

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2018

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/17/3180453

Roud Road, Roud, Godshill PO38 3LH

- 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 BCM against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref P/01259/16, dated 15 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is stables and change of use of land to mixed use – equestrian and agricultural.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 30 January 2018.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for stables and change of use of land to mixed use – equestrian and agricultural at Roud Road, Roud, Godshill PO38 3LH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/01259/16, dated 15 September 2016, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural matter

2. The address given on the planning application form incorrectly refers to the road as Roud Lane; I have corrected this to Roud Road.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located in a rural location in an area with undulating land. The fields are generally relatively small and separated by hedgerows. A number of agricultural and equestrian buildings are located in the vicinity of the appeal site; typically these are located close to roads. The appeal site is located adjacent to Roud Road; it sits a little below the brow of a hill. There is a stable block located in the adjacent field to the south west and it is sited close to the boundary with the road.

5. The proposed stable block would be of a fairly modest size, with a mono-pitched roof and a low overall height; it would be located close to the road. It would have a similar appearance to other buildings in the area. The location of the building, being a little below the brow of the hill, would prevent it from significantly breaking the skyline and so it would not appear as unduly exposed. In view of this and the proximity to the nearby building it would not appear isolated when seen from local roads. Views of the building from the nearby footpaths 17 and 18 would be limited due to the topography of the land and intervening vegetation. Where there would be glimpsed views this would be at a significant distance and the building would appear as a modest structure set within a landscape of similar buildings.
6. The change of use would result in horses being present on the land. This is not uncommon in a rural setting and no harm would arise to the character and appearance of the area from the change of use.
7. I therefore conclude that the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with Policies SP1, SP5, DM2, or DM12 of the Island Plan which together seek to ensure that development conserves the character of the area, the natural environment and the landscape whilst allowing change to take place.

Other matters

8. It appears that there is consent to erect a building on land within the same ownership as the appeal site. The stable block, its self, would be a modest structure which would take up little land and the proposal is to retain an agricultural use. I therefore have no substantive evidence that this development would render the wider agricultural activities unviable.
9. Some highway safety concerns have been raised. The development would utilise an existing field access and the nature of the use of the land would be such that vehicle movements are likely to be very modest. As such I consider that the use of the existing access would not result in any significant highway safety issues.
10. I note that an interested party suggests that the site is located within the Green Belt; however the information from the Council confirms that this is not the case. I also note the comments about the name in which the application is made and other detailed matters in respect of the information on the appeal form. However, there is no evidence that there were any procedural discrepancies in respect of the notification process or the ownership certificate.

Conditions

11. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. The plans specify the proposed external materials so a separate condition to deal with this is not necessary. The change of use and the building could give rise to a propensity for items related to feed and bedding to be stored on the land; this could have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such a condition is necessary to require that such items are stored in the building. It is however only reasonable that this relates to the equestrian use and not the agricultural use of the land.
12. The hedge adjacent to Roud Road is sparse, however as the stable block would be a modest structure which would not appear out of place, the building or the

change of use do not necessitate additional landscaping. There is no evidence that the development is likely to result in the addition of significant lighting infrastructure and as such a condition to control this is unnecessary. The Council has suggested a condition relating to an access track, passing bay and parking area. This appears to relate to a different development and so a condition to this effect is not necessary.

13. I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions in the interests of clarity and having regard to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would accord with the development plan when it is considered as a whole. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan:KC.147/5.B.
3. No straw, foodstuff or other feed and bedding materials relating to the equestrian use shall be stacked or stored on the site other than within the building hereby approved.