
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by **David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q9495/D/25/3366870

Yew Tree Cottage, Portinscale, Keswick, CA12 5SP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Watson against the decision of the Lake District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 7/2025/2028, dated 20 February 2025, was refused on 23 May 2025.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, conversion of attic and new rear entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. There was some negotiation about potential amendments during the course of the application but no agreement was reached and the scheme was refused as submitted. Whilst these potential amendments were submitted with the appeal for information no comment is made upon their relative merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed fenestration on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality which forms part of the Lake District National Park.

Reasons

4. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension and conversion of the roof space at Yew Tree Cottage, a good sized traditional but unlisted detached house on the side of a minor road. There is no objection to the size or location of the extension nor to a small rear entrance porch which also forms part of the scheme, but to the overall fenestration which includes five large roof lights to facilitate the roof conversion.
5. The house is situated side onto the minor road so the attractive symmetrical 'front' elevation faces east across an open field, seen by those approaching along the minor road and also, equally if not more importantly, by those approaching across the fields along a public footpath from Portinscale. This footpath approaches from the northeast, with both the front and right-hand side elevations of the house in full view, the direction from which the full impact of the proposed fenestration would be most clearly seen. The appellant does not provide a photo or adequately address this important view.
6. At present the side elevation includes a large full size patio door onto the garden which would be replicated in the proposed extension. The other existing windows in

the house are traditional four-pane windows which form an important part of its character.

7. However, the proposal includes an odd oblong shape single pane ground floor window under a four-pane window on the front facing elevation of the extension, albeit its visual impact somewhat reduced by the setback, a particularly prominent single pane window at first floor level on the side elevation of the extension, visually clashing with the four-pane first floor window on the existing side elevation, and overly large roof lights, drawing undue attention to the roof conversion. Whilst the lower part of the property is partly screened from wider views by the surrounding garden hedge, this would not fully screen the ground floor oblong window or patio doors and provides no screening at all for the first floor or roof slope of the building which are prominent in the landscape, particularly to the north and east.

8. The cumulative impact of the proposed fenestration and its overly modern elements would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host building and, given its prominence, the character and appearance of the flat landscape between Swinside, Portinscale and the A66 and the wider Lake District landscape of which it forms part.

9. This would conflict with Policies 02 and 06 of the Lake District National Park Local Plan 2021 which require an extension to be appropriate and development to reinforce the importance of local character in terms of appearance. It follows that the proposal also conflicts with Policies 01 and 05 which seek to conserve and enhance the extraordinary harmony and beauty of the Lake District landscape by ensuring the highest level of protection is given to the landscape and that the design of development maintains local distinctiveness. There would be no conflict with Policy 07 which deals with heritage assets. The proposal would also conflict with the legislative duty to seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscapes such as the Lake District.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would provide enhanced accommodation for the appellant with an attractive outlook from modern style windows. However, this benefit is outweighed by the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the property and its contribution to the landscape.

11. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR