
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q9495/D/20/3250992
56 Wordsworth Street, Keswick CA12 4BZ

- 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 Ian Hargrave against the decision of the Lake District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 7/2019/2322, dated 3 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is Loft conversion and install Dormas to rear elevation and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling situated within a predominately residential area. The other properties on the terrace and the majority of those in the surrounding area are also two-storey dwellings with a similar design to the appeal property. Given their design and the more traditional materials used in particular on their façades, these terraced properties contribute positively to the area's historic character. The appeal property is also located at the end of the terrace which faces the frontages of other dwellings and as a result I consider it to be in a relatively prominent location within the street scene.
4. The appeal property and others on the terrace have existing ground floor and first floor rear extensions. Several properties on the terrace also have rear dormer roof extensions. The proposal would install a large box-dormer extension with a flat roof to the rear of the host property. This extension would project approximately 2 metres to the rear and have a width of approximately 4 metres meaning that it would almost occupy a sizeable portion of the rear roof slope almost covering its entire breadth. The roof of the proposed dormer extension would also be located just below the existing roof ridge height of the host property.

5. The rear roof slope of the appeal property and that of its adjacent neighbouring dwellings do not have any dormer extensions and whilst I acknowledge that some of the properties further along the terrace do have rear dormer extensions with flat roofs and uPVC windows, none of these are quite as large as the proposal i.e. being almost as wide as the rear elevation and having two double-paned windows. They also do not project outwards from just below the roof ridge height of their respective host properties. Consequently, given the proposal's design, size and prominent location, I consider that it would be an incongruous addition to the street scene which would have an adverse visual impact.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy CS10 of the adopted Lake District National Park Core Strategy (October 2010) which supports proposals where their design reinforces the importance of local character and the distinctiveness of settlements. It would also conflict with paragraph 127 (b) & (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to ensure that development proposals are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history.

Other Matters

7. In support of the appeal my attention has been drawn to other similar extensions in the area. I do not know the full circumstances that led to these being accepted, and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal scheme before me including in respect of their dimensions. In any event I have determined the appeal scheme on its own merits.
8. I also note the appellant's point that the appeal property is not located within a Conservation Area but within an area where its boundary may potentially be extended to, and that as a result the strict controls in such areas should not be applicable to the appeal scheme. However, notwithstanding this fact, as the appellant has acknowledged, the appeal property is within an area subject to an article 4 direction meaning that development proposals similar to the appeal scheme are strictly controlled nonetheless in order to preserve the area's historic character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR