
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2025

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/25/3368813

2 St Catherines Cottages, Blackgang Road, Niton, Isle of Wight, PO38 2BW

- 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 Jonathan Knight against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00598/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey outbuilding store and car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey outbuilding store and car port at 2 St Catherines Cottages, Blackgang Road, Niton, Isle of Wight, PO38 2BW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00598/HOU, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no: A 0002 Rev P2 (Proposed Plans, Elevations & Street Scene – Store/Car Port).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area, including the scenic beauty of the Isle of Wight National Landscape.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Isle of Wight National Landscape (the NL). Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within NL's. Furthermore, the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 requires decision makers to actively seek to further the statutory purposes of NL's. As a result of the appeal site's location on the edge of a small settlement, close to surrounding countryside, the immediate area does have a spacious quality which contributes to its character.
4. The proposal would introduce a car port and garage within the existing parking area of the dwelling. The development would have a pitched roof; however its overall height and mass would be fairly limited. As such, it would clearly be

perceived as being subservient to the main dwelling itself. In terms of materials, the wooden façade and slate roof would complement the relatively rural surroundings and the appearance of the host dwelling, and it would therefore not appear as an incongruous or out of place structure.

5. Clearly, the proposal would introduce additional built form to the street scape. However, given the location of the appeal site adjacent to an existing sports field, with wide ranging views of the surrounding landscape, I do not consider that the proposal would erode the existing feeling of spaciousness to any meaningful degree.
6. Therefore, while taking account of the fact that the proposed development would be easily visible from public vantage points, I do not find that it would harm the character and appearance of the surroundings, or the intrinsic scenic beauty of the NL. The proposal would therefore conform with Policies DM2 and DM12 of the Island Plan Core Strategy, March 2012. Taken together, the relevant aspects of these policies seek to ensure that new development is well designed and that it preserves character and appearance, including important landscapes. It would also conform with Policy 40 of the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2019 – 2024, which seeks to preserve the natural beauty of the NL. Finally, there would be no conflict with the relevant aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework or the requirements of Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which in part, have similar aims to the above development plan policies.

Other Matters

7. A similar proposal has been considered at appeal in relation to the neighbouring property of 1 St Catherines Cottages¹. Each proposal has been considered on its merits. However, for the avoidance of doubt, even if one were to consider the cumulative effect of the two proposals, I do not consider that they would lead to harm in relation to character and appearance or the scenic beauty of the NL.

Conditions

8. I have imposed conditions to identify the relevant timescales and plans in the interests of certainty. A further condition relating to materials is necessary to preserve character and appearance. I note that Island Roads have suggested a condition that would limit the use of the development to vehicle parking and ancillary storage. However, the description of development is clear, and therefore any alternative use would require a separate permission. As such, this condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development is in accordance with the development plan when considered as a whole. Having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal reference: APP/P2114/D/25/3368810