
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2018

by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/M0933/D/18/3200963

61 Rydal Road, Kendal, LA9 6LD

- 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 Matthew Ward against the decision of South Lakeland District Council.
 - The application Ref SL/2017/1111, dated 8 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2018.
 - The development proposed is a dormer to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was submitted the Government has published a new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In relation to the main issue in this appeal there is no material difference between the old and the new Frameworks. As such, the cases for both main parties have not been prejudiced by the new Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the house and the general area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is described as being semi-detached but from my site visit, I note that there are two pairs of houses which, although separated by an alleyway at ground floor level, appear to form a row with a single pitched roof span. The houses in this row and the surrounding estate are largely of simple uniform appearance.
5. The proposed dormer at five metres wide and 2.2 metres in height would occupy almost all of the front roof slope. Due to its scale and despite the use of matching materials, I find that the proposed dormer would be an unduly dominant and incongruous feature within the roofscape, which would unbalance the overall appearance of the row of houses of which it forms a part and undermine the uniformity of the wider estate.
6. The proposed dormer would also be readily visible in public views and as a result would cause significant harm to the appearance of the house, the row of

houses which it forms a part of, and the wider street scene. The lack of objections from neighbours does not alter my judgement.

7. The appellant has referred to rear dormers that can be seen from the roadside. However, no details of which properties incorporate rear dormers have been provided. Whilst I noted the rear dormer on the appeal property which can be seen in glimpses through the spacing between properties, front dormers are not a feature of the street scene and as such this would not justify the development before me.
8. The appellant states that there are poor quality extensions around the estate that have been permitted by the Council however no details have been provided. In any event the misgivings expressed by the appellant about extensions that the Council may have permitted are separate from the planning merits of the proposed development and they have no bearing on the outcome of this appeal.
9. I have been referred to a housing development that has been built behind the Sandylands Estate which includes houses with varying rooflines and can be seen from the appellant's house, but that has no bearing on the planning merits of the appeal scheme.
10. For the reasons set out above the proposed dormer causes harm to the character and appearance of the house and surrounding area contrary to saved policy S2 of the South Lakeland Local Plan 2006 & Alterations: Final Composite Plan and policy CS8.10 of South Lakeland Local Development Framework Core Strategy which together seek a good standard of design which maintains or enhances the quality of the townscape. It would also conflict with the design aims of the Framework.

Other matters

11. The appellant has referred to housing shortage and states that purchasing a larger house is unaffordable and his family would have to leave the local area if the appeal is dismissed. I have no details about housing supply in the area but I understand the wishes of the appellant to provide more accommodation for his family. However, these personal circumstances are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Felicity Thompson

INSPECTOR