



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/22/3295052

The Annex, 10 Beech Road, Newport, Isle of Wight, PO30 2AH

- 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 Ms Karen Flux against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02179/HOU, dated 20 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is retention of garden shed. Proposed new vehicular access to include dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for retention of garden shed. Proposed new vehicular access to include dropped kerb at The Annex, 10 Beech Road, Newport, Isle of Wight, PO30 2AH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02179/HOU, dated 20 October 2021, and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing. No. 1; Drawing No.2; and Drawing. No. 3.
 - 2) The vehicle access hereby approved shall not be brought into operation until the adjacent public footway has been remodelled to form a dropped kerb and cross over for vehicle access as detailed on the approved plan, Drawing No. 1.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development as set out in the decision as this more accurately describes the proposal for which permission is sought.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the corner of Beech Road and Robin Hood Street. Whilst the appeal site appears to have been formed as an annex to 10 Beech Road (No.10), the main access to the host property is from Robin Hood Street. The host property is two storeys and set back from Robin Hood Street, with its frontage to that road comprising a small garden, an off street parking space and the proposed shed, which is the subject of this appeal. At the time of my

- site visit, most of the shed was already in place and only some fascia detailing and windows appeared to be missing.
5. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, albeit there is a large vacant building (which appears to have formerly been a public house) directly opposite the appeal site that is boarded up and surrounded by security fencing. There is a large ship container within the car park to this vacant building as well as other building materials in the open.
 6. There is no uniform design or layout to the surrounding residential properties. Whilst they are largely two storeys, the properties vary considerably in terms of their design, style, age, layout, scale and siting. A number of these properties have garages, sheds, single storey extensions and conservatories and other residential paraphernalia to the side, front and rear that are visible within the streetscene.
 7. Within this context, the proposed shed is sited on the corner of the appeal site abutting the back edge of the pavement to Robin Hood Street. It is single storey with a felt roof, and walls that comprise concrete on the lower part painted grey and white UPVC cladding on the upper part. The shed is used for storage, but also includes a covered area for refuse bins. Adjoining this is a car parking space and beyond this a fence on the common boundary with No.10. The pallet of materials and colours used on the proposed shed reflects those used on the host property, as well as on the boundary fencing and garden wall, in front of the host building.
 8. Based on the above and my observations on site, I am satisfied that the design, scale and location of the proposed shed is acceptable and would not be incongruous or unduly conspicuous within the streetscene. The proposed shed is small scale and gives the appearance of a standard outbuilding that you would commonly expect to see in such locations. Whilst I accept that it would be visible from the road, the pallet of materials and colours used, matching those on the host property and the overall quality of the finish, results in a building that harmonises well with the appearance of the host and sits reasonably comfortably on this part of the appeal site.
 9. Although the proposed shed would be sited in front of the building line to the host, as I highlighted above, there is no established building line and the orientation of the host property is somewhat unique given that it appears to have been formed as an annex to No.10. Whilst I accept that the proposal results in a change to the appearance of this part of the streetscene, for the reasons set out above, the proposed shed would not materially detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 10. Accordingly, I find that the proposed shed would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would thus not be at variance with policy DM2 of the Isle of White Core Strategy & Development Management Development Plan Document (March 2012) or paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (Framework).

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested two conditions in their Questionnaire which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions.

12. A condition that requires compliance with the approved plans is necessary and reasonable to reflect the details included in the application. I have, however, added a list of approved plans for clarity. A condition that requires the adjacent footway to be remodelled to provide a dropped kerb and cross over, as shown on the approved plan, is also necessary and reasonable in the interests of highway safety.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR