



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2023

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/22/3309507

The Laurels, Station Road, Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, PO41 0QT

- 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 & Mrs Hyland against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref. 22/01069/HOU, dated 13 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2022.
 - The development is proposed integral garage; formation of vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located towards the end of Station Road and comprises a large detached two storey property with a garden at the rear and a small garden to the front. The host property has a traditional appearance, being constructed of red brick, which, on the frontage, has been painted, together with decorative Mock Tudor style beams and render within the double gable ended first floor front elevation and a tiled roof. It forms part of a row of some six similar styled detached properties on the western side of Station Road, some of which are divided into two houses (semis).
4. Whilst there are some variations in the design and detailing of these six properties, most of their original features have been retained and where alterations have taken place the scale of change that has occurred is very modest. A particular feature of the host property is its bay windows set below a mono pitched tiled roof, a feature repeated on adjoining properties, albeit the bay windows of the properties further north are of a slightly different design. The result is an attractive streetscene which is a positive feature of the character of this part of Station Road.
5. The character of this row of six properties is enhanced further by their small front gardens, all of which remain intact. Whilst some include hardstanding they are all enclosed by either low brick/stone walls or low fencing creating a feeling of openness to the street frontage. None of these properties have integral garages and none of their frontages have been altered to provide off-

- street parking. As I observed on site, the latter takes place on street, with parking either time restricted or for resident permit holders.
6. The appeal proposal involves the removal of one of the bay windows, the widening of the gap and the construction of a large aluminium door to serve the garage that would be formed within the existing study to the host. A section of the boundary wall would also be removed to provide vehicular access to Station Road.
 7. Within the above context, the proposed garage door and associated works would result in the introduction of a discordant feature within the frontage to the host property and this part of the streetscene. The proposed garage would have the effect of unbalancing the symmetry of the front elevation, formed by the two identical bay windows. It would create an integral garage that would not be sympathetic to the host property or adjacent properties on this side of Station Road. As I confirmed above, there are no examples of properties in this part of the street with similar integral garages and the appeal proposal would introduce, therefore, a prominent and unsympathetic feature that would be out of keeping with the host property and surrounding properties.
 8. Whilst I sympathise with the personal circumstances of the Appellant and understand their reasons for seeking planning permission for the proposal and also acknowledge the benefit in allowing for an electric charging facility, these considerations, either individually or cumulatively, are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. I also accept that change can be important and should be supported where it allows properties to be adapted to meet owners requirements or to reflect how we live today. However, for the reasons given above, the proposed changes would, in my view, be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.
 9. The Appellant refers to other garages in the area but my attention has not been drawn to any specific example of a similar integral garage to that proposed. On my site visit, I did see a couple of examples of integral garages but these were within a modern infill development and a side extension to an older property and in both cases the sites in question were further to the north west on Victoria Road and do not, therefore, form part of the local context to the appeal site.
 10. I also acknowledge that there are other properties in the area that differ in terms of their design to the host property, but these are mostly commercial uses and their existence does not provide justification for the proposal that is before me. The latter includes the development of garages opposite the appeal site, which the Appellant has referred to. However, the context for that development completely different in that I understand it formed part of the refurbishment and extension of the former Yarmouth railway station building located immediately south of the garages. The design of the garages also replicates that of an old railway shed, further recognition that it is related to and an integral part of the station development and not part of the streetscene that includes the appeal site.
 11. Furthermore, in assessing any of these examples it is important to reemphasise the well-established principle that all applications must be considered on their individual merits having regard to the circumstances of the case and local context. The latter is the approach I have adopted in determining this appeal. Consequently, neither the station garage development nor any other examples

referred to are, in my view, comparable to the appeal proposal and they do not therefore affect my overall findings.

12. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area contrary to policy DM2 of the Island Plan Core Strategy & Development Management Development Plan Document (March 2012). This policy requires, amongst other things, a high quality of design to protect, conserve and enhance the existing environment; in optimising a sites development that regard be had to existing constraints such as adjoining buildings and features that contribute to the character of an area; and to encouraging development that integrates well with its surroundings. This policy is consistent with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) which requires new development to be visually attractive, to add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

13. The Council's Questionnaire indicates that the appeal site falls within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). However, the Council's Delegated Report confirms that the local AONB Partnership team were consulted but had no comment to make on the proposal. Similarly, the Council have not raised this as an issue or a concern in either their Delegated Report or in their objections to the appeal proposal. I concur with those findings and for these reasons there is no need, therefore, for me to consider this matter further.

Conclusion

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

G Roberts

INSPECTOR