
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: 22 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G0908/W/20/3251558

Land adjacent Lakes Cottage, Deanscales CA13 0SL

- 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 Joshua Lake against the decision of Allerdale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref FUL/2019/0297, dated 13 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is workshop/studio for domestic use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On the original application form the site address stated, 'Lake Cottage' not 'Lakes Cottage'. Given that the address used by the appellant on their appeal form and by the Council on their decision notice includes 'Lakes Cottage' I have assumed that this was a typographical error and have revised the appeal site address accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated at the edge of Deanscales, a predominately residential hamlet set within a wider rural landscape. It is on the opposite side of the road to Lakes Cottage and the main built-up area of Deanscales close to a road junction. To one side of the appeal site is a small area of overgrown scrubland beyond which is a gravel surfaced parking area and several single-storey garages. Further beyond this parking area is a two-storey workshop building and a two-storey residential dwelling. To the other side of the appeal site lie several mature trees and beyond these there is open agricultural land. There is also open agricultural land behind the appeal site. The existing development pattern for the hamlet largely consists of buildings being clustered around the road network with agricultural fields surrounding them.
5. The proposal relates to the construction of a one and a half storey workshop/studio building the use of which would be ancillary to the main dwelling, Lakes Cottage. The appeal scheme proposes to increase the roof ridge height of the single storey workshop/studio, previously granted permission under the application Ref FUL/2019/0181 from approximately 4 metres to approximately 5.5 metres and

install an upper mezzanine floor. Indeed, whilst on my site visit, I observed that construction work had already begun on the previously approved single-storey workshop/studio building.

6. Given the appeal site's position at the edge of the hamlet and at a main road junction I consider it to be in a prominent location on the street scene. Consequently, even though it would be set back slightly from the road frontage and still appear subservient to the host property, the proposal would nonetheless have an adverse visual impact by blocking the view of the rural landscape behind it when seen from a southern vantage point on Kingsthorpe Road. Furthermore, given its height it would also be visible from further along the road to the west, which as there are no buildings adjacent to it would be an incongruous addition to the street scene thereby also having an adverse visual impact in this regard. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. I acknowledge that the previously approved single-storey workshop/studio building would also block the view of the rural landscape behind it when seen from a southern vantage point on Kingsthorpe Road. However, this would be to a lesser degree than the proposal. I also acknowledge that the recently planted hedgerow would partially screen the proposal when viewed from a western vantage point. However, this would be less effective than it would be for a smaller building such as the workshop/studio already approved.
8. In support of the appeal scheme the appellant has pointed out that there is already a two-storey workshop building at Bracken House on the same side of the road as the proposal that has a roof ridge height of approximately 7 metres. However, this building is more centrally located in relation to the built-up area of the hamlet and is a fair distance from the road junction meaning that it is therefore not in such a prominent location as the appeal site.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would conflict with Policies S2, S4, S32 and DM14 of the adopted Allerdale Local Plan (Part 1) (July 2014) which aim to ensure, amongst other things, that new development proposals are of an appropriate scale and do not result in a detrimental effect in terms of visual amenity. It would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to ensure that developments are visually attractive.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to a similar development proposal being permitted in the area under Appeal Ref APP/G0908/A/07/2056549. However, I do not have all the details of this case before me or the circumstances which led to that decision being taken. In addition, the circumstances applicable to the Bracken House scheme¹ are not exactly the same as those presented in this case, which I have determined on its own merits. The existence of one other similar development proposal in the locality does not outweigh my findings in respect of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

C Coyne

INSPECTOR

¹ Appellant Statement of Case