



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C9499/D/25/3371447

Yew Tree Barn, Rylstone, Skipton, North Yorkshire BD23 6LJ

- 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 & Mrs Clarke against the decision of Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is C/60/44F.
 - The development proposed is Householder planning permission for erection of rear extension and alterations to roof to provide increased headroom to existing bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. There is nothing before me to suggest that the proposal would have an effect on a non-designated heritage asset within the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would conserve and enhance the landscape value the Yorkshire Dales National Park

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a located within the Yorkshire Dales National Park and is a converted and extended former agricultural barn. It is redolent of the typical vernacular of the local area, built from random stone with a slate roof and of a simple rustic style. There are a number of other dwellings located adjacent to the site and some of these also appear to be part of a rural conversion scheme.
5. The appeal site has been extended by virtue of a large extension to the rear with a catslide roof providing both ground floor and first floor accommodation. This would be extended to increase its height with a peaked gable end roof and contemporary style glazing overlooking the rear garden. The two bedrooms within the roof space would be enlarged to accommodate full head height throughout, which is currently limited in the present situation.
6. The Yorkshire Dales National Park is scattered with agricultural buildings, outbuildings, farmhouses and barn conversions. I note the predominate use of natural slate and stone to their construction with catslide roofs a particular characteristic of the Yorkshire Dales. The appeal site is no exception, even if this catslide roof is a more recent extension to the building that was converted in the mid-1990's. To my mind, the existing extension whilst large, is as expected to see

in this part of Yorkshire. Furthermore, the use of catslide roof reduces its scale and massing as the footprint is of a relatively large area.

7. I could see the former barn has been somewhat domesticised to its exterior by virtue of modern domestic paraphernalia, enclosed domestic garden and new garage. Its integrity has not been detrimentally compromised despite these changes and as a whole, the building portrays the characteristics of a former barn of a simple and traditional vernacular traditional to this part of the National Park. I cannot compare it to other conversions brought to my attention by the appellants as the details of the original conversion, or these other conversions, are not before me to compare.
8. An extension as such would significantly increase the overall bulk of the rear of the dwelling. Although the glazing to the north elevation would be intended to distinguish it as a modern extension, the ratio of solid to void forms part of the character of this former barn and is characteristic of the local area. The appellants point to the scheme with limited glazing to the northern end. Nevertheless, the extension with its high peaked roof would lack subservience to the host dwelling and the character as a traditional rural building would become more urbanised in this location and therefore its character weakened. Yew Tree Farm adjacent forms part of the site context of Yew Tree Barn, and although the proposal before me would follow a similar design, I cannot reasonably compare the two as the circumstances of Yew Tree Farm are not before me to comment. In any case, despite any other similar examples, I find the effect of this proposed extension to be harmful to the distinctive rural character of the host building and National Park as a whole.
9. There is some natural perimeter boundary treatment within the rear garden. However, this does not screen the rear of the dwelling from the wider landscape as it is exposed within the otherwise open landscape and seen from some distance. The catslide roof to the barn conversion is appropriate within this locality and the building still presents in the style of a rural building when seen from the rear elevation. The addition of an uncharacteristic, peaked gable end extension, despite similar being present to the adjacent dwelling, would not conserve and enhance the landscape value that the National Planning Policy Framework expresses great weight should be bestowed upon.
10. I could see for myself that the first floor of this extension functions as a wide landing leading into the main dwelling and to the two bedrooms. I understand the appellants struggle with their function as they are compromised by the head height. However, these are not the sole bedrooms of the dwelling, or indeed the only first floor habitable rooms. I reason that much like traditional catslide extensions, sloping roofs and limited headspace is a quirk. There is nothing before me to suggest that the long-term sustainability of the building for residential habitation would be threatened should the proposal fail.
11. The outcome of the appeal will be disappointing for the appellants. The absence of objections received is neutral in the overall consideration of things.
12. To conclude, in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework, great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks. The proposal would conflict with the same aims of Policies SP1, SP2 and SP4 of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2015-2020.

However, I find no direct conflict with policies L1, L2 and L3 of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2015-2020 as these policies relate to non-designated heritage assets and factors to take into account when considering granting permission for traditional conversions.

Other Matters

13. Any concerns the appellant has with regards to the processes of the Council should be referred to them and is not within my scope to comment on.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR