



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2025

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/24/3350351

57 Old Road, East Cowes, Isle of Wight PO32 6AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Merryfield against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00902/HOU.
 - The development is described as a proposed shed in front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development provided on the application form is quite lengthy and detailed. In the interests of clarity, I have used the description as provided on the Council's decision notice.

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 forms part of the front garden of No. 57, a two storey residential dwelling situated on Old Road. The immediate area is predominantly characterised by houses that are set back from the road, thus providing an element of spaciousness within the street scene.
5. The proposed development would involve the provision of a fairly modest sized shed within the small front garden area. While not particularly large, the proposed shed would reduce the spaciousness of the immediate surroundings to a limited extent, particularly as a result of being situated fairly close to the house itself. Furthermore, a shed of this nature would seem highly incongruous and out of place within the front garden, which in itself would constitute harm in this instance. It is inevitable that the shed would be easily visible from the road, particularly as the front garden area is slightly elevated, and therefore the identified harm would be readily apparent.
6. The appellant has sought to draw my attention to a garage that has been built at No. 73. However, this has been sited at the end of the front garden area, rather than being clearly within it, and is immediately adjacent to the driveway. In addition, it is also located further from the dwelling than the shed that is proposed as part of this appeal. As such, it is not directly comparable to the scheme before

me. In any event, the presence of other sheds or garages to the front of existing properties does not justify allowing an appeal where I have identified harm.

7. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies DM2 and DM11 of the Island Plan Core Strategy, March 2012, the relevant aspects of which seek to ensure that new development is well designed and that it preserves character and appearance.

Conclusion

8. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR