



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/25/3371942

Land west of Clarence Road, Wroxall, Ventnor PO38 3LS

- 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 and Mrs John and Sarah Andrews against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00796/FUL.
 - The development proposed is one additional shipping container.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for one additional shipping container at Land west of Clarence Road, Wroxall, Ventnor PO38 3LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00796/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 552/VW/25/1 and 552/VW/25/2.
 - 2) The shipping container hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for storage purposes ancillary to the authorised use of the land.

Preliminary Matters

2. The shipping container was already in position at the time of my site visit. I am therefore dealing with the appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the landscape and scenic beauty of the Isle of Wight National Landscape (the NL), and whether a local need has been demonstrated for the proposal.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies in the countryside just outside Wroxall, and within the NL. This part of the NL is a rolling, undeveloped agricultural landscape comprising fields of varying sizes divided by hedges, some of which are cropped, and others allowed to grow. From the B3327 to the east, the land slopes down to the appeal site and then rises up to a ridge. The east-facing slope is a prominent expanse of land made up of grass fields, hedges, and small blocks of woodland. It has an open character, with few buildings, and provides a wide and attractive countryside vista.
5. The site itself is a fairly narrow strip of land at the bottom of the slope, together with a perpendicular track rising up the incline to the B3327. The main part of the site is set back from the road behind an open grass paddock, and is somewhat

segregated from the wider countryside beyond by a line of trees and a hedgerow. The site accommodates an array of permanent and portable buildings arranged in linear fashion parallel to the hedgerow and trees. The structures are varied, but utilitarian in appearance. Whilst they are set against the backdrop of the hedge and trees, they are readily visible from the road across the open paddock. As a group, they have a rather incongruous urban character in this attractive countryside setting. The site does not, therefore, contribute positively to the landscape and scenic beauty of the NL.

6. The legislation¹ requires that, in determining this appeal, I must seek to further the purposes for which the NL was designated. Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework says great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
7. The absence of roadside hedging means that the shipping container is readily visible from a long stretch of the B3327. Being an angular metal structure, it has an industrial character, making it an incongruous feature in this scenic rural location. Although it is seen as part of a group of buildings, including another shipping container, it is the most northerly of the linear group, so it adds to the extent of the cumulative development. However, when approaching from the north, it is seen in front of the larger container to the south, so has little additional visual impact. Furthermore, although the container is seen as an extension to the group from southerly viewpoints, it is painted dark green, so it visually recedes against the background of the boundary hedge. Consequently, its impact on the character and appearance of the wider landscape is limited.
8. The evidence indicates that the container replaced two pre-existing tin sheds. There is nothing before me to indicate that these were unlawful structures. Whilst they were not as tall as the container, the photographic evidence shows that they were equally industrial in character, and were a paler colour, so were more visually distinguishable against the backdrop of the hedge. I am satisfied that the replacement of these buildings with a single movable structure, in a darker colour, resulted in no net harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the development has preserved the landscape and scenic beauty of the NL.
9. Notwithstanding that I have found there to be no harm to the landscape, Policy SP1 of the Island Plan Core Strategy² states that, outside of identified locations, development proposals will not be supported unless a specific local need is identified. Policy P40 of the Isle of Wight National Landscape: Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2025-2030 also requires evidence of need for development proposals. However, in both cases, there is little guidance in the supporting text as to what defines a local need.
10. In this case, the appellant has stated that the container is needed for the secure storage of valuable equine equipment that was previously stored in the tin sheds. I saw at my site visit that the container was being fully utilised for this purpose. The equipment is required in connection with the use of the site and adjacent land for

¹ Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended by section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023)

² Island Plan: The Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy (including Minerals & Waste) and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (March 2012)

private equine activities. There is no evidence before me to indicate that this is not a lawful use for planning purposes.

11. It is contended that the equipment could be stored in one of the other buildings/structures on the site. However, I saw at my visit that the adjacent container was fully occupied by a workbench and tools for maintaining equipment and machinery on the land. The other lawful container houses strimmers, chainsaws, a lawn mower, and a generator. The other structures on the site are timber stables and sheds, and a mobile home, none of which provide the secure storage required in a remote rural location. I also saw that the volume of the equipment stored in the container could not easily be transported to and from the site when required, or housed in a tack locker within one of the other structures. I am therefore satisfied that a need for the container in association with the use of the site has been demonstrated.
12. To conclude, a local need for the development has been demonstrated, and the container has preserved the landscape and scenic beauty of the NL. The proposal therefore accords with Policies SP1, SP5, DM2 and DM12 of the Island Plan Core Strategy which seek, amongst other things, to direct development to appropriate locations, and to preserve the landscape and natural environment.

Conditions

13. As the development has already taken place there is no need to impose a condition limiting the time for implementation. I have, however, included a condition specifying the relevant plans, as this provides certainty. The Council has suggested a condition limiting the storage use to purposes connected with the authorised use of the land, which I agree is reasonable and necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR