
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C9499/D/17/3166552
Lamblea, Carlton, DL8 4BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Malcolm Shaw against the decision of Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref: R/67/86, dated 17 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the removal of external staircase and form new side two storey extension and rear single storey lean-to extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of external staircase and form new side two storey extension and rear single storey lean-to extension at Lamblea, Carlton, DL8 4BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: R/67/86, dated 17 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 24/2016 01 (Survey Plans); 24/2016 02 (Survey Elevations); 24/2016 03 Revision D (Detail Design Plans); 24/2016 04 revision D (Detail Design Elevations); 24/2016 05 (Location Plan); and 24/2016 06 (Site Plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the original planning application was determined Yorkshire Dales Local Plan 2006 has been replaced by the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan, which was adopted in December 2016. The policies cited on the decision notice have, therefore, been superseded by policies in the new development plan. Policy GP2 is superseded by Policy SP4, Policy B14 is superseded by Policies SP4 and L1, and Policy B15 is superseded by Policy L3. The requirements of the new policies are largely the same as those they replace, however, for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal with reference to the Policies in the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2016.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a two storey stone built structure that has been converted into a dwelling from a former agricultural building. The village of Carlton is essentially linear in character, set out along the main road, and consists of predominantly two storey buildings in residential use. A number of these have clearly been converted from agricultural buildings which are either free standing or attached to the houses that they were associated with. Within the village a range of building designs and ages is present, however, an almost exclusive use of local stone for the walls and widespread use of stone roofing slabs give the village as a whole a homogeneous appearance. The character is largely residential, although with an obvious agricultural heritage evident from the agricultural buildings that have been repurposed to residential use.
5. I note that whilst the Authority has some reservations regarding the details of the fenestration of the proposed rear extension, it considers that the general form is appropriate to the original building. The principal area of dispute between the parties is with regard to the proposed side extension.
6. Policy SP4 of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2016 (Local Plan) requires that, among other matters, new development is informed by its context, conserves the architectural character of the area and reinforces local distinctiveness. Local Plan Policy L3, whilst relating primarily to new conversions of buildings rather than alterations to existing converted buildings, seeks to ensure that development does not adversely affect parts of the building of recognised significance.
7. Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires that great weight should be given to conserving cultural heritage in National Parks. The appeal building is not Listed, nor is it located within a Conservation Area. It is also not suggested that the appeal building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Local Plan Policy L1 is therefore not relevant to this proposal, however, having regard to the Framework, some limited weight can be given to the fact that the building was formerly in agricultural use and reflects an earlier stage of the development of the village.
8. The Yorkshire Dales Design Guide (Design Guide) 2002 sets out a number of design principles for new development in the National Park and seeks to ensure that new development respects the character and context of its setting and fulfils the objective of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park. The Design Guide identifies the visual homogeneity of settlements within the National Park as being one of its key characteristics and which the design principles set out in it seek to protect. The Design Guide suggests that for extensions to existing buildings, in all but a few exceptional cases, the extension should always appear to be subordinate to the existing building, including setting back new work from the front elevation and stepping down roof lines.

9. The proposed side extension follows this approach, being set back from the front and rear walls of the original building and having a lower ridge line. Although I note the Authority's view that this extension is domestic in character and is considered inappropriate on a converted agricultural building, I agree with the appellant's position that the original agricultural character of the building was much diluted when it and the adjoining building were converted to residential use.
10. The most prominent architectural feature on the building is the external staircase, which would be replaced by the proposed side extension. Whilst this is a common feature on agricultural buildings, and there are other examples of external staircases in the village, the staircase on the appeal has been heavily modified by infilling beneath it, extending the landing platform and the addition of a heavy stone enclosure. I have been provided with the drawings submitted when the building was converted to residential use and these show that the staircase was originally a smaller, open, staircase and, consequently, I consider that much of its architectural significance has been lost as a result of the subsequent alterations to it. I also note that in correspondence with the appellant in respect of a modified proposal for the building which omitted the two storey side extension, the Authority have stated that they consider that the removal of the existing external staircase would not require planning permission.
11. The proposed extension would result in the original door and window openings at first floor level in the gable of the building being lost. The ground floor of the gable elevation has already been significantly altered by the previous extension below the staircase and the first floor openings are largely obscured by the solid enclosure around the landing. There is no substantive evidence of the significance of these features that would warrant their retention in accordance with Local Plan Policy L3 or the Design Guide and, as noted above, the building is neither Listed, nor within a Conservation Area.
12. Due to the location of a driveway at the side of the property, the proposed extension would be visible in short range views from the main road when travelling from the east. However, the built form of the village consists of buildings with varied ridge heights, irregular building lines, and diverse elevational treatments and, consequently, these short range views would be consistent with other views when travelling through the village.
13. Concern has also been raised in respect of the design of the windows to be used in the extension. I saw when I visited the site that a significant number of buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site had uPVC replacement windows, including the house adjoining the appeal building. Throughout the village there is a diverse range of window designs, with no one style predominant. There is also no substantive evidence in respect of the design of the windows in the building prior to its conversion to residential use. From the drawings for the conversion scheme, many the existing window openings in the appeal building and the adjoining house, which forms part of the same structure, have been altered, and a number of entirely new openings have been inserted. Within this context I do not find the argument that the use of sash style windows would be harmful to the architectural integrity of the building a persuasive one.
14. As set out above, the original agricultural character of the building has been diminished by previous alterations to it. Whilst, taken as a whole, the

proposed extensions and alterations to the building would result in a further change to its character, the change would not be so significant that its original function would not be discernible. Although some of the alterations to the appeal building would be visible from the public domain, the effect of these would be limited to the near vicinity of the appeal building and would be consistent with the built form and street scene elsewhere in the village.

15. I therefore find that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. It would comply with the relevant requirements of Policies SP4 and L3 of the Local Plan and the guidance in the Yorkshire Dales Design Guide which seek to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design, which respects its context and conserves the architectural character of the area.

Conditions

16. I have had regard to the conditions that have been suggested by the Authority. In order to provide certainty as to what has been granted planning permission I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings. Due to the uniformity of the building materials in the surrounding area, in order to ensure that the proposed extension is in keeping with the existing building and surrounding area it is also necessary to impose a condition requiring that the materials used in the development match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions discussed above.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR