

## The Planning Inspectorate

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line 0117 - 987 8927 Switchboard 0117 - 987 8000 Fax No 0117 - 987 8139 GTN 1374 - 8927

E-mail ENQUIRIES.PINS@GTNET.GOV.UK

Taylor and Hardy Chartered Town Planners 9 Finkle Street CARLISLE CA3 8UU

Your Ref; C97/122 Our Ref; T/APP/E0915/A/98/290537/P7

Date:

1 MAY 1998

Dear Sirs

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6 APPEAL BY MR AND MRS HOLT APPLICATION NO: 97/0458

- 1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions to determine this appeal against the decision of the Carlisle City Council to refuse planning permission for a new house on land at 1 Eden Mount, Stanwix, Carlisle. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by interested persons including those made directly to the Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 14 April 1998.
- 2. The appeal site is situated within the Stanwix Conservation Area and is presently a garden area to 1 Eden Mount which is a Grade II listed building. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and Section 66(1) of the same Act requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building.
- 3. From the foregoing, my inspection of the site and its surroundings, and from the written representations, I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character of the Stanwix Conservation Area.
- 4. The Development Plan for the area includes the Carlisle District Local Plan (CDLP). Policy H2 states that proposals for new residential development will be acceptable provided that certain criteria are met of which criterion 3 requires that the proposed development complements or enhances existing adjacent residential areas and their amenity. Policy E43 reflects Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and provides that the Council will seek to ensure that any new development is in sympathy with the setting, scale, density and physical characteristics of the Conservation Area. Policy E35 states that proposals for new development which adversely affect a listed building or its setting will not be permitted.



- 5. The appeal site is about 290 square metres and is an overgrown garden area containing several fruit trees. Its north, east and west boundaries are defined by high brick walls whereas its south boundary, which fronts onto St George's Crescent, is defined by a low brick wall with wooden fencing above. The east boundary adjoins a lane which separates the appeal site from the main curtilage of 1 Eden Mount. Immediately to the west of the site is a pair of three storey semi-detached dwellings, 4 and 6 St George's Crescent, and to the north is a garden area and double garage.
- 6. The neighbouring dwellings are typical of properties, though some others are detached, on the north side of St George's Crescent. I agree with the Council that these dwellings, and also those on Eden Mount to the east, have a substantial scale, being two or three storeys with steep pitched roofs. On the opposite side of St George's Crescent detached houses set in substantial grounds predominate. The rear elevation of the proposed two storey dwelling would be built on the north boundary of the appeal site and its east gable wall would be built on the boundary to the lane. Apart from a narrow gap between the west gable wall and the adjoining boundary, which tapers from about 2 metres to about 0.5 metres, the building takes up the full width of the appeal site.
- 7. The area in front of the dwelling would provide a parking area for two cars, side by side, and a garden area. All of the dwellings on St George's Crescent have rear gardens, which provide private external amenity space, and front gardens which are generally open to the crescent. These garden areas define the setting of the dwellings and are fundamental, in my view, to the character of this part of the Conservation Area. The setting of the proposed dwelling, given the lack of a rear garden and the likely consolidation of screening on the frontage to create a private front garden, would be unsympathetic to the character of the area.
- 8. Compared to the neighbouring dwellings the proposed dwelling would have a relatively shallow pitched roof and its eaves height would be considerably lower. Given also its long front elevation, which would be about 13.5 metres, it is my view that its scale would be contrary to that of its neighbours. Its scale, in fact, would be similar to detached dwellings on the opposite side of the road but these are set in generous grounds. You contend that its scale would be similar to outbuildings and extensions to larger properties on both sides. However, I saw at my site visit that the buildings to which you refer are clearly ancillary to the larger buildings whereas the proposed dwelling would be an individual building with its own road frontage. Given also the proximity of the building to the boundaries of the site it is my view that the proposed dwelling would have an inappropriate scale and the development would have a cramped appearance. In my judgment the appeal site is not large enough to accommodate a dwelling of such a size.
- 9. I agree that the front elevation of the proposed dwelling would reflect a coach house/stable block type building which would be built from reclaimed materials. However, given the proximity and detailed elevations of the neighbouring semi-detached dwellings, it is my view that this appearance would be incongruous. Also, the size and blank nature of the east gable and rear elevations, given their position relative to neighbouring property and the lane, would be insensitive to the appearance of the area. It is my opinion that the proposed dwelling, with regard to its setting, scale, density and physical characteristics, would be harmful to, and would therefore not preserve, the character of this part of the

Conservation Area. The proposal would thus be contrary to criterion 3 of CDLP policy H2 and to CDLP policy E43.

- 10. Turning to other material considerations, 1 Eden Mount is at the end of a terrace of nine similar properties, all of which are listed and have rear garden and amenity areas which have frontages onto the lane. This lane clearly separates the appeal site from the terrace and the immediate curtilage of 1 Eden Mount. In my view the site is not part of, and does not contribute to, the setting of the listed building. Given also the position of the proposed dwelling on the site it is my opinion that the proposal would not adversely affect, and would therefore preserve, the setting of 1 Eden Mount. The proposal would thus accord with CDLP policy E35.
- 11. Taking all these factors into account I have concluded that the proposed dwelling would have a significant adverse effect on the character of the Stanwix Conservation Area. I have decided that the proposal is therefore unacceptable.
- 12. I have taken into account all other matters raised but have found nothing that outweighs the main considerations that have led me to my decision.
- 13. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

Yours faithfully

 $\bigcup$ 

John Braithwaite BSc BArch(Hons) RIBA Inspector

