
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F0935/W/25/3369753

Greenleaves Broadwath Road, Great Corby, Cumberland CA4 8ND

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kevin Bell against the decision of Cumberland Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0163.
 - The development proposed is outline application for a single storey dwelling adjacent to Greenleaves, Great Corby, CA4 8ND.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application is submitted in outline with all matters reserved for a subsequent reserved matters application. Accordingly, the access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are reserved for subsequent approval and do not form part of this appeal.
3. A screening direction was issued under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). In exercise of the powers conferred by Regulation 14 (1) and 7 (5) of the EIA Regulations, the Secretary of State directed that the development is not EIA development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is whether the site location is suitable for the proposed development, having regard to development plan policy governing such proposals.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to land adjacent to Greenleaves – a 20th Century detached dwelling being one of four dwellings in a loose cluster. It is located north of Clints Road to the northeast of the village of Great Corby in a countryside location with mature woodland to the north and west and open fields to the south. The appeal site and existing cluster of dwellings are separated from the built form of Great Corby by an area of woodland and Corby Beck as well as open fields and hedgerows.
6. Policy SP 2 of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, 2016 (LP) relates to strategic growth and distribution. It explains that within the District's rural settlements, development opportunities of an appropriate scale and nature, which

are commensurate with their setting, will be harnessed to positively contribute to increasing the prosperity of the rural economy and to enable rural communities to thrive. Within the open countryside, development will be assessed against the need to be in the location specified. Policy HO 2 of the LP relates to windfall housing development. It explains that new housing development on sites other than those allocated will be acceptable within or on the edge of Carlisle, Brampton, Longtown, and villages within the rural area provided that the development will not prejudice the delivery of the spatial strategy of the Local Plan and will conform to a number of key principles. Such principles amongst others, include that on the edge of settlements the site is well contained within existing landscape features, is physically connected, and integrates with, the settlement, and does not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside.

7. Whilst the appeal site is located in close proximity to other residential properties and thus is not an isolated location as such, the character of the site itself and its approach from the west is rural in character. This is particularly apparent after passing Grinton House (the last dwelling to the south of the road to the west of the appeal site) and the perception at this point is of having left the built form of Great Corby. The rural character at this point is aided by mature hedgerows/open fields and woodland on each side of the highway and lack of built features. A number of the dwellings in the cluster are set back and screened from view and there is a degree of open space surrounding the site and between each of the dwellings. This contributes to the feeling that you are in the countryside opposed to the settlement.
8. Given the above and my observations on site, I find the appeal site to be physically and visibly separate from the settlement of Great Corby and the proposed development would not integrate with it. This results in the development being an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. There may be a shared postal address and access through the adjacent coppice but there is still a clear sense of separation between the appeal site and the village. I appreciate the appellant's comments regarding proximity to services and amenities and that opportunities for development in rural areas such as this one are rare. Even so, the appeal site does not integrate well with the settlement and development here would lead to an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside contrary to the LP.
9. In coming to such findings, I have had due regard to the existing landscaping surrounding the site, but the appeal site is still visible on approaching the site and remains physically and visually separate from the settlement of Great Corby. Additional planting could reinforce the existing planting, but this would be subject to a subsequent approval and does not form part of this appeal. I am also not convinced that additional planting would fully screen the development from views, nor would it improve the appeal sites relationship with the built form of Great Corby.
10. There are a small number of dwellings along the southern extent of Clints Road, and I note the existing development located along Sandy Lane to the northwest of the appeal site, but the appeal site is separated from these by open fields, hedgerows and a mature woodland. My attention has been drawn to an application at Holly Bank, Faugh which involved the erection of one dwelling and was approved in 2014. This application was however determined under different policies which are no longer applicable, and the site location/context is also different to the appeal I am considering. Further, I have limited details on how that

scheme was assessed to be able to comment fully. Overall, I do not find that scheme to be directly comparable to the appeal before me which I have assessed based on its own merits. The appellant explains that an outbuilding of a similar size could be constructed using permitted development rights although I understand that permitted development rights have been removed for the site as part of a previous application to ensure no visual impacts. I am not therefore convinced that this could be achieved to be able to give it any weight as a fallback position.

11. Overall, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies SP 2 and HO 2 of the LP. Policy HO 6 of the LP relates to other housing in the open countryside and explains that new housing will be allowed in the open countryside in special circumstances. This includes where there is an essential need for a rural worker to live at or near their place of work, replacement dwellings or conversion of structurally sound redundant or disused buildings. There is no compelling evidence that the proposed development would meet one of the above criteria and thus would also be contrary to Policy HO 6.
12. Given the appeal site's relationship to the built form of the settlement of Great Corby, it would result in an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. Both the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the LP ensures that sustainable patterns of development prevail and that importantly unnecessary and unjustified encroachment into the countryside is avoided.
13. I therefore conclude that the location is not suitable for the proposed development, having regard to the development plan governing such proposals. It would therefore be contrary to Policies SP 2, HO 2 and HO 6 of the LP. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary with the provisions of the Framework.

Other Matters

14. The appeal site may lie outside of any areas of landscape designation, not form part of an Article 4 or Conservation Area and does not relate to a listed building but this would not alter my findings in relation to the above main issue. The appellant has provided some details in relation to the matters to be reserved but as set out earlier, these are not to be considered as part of the current appeal and thus would not alter my findings.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

15. The location of the appeal site is not suitable for the proposed development, having regard to the development plan governing such proposals and thus would result in an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. There would be some social, economic and environmental benefits associated with the scheme including the provision of a new dwelling which is understood to be for self-build. I am aware of the policies relating to efficient use of land and the role of small and medium sized sites etc and acknowledge that the proposed development would contribute to maintaining the vitality of the rural community. The extent to which these would be beneficial is however limited by the small-scale nature of the proposals and these would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
16. Bringing everything together, the development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the

provisions of the Framework that individually or cumulatively outweigh this harm.
The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR