



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2019

by J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q9495/D/19/3237474

4 Brantfell Place, Bowness-on-Windermere LA23 3FJ

- 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 R Collins against the decision of the Lake District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 7/2019/5401, dated 24 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There appears to have been some confusion over the proposed cladding material for the dormer extension. The appellant has confirmed that no timber cladding was specified in the application. I have, therefore, proceeded with the appeal on this basis.
3. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) are of the view that the proposed development falls within Schedule 2, Column 1, 10(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and have provided an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening pro forma to that effect. However, the pro forma is incomplete and does not determine whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the environment that would give rise to the requirement for an EIA. Consequently, the Secretary of State has issued a Screening Opinion in line with the regulations and has determined that the proposal is not likely to result in a significant environmental impact. Therefore, an EIA is not required.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 4 Brantfell Place is a relatively modern two storey end of terrace house as part of a row of four houses. The properties have simple traditional gabled roofs with unbroken roof slopes that provide a degree of uniformity across the terrace. Dormers are not a feature of the street scene and while some limited examples exist in the surrounding area, they are not overly prominent.

6. The proposal would see the introduction of a large dormer roof extension on the rear facing roof slope of the property. It would involve two pitched dormer windows linked by a flat roofed box style extension. Its scale, level with the ridge of the original roof and extending across almost the entire roof slope, along with its bulky design would result in an incongruous addition that would dominate the roof fundamentally altering its shape and appearance. Its massing and visual prominence would be disproportionate in terms of the existing roof profile and would not be a sympathetic nor subservient addition to the property.
7. Being highly visible from public views on the approach into Brantfell Place, the resultant building would look markedly out of character with the surrounding area. While the dormer extension would be constructed in materials of a similar colour and appearance to the existing roof covering, this would do little to temper its visual prominence and as such would not overcome the harm that I have found.
8. Consequently, the development would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS10 of the Lake District National Park Core Strategy 2010 (the CS) and the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to achieve high quality design that reinforces local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

9. My attention has been drawn to a nearby development that includes dormer windows¹. However, I can see that this scheme differs significantly to the appeal proposal. It involved the conversion of a cottage into three flats along with the installation of dormer windows. The dormers in that case were of a significantly reduced scale and of a differing form to those proposed as part of this appeal. I do not therefore consider this to be a comparable scheme and have instead considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant has a longstanding connection with the local area, and I appreciate his desire to enlarge the living space within his home to accommodate his family. I can also understand his frustration with rising house prices and the presence of holiday homes in the area. Accordingly, I take no pleasure in frustrating his efforts, but these matters do not justify the harm I have found in this case.
11. Furthermore, I am not persuaded by the appellants claim that the proposal would contribute to the sustainability of social and community cohesion as alluded to in the supporting text to policy CS11 of the CS. I have also had regard to the representation from the local Member of Parliament and note that Windermere Parish Council were supportive of the proposal. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm I have found and do not, therefore, lead me away from my conclusion.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal is dismissed.

J M Tweddle

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Ref. 7/2017/5512