



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

by **T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/K0940/W/25/3367478**

**Strickland Arms, Great Strickland, Penrith, Cumbria CA10 3DF**

- 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 Anton Flaherty against the decision of Westmorland and Furness Council.
  - The application Ref is 2025/0624/FPA.
  - The development proposed is single storey extension to the front of the building.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and on the street scene.

### Reasons

3. The building is an attractive and historic building set on the main street through Great Strickland. Whilst there are some modern buildings which incorporate modern materials next door to and opposite the site, the form, materials and detailing of the Strickland Arms contribute positively to the attractive street scene of often historic buildings set back behind stone boundary walls.
4. At the time of my site visit a canopy was in place on the front of the building, although the evidence indicates that this is unauthorised and currently the subject of enforcement action.
5. During my site visit, I walked up and down the street on which the Strickland Arms sits. There were examples of porches and limited front extensions on other properties, although most were simple and modest structures which broadly reflected the form and materials of their host building.
6. The single storey extension proposed would be of significant width, extending across most of this part of the elevation. However, what would be most harmful about the proposal relates to the design and the materials proposed.
7. Firstly, a pitched roof element is proposed to the centre of the lean to pitched roof. This would be a rather fussy feature which would be at odds with the simple form of the building. Further, the plans appear to show what may be a pair of glazed entrance doors centred on the main front facing elevation of the extension. These would be at odds with the traditionally proportioned doors which prevail on the public facing elevations of buildings in the area.

8. Further, the windows and doors are specified as upvc whilst the roofing material is detailed as imitation slate, with a specification to be confirmed. These materials would contrast with the generally more traditional materials often found on historic buildings within the immediate area.
9. Consequently, the extension, which would be visible from the street despite the presence of boundary treatment would have a significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and on the street scene. Whilst it may be possible to condition alternative materials and the appellant has indicated they would be happy to use traditional slate, the design of the proposal would remain.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies DEV5 and COM1 of the Eden Local Plan 2014-2032. Amongst other things these require high quality design which shows a clear understanding of the form and character of the district's built and natural environment, complementing and enhancing the existing area and which is appropriate in design to the location.

### **Other Matters**

11. I accept that the proposal seeks to move on from the previously refused canopy. I also note the difficulties and pressures that affect the pub business in general and acknowledge the accountants letter which reports a drop in turnover from 2022 year end to 2023.
12. I accept that the proposal would be likely to provide some support to the viability of the pub through increased floorspace. However, detailed information on the benefits of the proposal in terms of supporting the viability of the business is not provided which limits the weight that I can afford to these aspects of the scheme.
13. I note the examples of terrace structures at the Duke of Cumberland, Kendal and the Royal Oak, Appleby, however there is limited information before me as to the full circumstances of those developments and they have limited relevance to the proposal before me under this appeal for a different form of development. I can only afford those matters limited weight.
14. No details are included with regard to wooden structures stated to be recently erected within Great Strickland to a highway and pathway. I consequently afford that matter limited weight.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

15. There are no considerations to indicate that the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan with which the proposal would conflict. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

*T Burnham*

INSPECTOR