
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2025

by **C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q9495/D/24/3354152

Coach House, Uldale Village, Cumbria, Uldale CA7 1HA

- 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 Ian Follett against the decision of Lake District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is 7/2024/2139.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey timber porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to comment further. Where references are made to paragraph numbers of the Framework, these are references to the most recent version.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Based on the evidence before me the appeal property was originally constructed as a barn adjacent to the Old Rectory, a large, detached dwelling. A number of conversions and developments over time have resulted in several properties forming a group arrangement, centred around a courtyard to the side of the Old Rectory. The Coach House is of a simple and attractive design and is constructed from limestone with a slate roof that reflects the lake Districts vernacular architecture. Based on the evidence before me it is understood that the principal elevation was altered in order to allow for the conversion of the building to a dwellinghouse. Following the initial conversion the property was extended to the side and this extension was finished in timber cladding.
5. The appeal is for the erection of a large two storey porch extension on the principal elevation. The pitch of the porch roof would reflect a central pitched section in the main roof of the building and the proposed external materials include timber cladding and a slate roof to match the existing dwelling.

6. Timber clad porches of the scale proposed are not a design feature present in the group that the appeal property forms part of and based on the evidence before me, are not typical within the wider area. Further, the Coach House is quite modest in terms of its scale and mass and due to its height and overall size the extension would dominate the principal elevation of the building. It is acknowledged that timber cladding is present on an existing side extension. However, the use of timber cladding to the extent proposed would detract from the traditional limestone walls of the main building. In light of these factors the development would result in a dominant and incongruous addition that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the Coach House and the surrounding area.
7. The position of the appeal property in relation to other buildings in the group, would allow for only restricted views of the development from the road. However, the Coach House and its neighbours front on to a small courtyard where the large porch would be highly visible to occupants of these neighbouring properties and their visitors. Further, the harm identified in regard to character and appearance is not lessened by previous alterations to the principal elevation, or an absence of heritage assets.
8. Several photographs were provided of buildings showing projecting sections that were higher than single storey. In the examples provided the projections were constructed from stone matching the main body of the building and appeared original. Further, none of the examples clearly show the projecting sections coming from the front elevation. As such, they do not demonstrate that a timber two storey front porch is a design element that is typical of the rural vernacular.
9. For the reasons detailed above the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies 02 and 06 of the Living Lakes Your Local Plan Lake District National Park Local Plan 2020-2035 and the guidance on residential extensions provided within the Lake District Design Code The Code 2023 (LP).

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to a planning approval ref. 7/2014/2038 that was granted in 2014 for the replacement of a traditional dwelling in the National Park with a dwelling of a contemporary design that utilised external timber cladding. However, this development was for the replacement rather than the extension of a dwelling and was not assessed under the current development plan.
11. The Old Rectory that forms part of the group that the appeal property is part of has a side extension that is visible from the road and is finished in render. It is acknowledged that render, as an external material, is not typical within the existing group of buildings. However, the extension is lower and subservient to the principal elevation, which remained clearly legible and unaltered. As such the circumstances that apply to the appeal before me are different.
12. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on residential amenity, access or trees. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment. However, an absence of harm in these respects are neutral factors weighing neither for nor against the proposal.

13. The appellant asserts that the proposed scheme would maximise the use of the site and it would also improve their living conditions. In so doing, the proposal would support some of the aims of the NPPF. There would also be associated economic benefits during construction. However, due to the scale of the development, these benefits would be limited.
14. The proposed development would comply with some policies in the development plan. However, in light of the harm identified above the scheme would be in conflict with Policies 02 and 06 of the LP, and therefore would be in conflict with the development plan as a whole. The benefits outlined above would not be outweighed by the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR