



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 November 2025

by **Helen Hockenhull BA (Hons) B.PI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2025

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/K0940/W/25/3372289**

#### **Land to the South of Cark Manor Cark In Cartmel, GRANGE OVER SANDS, LA11 7PG**

- 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 Dixon Grange Ltd against the decision of Westmorland and Furness Council.
  - The application Ref is 2025/0731/FPA.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a storage building (Resubmission of SL/2023/0703).
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/K0940/Y/25/3372296**

#### **Land to the South of Cark Manor, GRANGE OVER SANDS LA11 7PG**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Dixon Grange Ltd against the decision of Westmorland and Furness Council.
  - The application Ref is 2025/0732/LBC.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a storage building (Resubmission of SL/2023/0704/LBC).
- 

## **Decision**

### Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Preliminary Matters**

3. As the site includes listed buildings, I have had regard to section (66)1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Act, which requires special regard be paid to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings.
4. The original planning application proposed different materials to those submitted in this appeal. It was previously proposed to provide metal roller shutter doors. Amended plans were submitted to the Council illustrating the use of timber mahogany doors. The appellant refused to extend the time for determination and therefore the Council did not have an opportunity to reconsult and consider these amendments. The appeal submission includes these amended plans. The Council have provided comments on these revised materials and state that they are now acceptable. As no party is prejudiced, I accept these plans and consider them as part of this appeal

## Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve the setting of the Grade II listed Cark Manor and Garden Flat (Ref 1100326) and Cark Manor Cottage, Railings and Gate (Ref 1335793).

## Reasons

6. The appeal site lies within the grounds of Cark Manor, a Grade II listed property, set in extensive grounds and used for short stay holiday accommodation. At the entrance to the site lies Cark Manor Cottage, also Grade II listed. The proposed storage building lies to the east of the house and south of the driveway on an area formerly occupied by a brick and glazed glasshouse. The brick foundations and walls still remain. The proposed building would be approximately 18 metres long, and 7 metres wide with a ridge height of around 4.8 metres. Existing residential properties lie to the south of the site off Sunny Bank. An existing stone retaining wall bounds the site to the north and west.
7. Cark Manor is a late 18th century house with some modern late 18th and 19th century extensions. It forms a two storey building in rough cast stone with hipped slate roof, sashed windows, a veranda with three fluted Tuscan columns, and a Tuscan porch. The property has a substantial curtilage with attractive landscaped grounds. Its significance derives from its historic and architectural interest with Tuscan influences. The original entrance to the house was from the south leading to formal lawns and a garden creating an impressive approach to the front elevation of the building. The eastern site entrance was added later leading to the rear of the house. This gives access to the appeal site, a functional part of the grounds, which once included a glasshouse, separate from the designed garden area.
8. Cark Manor Cottage dates from the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century, later than the main house, and is constructed in rough cast stone with a hexagonal slate roof. It is a single storey building with three bays. The listing includes the gates and railings. The railings are on a stone base, the centre part curving back to the gates. The stone piers are rusticated whilst the gate piers have urn detailing. As far as they relate to this appeal, the significance of these assets derives from their architectural interest, and association with Cark Manor, demonstrating the social standing of its occupants.
9. The proposed building would be of such a height that it would project above the retaining wall which runs parallel to the driveway. The footprint of the proposed building is larger than the replacement glasshouse approved on the site in 2022 as it includes the area proposed to be used as hot bed and cold frames. In terms of volume the proposal therefore comprises a much more substantial building. Furthermore, being of stone and roughcast render, it would be of a much more solid construction than the lighter glass of the proposed glasshouse. I acknowledge that views of the proposal would be filtered behind existing mature trees and hedgerow lining the access road and the boundary wall, however the presence of a large building would be evident, forming an incongruous addition to the site.
10. I accept that the site lies separate from the formal gardens which provide key views of the Manor and contribute significantly to its setting. Whilst intervisibility between the site and the Manor is limited, the historic association remains and

contributes to its special interest. Whilst the appeal site is a more functional part of the grounds, it is still important to the understanding and appreciation of the asset. Given the previous function of this part of the site, a storage building in this location is in my mind not inappropriate. The proposed materials of rough cast stone, render, slate roof and timber doors are appropriate having regard to the materiality of the buildings on the wider site. However, due to the buildings size and scale, I consider it would cause harm to the setting of Cark Manor and Cark Cottage. Given the context of the appeal site, and the fact that it would not directly affect the assets themselves, I find this harm to be at the lower end of less than substantial but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.

11. In line with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. The appellant has submitted that the storage building is required to house various garden tools and equipment in a secure and weatherproof building. I understand that currently, equipment is kept in the open subject to the weather and potential theft. This would assist the estates team to maintain the quality of the site and in turn support the tourism use and economic viability of the heritage asset. I recognise the importance of the gardens to the asset and that the lack of maintenance would affect the environmental quality of the site. This could potentially result in the use of the asset becoming unviable ultimately leading to its disrepair. However, I am not persuaded by the evidence before me that the building proposed is so essential to the ongoing maintenance of the site, that without it, the grounds would be neglected.
13. I acknowledge that there would also be a biodiversity net gain as a result of the proposal. However, this is provided in order to comply with the requirements of the Environment Act and in this case, carries very limited public benefit.
14. The Framework is clear that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. I find that the limited public benefits outlined by the appellant, do not outweigh the great weight given to the identified harm. The appeal scheme would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of Cark Manor and Cark Cottage, Railings and Gate, contrary to the Act, the aims and objectives of the Framework, Policies CS1.1, CS8.10 of the Core Strategy and Policies DM1, DM2 and DM3 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan. These policies seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

### **Other Matters**

15. A number of objectors have raised concern about the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of the occupants of properties off Sunny Bank. I understand that the previous applications were refused on these grounds, but the proposal is now for a smaller building further away from the nearby dwellings. The Council consider that the building is sufficiently far away from properties to prevent loss of outlook or daylight. I have no reason to disagree. In regard to noise, should I have determined that the appeal be allowed, an appropriate planning condition could have been imposed to require internal noise mitigation.

## **Conclusion**

16. I have found that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of nearby heritage assets. The proposal does not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with it.
17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I dismiss these appeals.

*Helen Hockenhull*

INSPECTOR