



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

**by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 20 October 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/20/3245830**

**Land adjacent to Genista, Maythorne Way, Luccombe, Isle of Wight  
PO37 6RX**

- 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 Ken Scovell against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
  - The application Ref 19/01396/FUL, dated 9 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as a "new holiday unit".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The Council confirmed that the correct spelling of the adjoining property is 'Genista' which I have used in the banner above.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area including the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

### Reasons

4. Policy SP1 of the Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy) sets out the Council's spatial strategy for the island and states that outside of defined settlements, proposals for tourism related development will be supported in accordance with Policy SP4 of the Core Strategy.
5. Policy SP4 of the Core Strategy seeks to support tourism related development which would increase the quality of existing tourism destinations and accommodation throughout the Island. Such opportunities should utilise the unique characteristics of the historic and natural environments, without comprising their integrity.
6. The appeal site lies within the AONB. Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs and that the scale and extent of development within this designated area should be limited. Policies DM2 and DM12 of the Core Strategy also seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments complement the character of the surrounding area, particularly in AONBs.

7. Luccombe is a small village that is mainly centred around Maythorne Way and Ash Grove. The area is rural in character and contains a variety of size and style of property in the vicinity of the appeal site, which on the whole are detached dwellings set within modest sized gardens. The area has a pleasant and verdant character which is set within a rolling open landscape.
8. The proposed holiday unit would be constructed over two floors, taking account of the site levels. It would be positioned centrally within the site, utilising an existing access off Maythorne Way with parking and turning areas also provided, with the remainder of the site given over to garden areas associated with the holiday unit.
9. The appeal site previously contained what the Council described as a timber chalet/summerhouse building which has permission to be replaced with a new holiday unit<sup>1</sup>. The site has since been cleared of buildings and although surrounded by trees and hedging which shields it from local views, given the topography of the land which rises steeply to the west, dwellings along Maythorne Way and Ash Grove are visible from A3055 Bonchurch Road and the appeal site is clearly visible through its access.
10. Landscaping to the boundaries, particularly to the rear (west), contains deciduous trees that will not screen the development effectively during the winter months when they shed their leaves. Given that the appellant seeks to secure a holiday unit that would be occupied all year round, and in line with the thrust of Policy SP4 of the Core Strategy, it is expected that the proposal would be used during these months. Therefore, although the development does not propose roof lights, the positioning of the two storey building towards the centre of the site would be noticeable through the landscaping, especially during the evening and darker months when the building is likely to be illuminated from within. It would also be clearly visible through the access into the site.

Notwithstanding the presence of residential properties in the vicinity of the appeal site, it is located within the AONB and so has the highest status of protection in relation to conserving and enhancing its landscape and scenic beauty. Moreover, new development is more restricted in this area and I remain unpersuaded that the building would indeed conserve or enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of the landscape character of the AONB. Whilst the proposed holiday unit may not be as intrusive in the landscape when compared to other properties in the vicinity, it nonetheless remains important to protect the intrinsic qualities of the area, which as a designated landscape is very sensitive to change. The scale, design and location of the proposed holiday unit would undoubtedly alter the site to the detriment of the scenic beauty of the AONB and, by failing to complement its overall character, would harm its integrity.

11. Consequently, the development would be in conflict with Policies SP4, DM2 and DM12 of the Core Strategy and the objectives of the Framework which seek, amongst other things, to conserve the character and local distinctiveness of the AONB, protect the visual qualities of the environment, seek high quality design, and complement the character of the AONB.

### **Other Matters**

12. The appellant makes reference to other holiday units that have been approved at Highcliffe, 6 Luccombe Road and Rose Acre and an extension at Sea Tang. Invariably, such cases will depend on their individual circumstances and so whilst noting these other decisions, they are not determinative in this appeal. Moreover,

---

<sup>1</sup> P/01197/17 dated 12 March 2018

I have not been provided with full details of these developments in order that I can make a direct comparison to the proposal before me. In any event, I have considered this appeal on its own merits which is a fundamental principle that underpins the planning system.

13. I acknowledge that the appellant seeks to provide a higher quality development for tourists and that a diverse range of accommodation to meet such expectations is necessary. I also accept that the development would contribute towards the Island's economy. However, while noting the benefits that would result in this respect, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

*Graham Wyatt*

**INSPECTOR**