/P2114/A/14/2227919

division of the site as proposed would unacceptably harm the established character of the area. I agree with that position and give that Inspectors decision substantial weight.

6. A new dwelling in this location would still be noticeable from nearby rear gardens, from the rear windows of neighbouring dwellings and the change in character would be very apparent even it would be screened from the road. As well as the additional building, the use by a new household increasing the activity in a rearward position would also change the character of the area. The increase in density of development in the area would have a greater impact than if the existing household at No 19 were to use the site as a garden or construct outbuilding upon it.
7. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. This would not protect the environment. It has not been demonstrated how the proposal would enhance the character and context of the local area. The proposal would therefore not comply with Policies SP1 and DM2 of the Island Plan² (IP). It would be a poor design, in terms set out in paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. The site is within Wroxall which is a Rural Service Centre identified in IP Policy SP1. This residential development in an accessible location would be a benefit of limited weight in favour of the proposal helping to meet targets set down in other policies such as IP Policy SP2. There would be some impact upon the privacy of neighbouring properties and No 19 due to the position of the proposed dwelling. However these would not be harmful effects. Overall these other matters do not outweigh my conclusions on the first main issue.

Conclusion

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

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

² Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including waste and minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document, adopted March 2012