



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C9499/D/20/3253749

Owl Barn, Casterton, Kirkby Lonsdale LA6 2SF

- 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 & Mrs Barrow against the decision of Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref S/05/18C, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey oak framed mansard to replace existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey oak framed mansard to replace existing conservatory at Owl Barn, Casterton, Kirkby Lonsdale LA6 2SF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/05/18C, dated 13 March 2020, 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: 11601/04; 11601/03; 11601/02 and 11601/01.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans the development shall be carried out in accordance with the following design details and retained as such thereafter:
 - i. The external roof covering of the extension shall be finished with roof slates to match the existing building as at the date of this notice in terms of materials, dimensions and colour;
 - ii. The stone wall at the base of the extension shall be built up in local natural stone laid and pointed to match the existing building as at the date of this notice in terms of colour, texture, coursing and size;
 - iii. The timber frame of the extension shall be unstained timber left to weather naturally; and
 - iv. No lighting shall be installed on the external elevations of the extension unless details of any lighting have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) Within 6 months of the completion of the development hereby permitted, one durable bird box shall have been installed on the building or within the site. The bird box shall be retained as such thereafter, unless details

of an alternative biodiversity enhancement measure are first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The residential use of Owl Barn derives from its conversion from a traditional agricultural building. The Council accept that the building is now of a clearly domestic character due 'to the many alterations that have occurred since [the] building was converted' but that it retains some elements of a traditional character. To this end, the building's massing, rectangular plan form and use of traditional materials are specifically noted by the Council as being vestiges of the building's former character.
4. I agree that Owl Barn has a clearly domestic residential appearance. The extensive glazing and heavily recessed front entrance and neatly manicured landscaped grounds on the approach to the property firmly reinforce that image. There are, I accept, elements of the building that hint at its former character such as its substantial massing, the arched cart-openings on the front elevation and its stone-and-slate construction, but the existing building is far from the simple, rectangular plan-form building that the Council suggest is the case.
5. The proposed extension would be located in a sunken (relative to surrounding ground form) position on the secluded rear elevation of Owl Barn. It would be both wider and have a greater depth than the existing extension, but not significantly so in my judgement, nor would it be widely visible from public or private vantage points. The proposed extension's simple rectangular plan-form would simplify the existing arrangement at the rear with the current extension and, whilst the glazed lantern roof may not be wholly rooted in the local vernacular, it would be a discrete element of the proposed extension. The lantern would not dominate the extension nor, in turn, would the extension dominate the rear of Owl Barn.
6. The extension's return may be visible in longer views across intervening fields from the road at the front, but the existing metal railings and first floor viewing platform on the gable end of Owl Barn's flank elevation dominate the rear elevation and would distract from glimpses of the proposed extension. The extension's simple rectangular plan form would reflect one of the traditional character elements identified by the Council, as would the use of stone-and-slate in the extension's construction. The overtly timber-framed construction of the glazed units might be less so, but its stone base-wall would provide a meaningful link with materials of the main building.
7. Whilst I agree with the Council that the proposal would introduce alternative rooflines at the rear of the property, I do not share their view that those roof slopes and angles would be either discordant or harmful. Indeed, the main body of the roof structure would sit lower, comparatively, on the rear elevation than the highest point of the existing roofline, whilst the sloping hipped roof would replace the conflicting lines of the existing lean-to extension with its centrally located mini-gable peak above the doors leading out on to the patio

area. The lantern would sit atop this but would not conflict with either existing roof slopes or other features or openings at the rear of the building.

8. As the proposed extension would replace an existing extension, and with a simplified footprint form, it would neither undermine the building's remaining rectangular plan form nor overwhelm its substantial scale and massing. Indeed, in that context I consider the proposed extension, despite its increased proportions, to be a modest and discrete addition to the property in a reasonably secluded position on it. The proposed extension would not, for the reasons I have outlined, cause harm to the wider character or appearance of Owl Barn, or to Owl Barn within its tranquil rural setting.
9. Policy CS8.10 of the South Lakeland Local Development Framework (SLDF) states that the siting, design, scale and materials of all development should be of a character which maintains and enhances the quality of the landscape or townscape and, where appropriate, in keeping with local vernacular tradition. Policy S2 of the South Lakeland Local Plan (SLLP) expects all development to take proper account of the South Lakeland Design Code. For the reasons I have set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would be a modest, discrete addition to Owl Barn that would take proper account of the design code and which would result in a form of development that would not harm, and therefore maintain, the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. The proposal would be consistent with the requirements of SLDF policy CS8.10 and SLLP policy S2, the first purpose of the National Park and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

10. It is noted that the Council do not object to the proposal in terms of the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties or upon biodiversity. With regard to the former, the proposed extension would replace an existing extension in a sunken location relatively far from the property's side and rear boundaries, whilst to the latter I agree that a suitably worded planning condition would ensure the installation of an appropriate bird box. I concur with the Council's conclusions in these respects.

Conditions

11. I have considered the Council's list of suggested conditions in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to time limit and plans conditions, which are both necessary in the interests of certainty, I agree that a materials condition in the form suggested by the Council is also necessary in the interests of character and appearance. So too, a condition requiring the installation of a bird box in the interests of biodiversity.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons I have set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR