



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/25/3371013

2 St Michael's Road, St Helens, Ryde, Isle of Wight PO33 1YJ

- 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 & Mrs Andrew & Sue Tolley against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00567/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the removal of the chimney; proposed porch; alterations to fenestration and cladding of all elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the removal of the chimney; proposed porch; alterations to fenestration and cladding of all elevations at 2 St Michael's Road, St Helens, Ryde, Isle of Wight PO33 1YJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 25/00567/HOU and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The cladding shall be in a colour with details first submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and thereafter remain in this colour unless a change is again agreed under that procedure;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 24:165:001; 24:165:002A; 24:165:003A.

Application for Costs

2. An application for an award of costs was made by Mr & Mrs Andrew & Sue Tolley against the Isle of Wight Council. This is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the alterations to No. 2 St Michael's Road on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the St Helen's Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. In rejecting the proposed fibre cement weatherboarding to clad the bungalow, the Decision Notice says that *'it would be harmful to the setting and appearance of the St Helen's Conservation Area'*.

5. The glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024, ('the Framework') defines the setting of a heritage asset (in this case the conservation area) as '*The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced*'.
6. No. 2 St Michael's Road is on the west side of the road, and the north boundary of the garden is also a small part of the boundary of West Green, a large area of open green space that forms part of the conservation area.
7. However, although it is the first building on the western side of the road and therefore prominent, the bungalow is of a modest scale and a conventional design typical of the mid-C20th. It is not read as a separate visual entity, as in views from within the conservation area it is seen together with the neighbouring dwellings on both sides of St Michaels Road as part of the built-up area of St Helens.
8. To draw the eye and be perceived negatively to the extent that it spoils the experience of observing West Green as a pleasing area of openness from either outside the conservation area or indeed within it, the proposed external treatment of No. 2 would have to be either of a highly unconventional form or of a strong primary colour. This is because of the building's ordinary appearance and modest size, a combination that even though in a prominent position, does not invite further scrutiny of the bungalow.
9. Moreover, I saw on my visit that St Michaels Road has a variety of house types and external materials on its western side, in some cases including areas of cladding. The grounds of appeal cite other examples in the locality, including within the conservation area itself. I consider this confirms that the proposal would not stand out as being out of keeping with its surroundings. It would also remove the artificial stone which is of limited visual merit. The application file includes the written support of half a dozen local residents who support the change from the existing reconstituted stone to cladding and their views should carry some weight.
10. Furthermore, the appellant has explained that external wall insulation is the only viable means of significantly improving the thermal performance of the property and that this limits the options to either render or cladding. I am minded to agree that of these, cladding would be the preferred choice. Because the adjoining part of the conservation area is open land rather than built form, the decision does not need to have the rigour that might be necessary in the event of there being a neighbouring building of a particular architectural style, or even with listed status.
11. Overall, I conclude that the proposed cladding would not cause harm to the character and appearance either the conservation area, its setting, or the wider locality in conflict with Policies DM2 and DM11 of the Island Plan Core Strategy 2012, or with the Framework. I shall therefore allow the appeal.
12. A condition to limit the options of the colour of the cladding will safeguard visual amenity, whilst a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR