



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2022

by **Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MIEnvSc**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M0933/D/22/3297023

1 Dorchester Crescent, Ulverston, Cumbria, LA12 9LP

- 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 Timothy McGarry against the decision of South Lakeland District Council.
 - The application Ref SL/2022/0069, dated 21 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is dormer extension front and rear for bedroom and bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have adopted the description of the development from the application form in the banner heading above. However, it is described in the decision notice as changing the hipped roof to a gable end, with the addition of a front & rear dormer extension for a bedroom & bathroom. This corresponds with the submitted plans and it more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.

Reasons

4. No 1 is a single storey semi-detached property finished in brick and render with a hipped roof. It forms part of a group of matching properties set back behind open frontages on either side of the road. The wider residential area is characterised by repeating groups of fairly modest single storey semi-detached properties. Notwithstanding that some properties have been altered, the similar ages and repeating styles of properties and frontage treatments results in a coherent and harmonious townscape.
5. The proposal would be a hip to gable extension and dormer roof extensions to the front and rear roof slopes. Taking into account the shallow slope of the hipped roof, the gable end extension would be a significant increase in the size and scale of the roof. The dormers would be nearly the full width of the extended roof. They would finish at the pitched ridge and they would be more than half the height of the roof. Consequently, the dormers would be large and bulky additions. While the rear dormer would not be prominent in the street scene, the front dormer would be conspicuous.

6. Particularly as the group retain their simple original roofs, the gable end extension and the overly large dormers would cumulatively be discordant and visually obtrusive. The roof alterations and additions would be out of scale and not in keeping with the modest host property, its adjoining neighbour or the coherent group of properties of which it forms part. The proposal would be an incongruous feature that would not respect or relate well to the surrounding townscape character. It would disrupt the uniformity of the street scene and it would diminish sense of place and local distinctiveness.
7. My attention has been drawn to roof alterations to semi-detached properties elsewhere. Full details have not been provided and it is not clear that those schemes benefit from planning permission or were considered in the same policy context. Most cases appear to relate to existing gable end roofs and not hip to gable conversions. The dormers are generally modest and subservient, and they do not dominate the host property roof. In the cases relating to hipped roofs, the dormers appear to respect and they do not overwhelm the original roof form or unbalance the pair. None of these appears directly comparable or provides a visual context or a justification for the proposal.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the property and the area. It would conflict with policies CS1.1, CS8.2 and CS8.10 of the South Lakeland Core Strategy Adopted October 2010 and policies DM1 and DM2 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document Adopted March 2019. These require, among other things, that development responds appropriately, including in proportion and scale, to local context and it contributes positively to local distinctiveness, settlement character and sense of place. It would also conflict with the design and visual amenity aims of the National Planning Policy Framework including in relation to adding to the overall quality of the area and strong sense of place.

Other Matters

9. The creation of additional living space at first floor level would be a benefit to the appellant. However, there is little evidence that the existing dwelling fails to provide a reasonable standard of living accommodation or that there is otherwise a compelling justification for the proposal.
10. The visual acceptability of the rear dormer and the absence of harm to neighbouring residential amenity and the highway network are neutral matters that weigh neither for nor against the scheme.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
12. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR