



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2022

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E0915/W/22/3305516

30 Lismore Street, Carlisle, Cumbria CA1 2AH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Mohammed against the decision of Carlisle City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0307, dated 8 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of shop frontage revised application.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal before me relates to a part retrospective/revised application and at my site visit I was able to see the works that have already taken place on site which do not accord with the drawings submitted as part of this appeal. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the plans the Council based its decision on.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a hot food takeaway located within a residential setting, occupying a prominent position on the corner where Lismore Street meets Broad Street. At my site visit, I observed that the area is characterised by Victorian terraces which share a uniformity of design detailing including recessed entrances with pillars either side and decorative features above as well as casement windows with headers and cills which are separated by large areas of brickwork. As a result, the area has a clear rhythm of development with an overall cohesive, traditional appearance. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The submitted plans demonstrate that prior to the works that have taken place at the property, the appeal site complemented the established proportions, character, style and scale of other buildings in the area as a result of its architectural detailing. The proposed development would provide 2 large, glazed windows fronting Broad Street and Lismore Street which would comprise transom lights on the upper proportions. Such features would introduce a more modern appearance to the building which would not correspond with the

traditional architectural detailing of other buildings in the area and would appear overly prominent in comparison to other properties.

6. At my site visit, I could see the transom light arrangement within a large, glazed opening and whilst I note that the windows on site are indeed larger than that proposed and the materials and general arrangement would indeed change with the proposals, such features albeit proposed to be reduced in size would nevertheless still not be in keeping in this location and would detract from the character of the area.
7. The proposed front door onto Lismore Street would have a fanlight above with no decorative feature and would be flush with the window framing. Such features would also be at odds with the established architectural detailing of the host property prior to the works that have taken place as well as surrounding properties and would be a stark contrast to the more traditional character.
8. I note the planning history relating to the appeal site including a previous appeal for the installation of a new shop front. However, the previous appeal decision also acknowledged that the former shop front shared a uniformity of design detailing with other residential properties in the area including window sizes, cills, headers, recessed doorways and other decorative features. Although the proposed development would reduce the size of the shop front windows and would provide some architectural features similar to the surrounding properties including pilasters, cornices and stall risers, the proposed development would still introduce discordant features within the existing street scene and would lose architectural features of the property which contributed positively to the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to the objectives of Policy EC7, criteria 1 and 3 of Policy SP6, and criterion 1 of Policy HO12 of the Carlisle District Local Plan which together, amongst other things, requires development to respond to the local context and the form of surrounding buildings. It would also be contrary to the objectives of Carlisle City Council's Shopfront Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which requires shop fronts to contribute to the creation of a strong sense of place within the local context and relate in scale, proportion, materials and decorative treatment to the relevant façade of the building and, where appropriate, to adjacent buildings. The proposed development would also be contrary to chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

10. I note that the property is being renovated internally to bring it up to date and the new shop frontage would complete the upgrade of the premises. However, this would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified taking into account the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually

or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR