

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C9499/D/21/3289177

Casterton Cottage, 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 and Mrs Stuart Wilkie against the decision of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref S/05/45, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage, potting shed and part of the single storey utility room, the addition of double storey extensions and single storey replacement garage, workshop/studio.
-

Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Stuart Wilkie against the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority. This application is the subject of a separate decision

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a distinctive detached Arts and Crafts-style dwelling with tall chimneys and some of the first floor rooms set within a steeply-pitched roof which extends to ground floor level. The house is set back from the road within relatively spacious gardens. It has a detached single storey garage towards its northern boundary.
 5. It is located along a narrow country lane, without pavements or streetlights and which is tightly bordered by hedgerows and occasional stone walls.
 6. The area is characterised by the presence of dwellings set back from the lane within garden plots, some of which are expansive. Gardens, hedgerows, trees and views through to countryside beyond are dominant characteristics and to some considerable degree, dwellings tend to nestle into their bucolic surroundings without drawing undue attention to themselves.
-

7. During my site visit, I observed that a number of dwellings in the area have been extended or altered in some way, but that generally, such changes appear subservient to host properties and in keeping with their surroundings.
8. I also noted that, whilst houses along the lane including the appeal property are different to one another in appearance, there are numerous examples of interesting and period features, which together contribute a distinctive and attractive charm to the area.
9. The appeal property itself appears visible in its surroundings from near and distant views. Each of the appeal property's elevations are notable for their interesting gables, tall chimneys, steep slate roofs and fenestration, especially the ornate, carefully designed architecture of the south east and south west elevations.
10. The proposed development would include a large and prominent two storey extension. The attractive south east elevation would be largely obscured and wholly dominated by the proposal, which would be of such proportions as to overwhelm, rather than appear subservient to the host property.
11. Further, the equally ornate and charming south west elevation would be visibly swamped by a two storey extension to one side and a single storey extension to the other. Together, these additions would radically alter and overwhelm the appearance of this part of the host property.
12. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the prominence of the proposed development, the scale and appearance of which would draw undue attention to the appeal property, which is already widely visible in its surroundings.
13. In addition to the above, I find that the width and overall scale of the proposed single storey garage/store and studio would extend the appeal property to such a degree as to lead it to appear unduly dominant when seen from the front. The flat roof and contemporary design of this element of the proposal would also add an element of incongruity, resulting in it appearing out of keeping with the identified attributes of the area.
14. I also consider that the proposed addition of a dormer window to the south east elevation and a Juliet balcony to the south west elevation would add visual clutter that would serve to draw the eye and detract from the existing traditional and distinctive appearance of the host dwelling's roofscape.
15. Taking all of the above into account, I consider that scale and design of the proposal would overwhelm and fail to appear as a subservient addition to, the host property; and would not appear in keeping with its surroundings.
16. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Core Strategy¹ Policy CS8.10; and to Local Plan² Policy S2, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

¹ South Lakeland Core Strategy (2010).

² South Lakeland Local Plan (2006).

Other Matters

17. In support of the proposal, the appellants state that a smaller scale extension would have resulted in a form and design that would be incongruous with the host. Whether or not this is the case, I have found that the proposed development would result in significant harm within the Yorkshire Dales National Park and hence the decision below.
18. The appellants also refer to other developments in the vicinity of the appeal property. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that other developments in the area are so similar to the proposal before me as to provide for direct comparison. Notwithstanding this, as above, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and the presence of other developments elsewhere is not a factor that mitigates this harm.
19. I note that the proposed development would result in investment into a dwelling that has stood empty for some time. This is a factor that stands in favour of the proposal, but it does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR