
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: 19 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/25/3368288

Land West Of Clarence Road, Wroxall, Isle of Wight

- 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 John Andrews against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01923/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the retention of tractor shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the application, the Council amended the description of development. The appellant confirmed that they do not object to the change in wording. I have therefore used the amended description as part of this decision.
3. I have also utilised the site address as provided on the decision notice.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are: (i) the effect of the development upon protected species and ecological features; and (ii) the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, including the scenic beauty of the Isle of Wight National Landscape.

Reasons

Protected Species and Ecological Features

5. The appeal site is within a grassy paddock, and as such, it is quite possible that protected species inhabit the area. Moreover, the tractor shed which is the subject of this appeal, is of a size which is not insignificant. The protection of such species is a very important matter and, if I were to allow this appeal, I would need to have sufficient certainty that any such impacts would be acceptable or could be suitably mitigated. There is no substantive evidence before me relating to the presence of protected species in this location, or any impact of the development in this regard. Therefore, while unacceptable impacts might be considered unlikely, the lack of evidence means that I simply do not have sufficient certainty that this would be the case. As such, there is potential for harm in relation to this matter.
6. Furthermore, there is also no substantive evidence before me relating to the impact of the development upon biodiversity more generally, including the consideration of Biodiversity Net Gain. I note that the appellant has suggested the

imposition of conditions to require the installation of bird or bat boxes and the provision of additional planting. However, such details are limited, and it is not clear what the impact of such measures would be, and whether they would successfully mitigate any harm caused as a result of the development that has taken place. I note that the appellant has stated that the Council did not ask for details relating to protected species and biodiversity during the application process. However, I can only determine this appeal based on the evidence before me, including the requirements of relevant development plan policies.

7. There are mature trees close to the tractor shed. However, it is notable that the shed does not have a concrete base that could affect the roots of the trees. As such, despite the lack of evidence in this regard, I am satisfied that the development would not have affected the trees to an unacceptable degree.
8. Nevertheless, due to the potential for harm in relation to protected species and biodiversity, I conclude that the development conflicts with Policies SP5, DM2 and DM12 of the Island Plan Core Strategy, March 2012 (the CS). Taken together, the relevant aspects of these policies seek to preserve the natural environment and biodiversity, including by requiring new development to contribute to environmental enhancement where appropriate and practicable.

Character and Appearance

9. The paddock in which the shed is located is situated close to the edge of the village of Wroxall, and 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.
10. The B3327 runs north to south on the eastern side of the appeal site. From the road, the topography of the land slopes downwards into a valley. There are mature trees and hedgerows adjacent to the road which have the effect of partially screening views of the tractor shed. Moreover, even where views are possible, the shed appears as a relatively minor structure. Its appearance, by way of the materials used including its wooden exterior, conforms with the rural character of the surroundings. In essence, the shed appears as a perfectly natural addition to the landscape.
11. As such, I am satisfied that the development preserves the character and appearance of the area, including the scenic beauty of the NL. Moreover, the appearance of the shed, including the materials used, is sufficient to adhere to the legislative requirements set out above. I therefore conclude that the development conforms with CS Policies SP5, DM2 and DM12, the relevant aspects of which seek to ensure that development is well designed and that it preserves character and appearance, including the beauty of the NL. The development would also conform with Policy 39 of the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2019 – 2024 (the AONBMP) which has similar aims.

Other Matters

12. While not included within the Council's decision notice as a reason for refusal, the officer report raises concerns about the justification or need for the tractor shed.

Indeed, it is noted that CS Policy SP1 does state that, outside of identified locations, development proposals will not be supported unless a specific local need is identified. Furthermore, Policy P39 of the AONBMP also states that evidence of need for development in a particular location should be provided. In this instance, the appellant has stated that the need is associated with the storage of a tractor and other equipment related to the management of the land.

13. I note that the Council has sought to argue that the equipment could be stored in other buildings on the site. From the evidence before me, it is not completely clear which buildings are lawfully in place, and which are not. However, it seems to me that the appellant's arguments are compelling, and in particular I can see no reason to doubt that other buildings on the site are either required for other purposes or are not suitable. As such, I am satisfied that the need for the shed has been adequately demonstrated through this appeal.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the development has the potential to result in harm to protected species and biodiversity. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, notwithstanding that I have not found harm in relation to character and appearance or trees. Whilst the provision of the tractor shed is likely to be helpful in relation to the management of the land, the small-scale nature of the scheme means that any such benefits are likely to be limited. Accordingly, 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