
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/25/3374070

The Gables, 11A Yealand Road, Carnforth LA5 9SG

- 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 C Hobbs against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00486/FUL.
 - The development proposed is car port, garage and store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In November 2023, all designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB's) in England and Wales became 'National Landscapes.' Decision makers performing functions that affect land in National Landscapes must 'seek to further' the purposes for which these areas are designated¹. The primary purpose of the designation of the Arnsdale and Silverdale National Landscape (ASNL) is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty². I have referred to the ASNL throughout my decision.
3. The appellant indicates that a reduced width for the proposed car port was offered to the Council. However, there is no evidence before me that amended plans were formally submitted for consideration³. The appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that I consider the proposal that was before the Council and on which public views were sought. For clarity, I have determined the appeal based on the plans as decided by the Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are;
 - i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings having regard to its location within the ASNL, the Yealand Conyers and Redmayne Conservation Area (YCRCA) and the setting of a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA); and
 - ii) the effect upon the living conditions of the occupants of No 15 Yealand Road, with particular regard to outlook.

¹ Section 11A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 and section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended by section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023)

² As explained at paragraph 69 of the Local Plan for Lancaster District – Part Two; Development Management Development Plan Document, 2025.

³ The Council's officer report indicates that although amendments were requested, none were provided.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. In addition to the statutory duty outlined above, the Framework requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes. The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that all development within these areas will need to be located and designed to reflect their status as landscapes of the highest quality⁴.
6. The supporting text to Policy EN2 of the Local Plan for Lancaster District – Part One; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document (LP Part 1) 2025, explains that the objective of the Local Plan is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the ASNL by resisting inappropriate development and insisting on the highest standards of design and construction. New development must relate to the established character of the area in which it is to be located. It must integrate with its setting and be in keeping with neighbouring buildings and the landscape by appropriate siting, nature, scale, proportion, massing, design, materials and landscaping.
7. These aims are reinforced in Policy DM46 of the Local Plan for Lancaster District – Part 2; Development Management Development Plan Document (LP Part 2) 2025, and Policies AS02, AS07 and AS08 of the Arnsdale & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Development Plan Document (DPD) 2019. Policy AS07 specifically requires that all development proposals in the ASNL must protect, conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, historic landscape character and the distinctiveness of settlements.
8. From the evidence before me the ASNL is characterised by low limestone hills, pasture, woodland, coastal scenery and distinctive settlements including Yealand Conyers which forms the southern half of the YCRCA. Buildings vary in age, styles and sizes but they predominantly originate from the 17-19th centuries and comprise farmhouses and traditional barns, grand houses as well as humble weavers cottages. They are arranged sporadically but linearly along the main road.
9. Despite this variety, the vernacular form and the use of slate and local limestone which links to the area's geology, provide a strong cohesiveness to the character of the YCRCA. Mature trees and hedgerows, combined with dispersed building patterns, create a spacious, verdant character. This spatial composition and architectural quality underpin the significance of the YCRCA and contributes to the cultural heritage of the ASNL.
10. The appeal site comprises a large detached 2-storey dwelling set on rising land with a generously sized and landscaped front garden. Constructed of limestone with a blue slate gabled roof, it contributes positively to the spacious, pleasant qualities of the YCRCA.
11. The proposed 2-bay car port with enclosed storage would be subservient to the host building which has a long, linear presence. Nonetheless, it would be substantial in size. From my observations and the evidence before me, open-fronted car ports are not a building typology characteristic of the YCRCA. Its timber construction and half-hipped roof would fail to reflect the materials and form of the

⁴ Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 8-041-20190721.

host dwelling, the wider conservation area and the ASNL. Despite being set back from the road, it would be to the front of the dwelling in an elevated position and would therefore be prominent. In such views, the form and materials of the proposed car port would be incongruous and inharmonious, drawing the eye to a negative degree. Whilst there is some shrubbery to the front of the car parking area, it would not screen the proposal in its entirety and cannot be relied upon to remain.

12. The Conservation Officer advises that whilst a weathered silver timber would reduce any negative impact exerted by the proposed car port, there is no suggestion that it would mitigate or offset the harm in its entirety. Even if the chosen timber was one which weathered to a silver colour, its smooth finish and elongated form would contrast sharply with the textured and buff coloured random rubble limestone walls of the host dwelling and neighbouring buildings. In this regard, I am not satisfied that the proposed facing material would be recessive. Stone would not necessarily make a building more assertive if the siting, scale and form of the building was appropriate for its context.
13. The appellant refers to Historic England guidance which supports materials that provide legibility and avoid false representation in historic contexts. Be that as it may, local plan policies require new development to integrate with its context and be in-keeping with neighbouring buildings and the landscape in terms of siting, design, massing and materials.
14. It is suggested that timber is commonly used for secondary structures in the ASNL, but no comparable examples of timber car ports have been provided. Any timber building associated with the former Flax Mill at No 11 Yealand Conyers no longer exists, and its history is unknown. I observed that most ancillary outbuildings visible from the road within the YCRCA, including garages, are of an enclosed form and stone built, with timber limited to details such as doors. I am not satisfied that the proposal achieves the high design standards required for development within the ASNL, concerns which are shared by the Parish Council, the Arnside & Silverdale National Landscape Officer and interested parties.
15. No 15 Yealand Road is a 2-storey dwelling that lies adjacent to the appeal site. The Council considers it to be a NDHA and this is not disputed by the appellant. NDHA's may be identified through local and neighbourhood plan-making processes, conservation area appraisals and reviews, or as part of the decision-making process on planning applications. Based on the evidence before me including my observations, I consider that No 15 merits NDHA status. Its significance derives from its age, modest scale, historic construction and pleasing architectural detailing including 3/3 sash windows.
16. No 15 sits close to the back edge of the pavement such that it is at a lower land level than the appeal dwelling and prominent in views along Yealand Road in both directions. The front garden to the appeal site forms part of the setting of the NDHA as it forms part of the spacious environs within which it is experienced.
17. The proposed development would be close to the boundary with No 15 on land at a higher level, roughly consistent with the first floor of the neighbouring property. In views from the road, the wide flank elevation would appear to crowd and loom over the modestly scaled NDHA at a lower level. This encroachment would harmfully

disrupt the setting of the NDHA. There are no section drawings or visual representations to persuade me otherwise.

18. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the YCRCA contrary to section 72(1) of the Act⁵. It would also cause harm to the setting of the NDHA. Given this identified harm, it follows that the proposal would adversely affect rather than conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the ASNL. In doing so, it would fail to further the purposes for which the ASNL is designated.

Public Benefits and Balance

19. Paragraph 212 of the Framework requires that great weight be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, regardless of the level of harm. Any harm to their significance should require clear and convincing justification. For non-designated heritage assets (NDHA's), a balanced judgment is required, having regard to the scale of harm and the asset's significance.
20. The harm to the setting of the NDHA would be modest given the scale of the proposed development and siting on elevated land. Harm to the significance of the YCRCA would be less than substantial and at the lower end of that spectrum. However, it remains important and should not be mistaken for a less than substantial objection. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
21. Additional storage and covered parking would be a private benefit to the appellant. With no evidence of the timber's environmental credentials, I am not persuaded that similar benefits could not be achieved using local stone, which would be less harmful to heritage assets. Without any specific public environmental, economic or social benefits, I am not convinced that the proposal can be described as sustainable development. Overall, the limited public benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion – Character and Appearance

22. Drawing these points together, the development would fail to preserve the setting of the NDHA and the character and appearance of the YCRCA would neither be preserved nor enhanced. The harmful impact would thus further fail to conserve or enhance the ASNL. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies DM29, DM38, DM41 and DM46 of the LP Part 2. These policies require, amongst other things, high quality design and the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets, as well as the landscape and natural beauty of the area. It would also conflict with Policies AS02, AS07 and AS08 of the DPD as set out above.

Living Conditions

23. No 15 has a rear patio at ground level, with the remainder of the garden rising steeply away from the dwelling. The proposed car port would sit alongside the boundary adjacent to the elevated section of garden. Its position to the south may cause some shading but given the garden's size and the building's single-storey form, overshadowing and loss of outlook from the garden would not be unacceptable.

⁵ The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

24. A separation distance of approximately 7.5m would exist between the proposed building and the rear of No 15. However, the proposal has the potential to be oppressive and create a dominant enclosure of space at a high level which could be harmful to the outlook currently experienced from the rear ground floor windows of No 15. Although these windows look out onto the patio which is enclosed on all sides by stone walls, they are limited in height. At 3.9m high, I am not convinced that the impact of the proposed car port would be akin to a high fence, given its siting on land which is already raised above the ground floor windows.
25. Presently, there is a row of shrubs/small trees between the appeal site and No 15 including a tall conifer. These are soft landscaping features which do not have the same impact as a solid building. The existing landscaping is not shown as being retained on the site plan and it is likely from the proximity of the proposed building to the boundary, that this would be removed. The Council refers to the approved removal of natural screening, but no specific details have been provided and it is unclear whether this relates to the appeal site or No 15⁶.
26. Rather than the overbearing impact being overstated, given the uncertainty regarding the retention or otherwise of the existing landscaping, the differing land levels and the proposed scale of the car port, I find it has not been proven that the development would not adversely affect the outlook afforded to the occupants of No 15. No topographical or section drawings showing the proposed development relative to the existing ground levels of No 15 have been provided to clearly demonstrate the impact. It is therefore reasonable to take a precautionary approach.
27. The appellant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 15, with particular regard to outlook. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy DM29 of the LP Part 2 which seeks amongst other things, to ensure that there is no significant detrimental impact to amenity including visual amenity and massing.

Other Matters

28. The appellant refers to a flat roofed outbuilding to the rear of No 15 constructed of modern materials. It is unclear as to whether this was built under permitted development rights⁷ or with planning permission. Either way, I observed that the building is not prominent in public views from Yealand Road being set back behind the dwelling and screened by rising ground, a stone boundary wall and a more historic outhouse. Its existence does not affect my findings.

Conclusion

29. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR

⁶ Planning application 25/0059/TCA.

⁷ As established by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended.