



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/21/3284194
Beckside, Long Level, Cowan Bridge LA6 2HS

- 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 Andrew Makinson against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01346/FUL, dated 18 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to existing house to provide new entrance lobby and dining kitchen on GF, and en-suite bedroom on FF.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The proposed development is described as a two storey side extension and covered storage area to the rear on the decision notice and the appeal form. This is a more succinct description than on the application form and so I have assessed this appeal on the basis of the revised description.
2. The appeal site is referred to as Beckside on the application form and the decision notice but is also referred to as Beckside Cottage on the plans and in other documentation. In the interests of consistency, I shall refer to the appeal site as Beckside.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and covered walkway to the rear at Beckside, Long Level, Cowan Bridge, LA6 2HS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01346/FUL, dated 18 October 2019, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: -

- *Drawing No: - Site & Location Plan – 173(00)002 Revision A;*
- *Drawing Nos: - Existing – 173(01)001 P1; 173(01)002 P1; 173(02)001 P1; 173(02)002 P1; 173(02)003 P1*
- *Drawing Nos: - Proposed – 173(04)003 P4; 173(04)004 P4; 173(04)005 P4; 173(05)001 P4; 173(05)002 P4; 173(05)003 P4; 173(06)001 P1; 173(07)001.*

Main Issue

4. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on a non-designated heritage asset and its setting.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located off the A65 to the south of Cowan Bridge which crosses Leck Beck, a tributary of the River Lune. An older bridge runs parallel to this but is inaccessible for vehicles but can be crossed by pedestrians. This older bridge is a Grade II Listed Building. The appeal site includes a stone built dwelling, identified by the appellant and the Council as being a vernacular house, historically a pair of cottages, dating from the 18th century. It adjoins a terrace of stone dwellings. The appeal site therefore sits within a setting comprising stone dwellings, the adjacent river and weir close to the bridge and the Grade II listed bridge itself. A heritage statement has been submitted as part of the planning application. There is also a detached timber building which is used as a workshop.
6. Due to its vernacular form and appearance and its aesthetic value close to the Grade II Listed Cowan Bridge, the Council refer to Becksides as a non-designated heritage asset although no published list of such assets has been submitted with the appeal documents. The appellants have questioned this designation. However, I am satisfied that the Council has explained its reasoning for this designation given the position of Becksides within the group of stone dwellings and the listed status of the bridge. On the basis of the information before me, I consider that it warrants consideration in terms of its heritage value. I have therefore considered the proposal in terms of its effect on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
7. Local Plan¹ Policy DM41 establishes that where a non-designated heritage asset is affected by a development proposal, the effect on the significance of the heritage asset will be taken into account. This is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework². Policy DM41 also advises that extensions or alterations should be designed sympathetically, without detracting from or competing with the heritage asset and proposals should relate appropriately in terms of siting, style, scale, massing, height and materials. Local Plan Policy DM29 sets out key design principles for new development with the aim of making a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape and/or townscape.
8. In addition to extending the house, the proposal includes a separate covered storage area. The reason for refusal refers to the proposed development but the officers report makes little reference to the covered storage area. The

¹ A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031 Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD, Adopted Version July 2020.

² Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

appellant also has not referred to this in their grounds of appeal. I see no particular harm with this element of the proposal and no specific case has been made against it. I therefore have no reason not to find the covered storage area acceptable.

9. Whilst the extension would provide a significant amount of extra floorspace to the existing house, its design and orientation would ensure that it would not appear unduly bulky or out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property. The simple vernacular form of the house would be retained and provided that the finished materials of construction reflected the traditional materials of the existing dwelling, I do not consider that it would conflict with its overall appearance.
10. Becksides is set at a much lower level than the existing listed bridge and its position within the overall setting of stone dwellings, the river and weir and the bridge would not be compromised. In assessing the effect of the proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, a balanced judgement is required. In my view that balance weighs in favour of the proposed extension.
11. I note the other developments that have taken place in the area including the refurbishment of the adjacent terrace and residential development to the south of the appeal site. I also noted on my site visit newer houses on the opposite side of the A65. These all have an effect on the character of the area in that they represent an area that is undergoing some change.
12. I consider that the proposal would cause less than harm to this non-designated heritage asset. It would be of a scale, massing, height and materials appropriate to its setting and historical context and therefore would be consistent with Local Plan Policy DM41. I also consider that it would be consistent with the aims of Local Plan Policy DM29.
13. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance³. Whilst the submitted plans and the application form indicate the materials to be used in the proposed roofing, walls, window and doors, a condition requiring that those match the existing dwelling is necessary as I consider that it is important that the appropriate materials would be used in construction. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, it is also necessary to ensure that the proposal is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.
14. A Bat Survey and a Flood Risk Assessment form part of the submitted application and their findings have been taken into account accordingly. The appellant has also described a 'fall back' position by referring to how the house could be extended under permitted development⁴ which I have noted. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion.
15. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on a non-designated heritage asset or its setting. It would comply with Local Plan policies DM29 and DM41 and the Framework. The appeal therefore succeeds.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

³ Planning Practice Guidance Published 6 March 2014, Updated 23 July 2019.

⁴ Under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as Amended).