

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2024

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F0935/D/24/3343360

20 Rosehill Drive, Morton Park, Carlisle CA2 6HL

- 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 Darren Schofield against the decision of Cumberland Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0052.
 - The development proposed is described as I would like to put a 20ft container to the side of the property, partly for extra storage and partly for a garden room, approximate dimensions are 20ft x 8ft x 6ft height. I also plan on a new fence in front of container and some cladding to take eye off it.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Although there is a part-built structure to the side of the dwelling in the area where the container is proposed that structure does not reflect the size or design of the container shown on the submitted plans. Furthermore, the fence to the side is not that which is proposed. I have therefore considered the appeal based on the development proposed on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed container would be sited to the side of an end terraced dwelling found in a residential area characterised by residential properties of a similar style and design. They are finished broadly in the same materials. An open grassed amenity space is next to the appeal site and the junction of Rosehill Drive and Greenside Road. This is replicated on the opposite side of the junction. A timber panel and concrete post fence of varying height extends along the site's boundary with the amenity space.
5. Owing to the proposed container's utilitarian and functional design together with its siting to the side of the host property, the proposal would not respond to local character insofar as reinforcing the uncomplicated local architectural style that is complemented by the consistent use of materials such as brick

and tiles. This is despite the single-storey elements that are to the side of a number of properties in the area, including the appeal property.

6. Cladding is proposed to help assimilate the container into its environment. While the proposed contemporary look would help soften the introduction of a stark feature into the area, the cladding would not mitigate the proposal's harmful effect due to its design and siting, especially as the container would rise above the height of the proposed fences to the side of the property. Due to the site's location near the junction and the amenity space, the container would be a prominent addition to the area.
7. Even though neighbours did not raise any concerns about the proposal, this does not alter or outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, it is open to the appellant to propose an alternative scheme to the Council in the first instance to see if a solution can be found.
8. The appellant raises points about the Council's handling of the planning application, but the Council can only reach a formal view on a proposal once a planning application is before them. I have, in any event, considered the proposal on its planning merits. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Policies SP 6 (1 and 3) and HO 8 (1 and 5) of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, section 5 of the Achieving Well Designed Housing Supplementary Planning Document and paragraph 135 b) and c) of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies, among other things, seek development to reinforce local architectural features to promote, maintain, and respect local character and distinctiveness and make use of appropriate materials and detailing so that the development is a positive addition.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a decision other than in accordance with this.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR