



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2024

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F0935/D/24/3350326

3 Syke Road, Wigton, Cumbria CA7 9LX

- 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 Miss Christine Stagg against the decision of Cumberland Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/2024/0055.
 - The development proposed is construction of entrance porch and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. An amended plan, drawing no: 004, Rev B, was submitted during the application. However, the appellant asked the Council to determine the application based on drawing no: 004, Rev A. This is the basis on which I have determined the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No 5 Syke Road (No 5) with regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site (No 3) is a traditional, two storey, semi-detached dwelling. It is attached to No 1 Syke Road, in a row of similar style housing. It is set back some distance from a wide, straight road, and has a large parking area to the front. A traditional stone wall with distinctive capping forms the front boundary wall and stretches along this side of Syke Road. On the opposite side of the road there are bungalows with low front walls, set behind a wide grass verge.
5. The proposed entrance porch and garage would extend development a significant distance from the front of the existing house and would infill the area between the side elevation and the boundary with No 5. However, this side of Syke Road is characterised by uncluttered fronts, free from development, other than small porches. This results in a uniformity to the housing. It is this consistency of appearance, set behind the stone boundary

wall and free of garages and front extensions, which contributes positively to the visual character of the area.

6. Extending up to the boundary and building a substantial forward projection would, therefore, unbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings. Despite the proposed development being single storey, the size and form of the extension would overwhelm, and not be sympathetic to No 3. A combination of the scale and one-sided nature of the front extension would result in the proposal appearing incongruous in this location. This is especially as it would disrupt the existing pattern and rhythm of the housing along this side of Syke Road, all with a similar front building line. Moreover, as the front of the site is open and highly visible, the proposed development in this location would be visually intrusive.
7. Therefore, as a result, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
8. It would not accord with Policies S4, S32, DM14 and DM15 of the Allerdale Local Plan, (Part 1) 2014¹, (ALP). Together these policies require the design of development to be of an appropriate scale and appearance which respects and integrates with the character and appearance of the site and the local area.

Living conditions of No 5

9. The proposed extension would be constructed along the boundary with No 5. Whilst there is limited evidence of ground floor windows on the side elevation of No 5, I observed one narrow window from the roadside. Photographic evidence also points to a 1st floor window on this elevation. Although there are trees close to the fence within the grounds of No 5, these are slightly forward of the front elevation, and so do not block any side windows.
10. The existing high fence between the two properties is a slim structure with a physical gap either side of it. Although the fence already affects the outlook from any ground floor windows at No 5, it is not of solid construction. Instead, an extension with a pitched roof built along a considerable length of the boundary, and higher than the fence, would result in a sense of enclosure and be oppressive to the occupiers. This would unacceptably harm the outlook of the occupiers of No 5.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 5 with regards to outlook. It would not accord with ALP Policy S32 which requires development to not have an unacceptable effect on residential amenity, including increasing a sense of enclosure.

Other Matters

12. The appellant refers to the roof of No 1 being altered from slate to a tiled roof, indicating that the appearance of nearby properties does vary. Such a change is not directly comparable to the proposed extension, and in any case, I have considered the appeal on its own merits, based on the evidence before me.
13. The appellant's evidence includes several photographs, including one showing single storey front and side extensions. However, as there is no explanation or

¹ Strategic and Development Management Policies

location of the extensions, it does not provide any weight in favour of allowing this proposal.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and that warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.
15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR