
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/17/3167859

32A Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth LA5 9TB.

- 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 & Mrs Tim and Julia Walker against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/01200/FUL, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension over the existing terrace and construction of a first floor rear balcony.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The site visit for this appeal was arranged for 30 May. At the appointed time there was nobody at the property. However I am satisfied that I was able to view the site and its surroundings sufficiently to enable me to proceed to a decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, bearing in mind its location within the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

4. I am aware that previous proposals have been considered at this property, the most recent of which was dismissed on appeal in August 2016. The proposal before me seeks to address the reason for the refusal of that scheme.
 5. Although I do not have the drawings of the previous scheme before me in this appeal, I acknowledge the point that the wall projecting at the rear has been reduced in scale. Nonetheless I do not agree that the proposal would be invisible from most angles. My observations at the site visit indicate that the height of the enclosure above the existing roof terrace would be readily visible from the street to the north-west. From this direction it would appear as an incongruous glass enclosure extending from the solid tiled roof of the dwelling.
 6. From the south and east direction, albeit at greater distance, the proposal would also be a discordant element in the form of the house. Here the raised
-

wall would be of greatest prominence, together with the balcony affixed to the rear wall. These elements, in combination with the glazed parts of the design, would be jarring components of the overall architectural composition of the house. In total the development would be an uneasy and unattractive addition to the dwelling which would be at odds with its relatively simple character.

7. Policy DM35 of the Local Plan Development Management DPD seeks to ensure that development follows the principles of good design and makes a positive contribution to landscape or townscape. I do not consider that this proposal accords with that policy. Similarly I consider that the proposal is in conflict with Policy DM28, which seeks to protect nationally important designated sites, as here in the AONB. These policies follow the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in which it is explained that AONBs attract the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
8. My overall conclusion here is that the proposed development, whilst acknowledging the attempt to address previously expressed concerns, would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the dwelling itself and the surrounding AONB. I do not have sufficient evidence in relation to other extensions nearby for these to have any impact on my decision in this case. In any event each proposal must be considered on the basis of the circumstances pertaining to it. In this case I recognise that the proposal is at least partly driven by the Appellant's interest in astronomy, but neither this nor any other matter is sufficient to lead me to any view other than that the appeal must fail.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR