



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2024

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q9495/D/24/3338321

Easedale, Thrushwood, Keswick CA12 4PG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Convery against the decision of Lake District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is 7/2023/2197.
 - The development proposed is refurbishment of existing detached property, including conversion of part of the existing garage and raising of the existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for refurbishment of existing detached property, including conversion of part of the existing garage and raising of the existing roof at Easedale, Thrushwood, Keswick CA12 4PG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7/2023/2197 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location Plan Drawing No. P-05 Rev B; Proposed Site Plan Drawing No. P-07 Rev B; Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No. P-03 Rev E; Proposed Elevations Drawing No. P-04 Rev D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be undertaken other than strictly in accordance with the 'summary of development and mitigation' requirements detailed in F1 of the submitted Bats, Barn Owls and Breeding Birds Survey.

Procedural Matter

2. The location of the appeal site in the above banner heading has been taken from the decision notice and appeal form as this accurately describes the location of the site.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property relates to a detached dormer bungalow known as Easedale which is located on the southern side of the A591. It is located along a row of other detached dwellings which are set back from the road within large plots that are well landscaped and comprise reasonably large, detached bungalows or two storey properties. There are a number of public footpaths positioned nearby to the east and south in open fields. While the overall age and style of properties is reasonably consistent, I observed a number of different roof configurations including varied height differences between properties.
5. The proposed development seeks planning permission to raise the overall height of the property to create a two-storey dwelling. The existing hipped and flat roofed aspect on the northeast (front) elevation would be retained; the height extension would result in the creation of a central gable end extension which would be predominantly glazed. The southwest elevation would see the creation of a centrally placed Juliet balcony on the new first floor and an adjacent bay window where its walls and hipped roof would be covered in slate. A flat roofed dormer window would be installed on the southwest roof plane. A chimney stack would be placed towards the northwest side of the dwelling.
6. The neighbouring properties on both sides of the appeal site to the east and west are both two storey properties with varied roof configurations and heights. The existing property being a dormer bungalow is therefore already smaller than its neighbours in terms of height and does not align.
7. The proposed increase in height of the roof would make the property higher than its neighbours although it would not extend significantly higher and thus when viewed in context of its neighbours would not form a significant addition. The Council raise concern regarding the overall change in height appearing dominant with the dwelling's scale being visually out of keeping with the size and scale of the neighbours and other dwellings on the street. However, some unbalancing in terms of height already exists by the dormer bungalow being positioned between 2 two-storey properties which all have varying roof configurations and heights. Whilst the works would add more bulk and mass to the property than at present, it would comprise an uncomplicated built form and the increase in height of the roof would merely reflect the size and massing of its neighbours. The difference would be no more harmful than the difference that already exists onsite albeit that it would be slightly higher opposed to being lower. It would also arguably be less harsh/noticeable on the eye than at present as all three properties would be two storeys in height and thus more consistent with one another.
8. At my site visit, I observed the properties along the row whereby there are a number of detached bungalows but also a number of two storey properties not just those of the neighbouring properties. As a result, on approaching the site from the west along the A591, there are already a number of varying roof heights/configurations that exist which are partly obscured by trees and shrubbery. This would continue to be the case by the proposed development with the difference in height not being so out of keeping within the street scene.
9. The property is located back from the pavement and the landscaping surrounding the site and positioning of properties would help to screen the development from views on approaching the site from the east along the A591

whereby views are somewhat limited until you are closer to the property or directly opposite it. As a result, the overall height difference would have a very limited effect upon the street scene. Notwithstanding and given the presence of other varied heights and roof configurations nearby means that it would not be particularly prominent or dominate the overall appearance of the area nor be uncomfortable within its context. This is also the case when viewed from nearby public footpaths although many views particularly those to the east are somewhat restricted by mature planting in any case.

10. The window openings proposed on the southwest elevation are of differing designs, forms, sizes and positionings. However, I do not find them to be so contrasting or confusing to give a crowded and inconsistent overall appearance. The windows on the northwest and southeast elevations are restricted to ground floor level and their overall design, form, sizes and positionings are not largely different to that of the existing property. Based on my observations onsite, I cannot agree that the overall arrangement of windows is harmful in context of neighbouring properties where the fenestration patterns vary somewhat, and I did not find them to have a regular pattern.
11. Whilst the development would result in several structural elements of differing heights and roof types, it would still comprise an uncomplicated built form overall. Further, there is already a variation within the existing property, and this is a characteristic of the row of properties in this area. I do not therefore find the variations to be disjointed or harmful to the appearance of the property and surrounding area.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies 01, 02, 05 and 06 of the Lake District National Park Local Plan 2020-2035, 2021 and the Lake District Design Code Supplementary Planning Document, 2023 which together, amongst other matters, requires development to reinforce the importance of local character by having regard to scale, height, density, layout, appearance, and materials.

Other Matters

13. The Council has assessed the proposed development with regard to impact on the amenity of neighbours. It concludes that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on amenity due to visual intrusion, overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing effect, noise, or other adverse impacts. This is due to the nature of the proposals which is not increasing in footprint, the existence of a dormer window where views can already be obtained and the Juliet balcony/dormer window being areas where people could not congregate. Based on the plans provided and my observations onsite, I have no compelling reason to disagree with the Council's assessment of this.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council including the standard time for commencement of development which I have applied. I also agree that a plans condition is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to materials is also required in the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the development. The condition relating to the Bats,

Barn Owls and Breeding Birds Survey is also necessary to minimise the risk of unacceptable harm or disturbance to protected species.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole, the appeal should be allowed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR