



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2022

by G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E0915/D/21/3288392

5 Chestnut Grove, Linstock, Carlisle CA6 4RS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Geoff Hall against the decision of Carlisle City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0700, dated 7 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front porch to provide entrance lobby & wc.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is the end home of three within a converted former barn. The building retains a strong but simple linear form, particularly along its front elevation. Visible ventilation slits (now blocked up) are evident on the gable elevations whilst the timber panels below the window openings provide further references to the building's previous use as a barn. Whilst the building lies within a modern residential setting, it retains sufficient elements that hint at its previous function and character and provide a contextual link with other older properties nearby.
4. The proposed porch would be a not inconsiderable addition to the front of property. Its width would be substantial in the context of the appeal property's frontage and it would be a dominant and disruptive addition to the front of No. 5. It would, as a consequence, dominate and disrupt the strong and simple linear form otherwise present across the building's frontage and erode the retained character of the building as a converted former barn. The context within which the appeal building lies is noted, but so too is that of the converted range of which it forms part.
5. Carlisle Local Plan (LP) policy SP6 sets out the Council's approach to securing good design and states, amongst other things, that proposals should respond to local context, form massing and detailing (criterion 1) and take into account the historic environment (criterion 4) whilst LP policy HO8 states that house extensions should relate to, and complement the existing building in scale, design and form. For the reasons I have set out, the proposal would fail to do so and would thus be in conflict with LP policies SP6 and HO8.

6. The incorporation of an oak entrance frame is noted and, together with the glazed panels on one corner of the proposed porch, would be an attractive element of the proposal. However, these features would not alter the form of the proposed extension or its impact on the form or character of the appeal property and do not, as a consequence, alter my conclusions set out above.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR