



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2022

**by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/22/3291179**

**14 Johnson Road, Newport PO30 5NR**

- 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 D Wray, against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
  - The application Ref 21/02105/HOU, dated 19 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2021.
  - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as "Addition of first floor to existing single storey garage to form space solely for ancillary/domestic use as part of the host property 14 Johnson Road".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene and locality.

### Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two storey end of terrace dwelling with a single storey side addition. Similar terraced housing characterises the locality. Next to the host property there is a single storey double detached garage. Because of its height this is clearly subordinate to the associated dwelling. However, the outbuilding would have an additional floor added, creating a two storey structure with the ridge of its pitched roof only being slightly below that of the host dwelling.
4. The proposed elevations do not enable a comparison of the overall widths of the front elevations of the host dwelling and outbuilding. However, based on the block plan it is clear that the width of the enlarged two storey outbuilding would be broadly similar to that of the host dwelling at this height. Furthermore, the former would have a front two storey gable feature. This would provide an abrupt, discordant and jarring contrast with the adjacent dwelling where the only front projection is single storey with a noticeably less bulky form, having a mono-pitch roof sloping down from the main wall.
5. The resultant two storey gable would also extend noticeably further forwards than the single storey projection. Other dwellings nearby often have flat front elevations with no forward projections. Moreover, the two storey gable would be a particularly unusual and bulky feature, while also being unduly out of keeping with the general rhythm of front elevations found in the vicinity. In

- this context, the enlarged outbuilding, rather than being subordinate to the host dwelling, would be unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive.
6. There is a detached two storey dwelling immediately to the south of the detached pair of garages in Harris Road. The space to the rear boundary in this part of the appeal site is fairly limited. In consequence, the development would result in adjacent two storey buildings in unduly close proximity sited so that their rear elevations face each other. In the context of the locality this would reflect a relatively unusual and cramped relationship, unacceptably at odds with the general pattern of development.
  7. The adjacent dwelling lends no significant support to the appeal for this reason but can also be distinguished as it involves a house rather than an outbuilding. It also has a somewhat freestanding position, rather than being located at the end of a line of dwellings as with the extended garages. More efficient use of the site and the provision of a structure with storage and garage space would be achieved in this case at the unacceptable expense of the quality of the built environment.
  8. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the character and appearance of the streetscene and locality would be harmed. The development would therefore conflict with Policy DM2 of the Island Plan Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including Waste and Minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document, March 2012, the aims of which include seeking high quality design which complements the character of the surrounding area.
  9. The development would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). This indicates that decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, which would not be achieved in this case.
  10. There is no objection in relation to the area of amenity space available to be used by occupiers of the host dwelling and extended outbuilding for matters such as recreation. However, this is a separate consideration relating to living conditions rather than concerning the effect on character and appearance and mere acceptability in this regard does not weigh positively in favour of the appeal.
  11. The development would enable the Appellant's daughter to live at the property in order to attend University/College. This is said to be necessary because of the rarity of affordable housing on the Isle of Wight and none being available locally. It is argued that this situation is exacerbated by the absence of a 5 year housing land supply, as well as by only 54% of housing need having been met on the Isle of Wight in the last three years.
  12. Normally, the weight attributed to these matters depends on the contribution of the proposed development to the supply of dwellings. However, in this case there would clearly be no contribution and the Appellant stresses that the proposal does not constitute a new dwelling. In consequence, this is not a matter that can be afforded any meaningful weight.
  13. It is also suggested that Paragraph 11 of the Framework concerning the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies because of the housing land supply shortfall resulting in development plan policies being out of date. However, this is not the case because the application would not result in

the provision of any new houses and footnote 8 regarding this matter cannot apply.

14. Nevertheless, personal circumstances are a material consideration. However, in my experience they rarely justify permitting built development. I conclude that in this case the development would be likely to remain long after the circumstances used to justify it cease to apply. Even if there was some fairly modest effect in terms of reducing the demand for accommodation on the Isle of Wight, this would not justify accepting such a harmful development as that now proposed.
15. Having regard to the above considerations, because of the harmful effects that would arise it is decided, taking account of all other matters raised, that the appeal fails.

*M Evans*

INSPECTOR