



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 31 March 2026

**by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 30<sup>th</sup> April 2026**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/C9499/W/25/3368183**

**Mock Beggar Hall, Main Street, Appletreewick, Skipton, North Yorkshire  
BD23 6AD**

- 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 Peter Weatherhead against the decision of Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref is C/02/102D.
  - The development proposed is construction of 2-bedroom annexe.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/C9499/Y/25/3368188**

**Mock Beggar Hall, Main Street, Appletreewick, Skipton, North Yorkshire  
BD23 6DA**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Peter Weatherhead against the decision of Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref is C/02/102E/LB.
  - The development proposed is construction of 2-bedroom annexe.
- 

## **Decision**

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

## **Preliminary Matters**

2. Reference is made by the appellants to policy C1 of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2015-2030, 2016, (LP) which relates to new housing development. However, as described in the banner heading above, the proposal applied for is the construction of a two-bedroom annexe. This is the basis on which I have considered the appeal.
3. The application was refused based on the plans submitted with the application, however, a revised plan<sup>1</sup> was presented to the Authority prior to its decision. This shows a connecting door between the existing house and the proposed extension, although no other changes have been presented to me. Whilst the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme to overcome a Council's reason for refusal, in this instance the Authority has seen the plan and commented on it. Therefore, applying the principles established by 'Holborn'<sup>2</sup>, as the Authority will not be prejudiced, I have based my decision on the revised plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> Drawing 3142A

<sup>2</sup> Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

4. In addition, personal information was submitted with the appeal which was not before the Authority when they made their decision. Consequently, they had not previously considered LP policy C8. However, as they have covered this in their appeal statement, they have not been prejudiced. Therefore, I have considered this in my decision.
5. As set out above, there are two appeals on this site, one for planning permission, and the other for listed building consent. Planning permission and listed building consent are under different legislation; however, I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
6. The proposal relates to a listed building within a conservation area. Therefore, as required by sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

## **Main Issues**

7. The main issues are:
  - whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and
  - whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Appletreewick Conservation Area (CA).

## **Reasons**

### *Special interest and significance*

8. Mock Beggar Hall is a grade II listed building<sup>3</sup>, which, according to the listing description, dates from the 15<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. However, the site predates this, having been a grange to Bolton Priory. The special interest and significance of the building, in relation to this appeal, is its historical, architectural and archaeological interest.
9. The oldest part of the house has a doorway, probably part of the original 15<sup>th</sup> century house, surviving within the porch. This is attached to a later three-bay barn. The house was altered and extended in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, with further alterations in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It has a prominent, two storey, 17<sup>th</sup> century gable wing, the 'shippon', to the front, with a flight of external steps. This has a circular opening above the door and pigeonholes in the gable.
10. Its early date and association with Bolton Priory, as well as its architectural detail, including features such as hoodmoulds, carvings and datestones, built over many centuries, contribute to its historical and architectural interest and its high evidential value. Constructed from coursed, squared, stone, with a stone slate roof, and set against a backdrop of fields bounded by stone walls, it provides strong aesthetic interest.

---

<sup>3</sup> List entry number: 323668

11. The site is located within the village of Appletreewick, a linear settlement of historic farms, larger houses and cottages. The CA is divided into two: the village, and a separate area of farmsteads to the west. Historically, the village was associated with sheep farming and lead mining. It consists of high quality, stone, vernacular dwellings with stone slate roofs of 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century date, as well as substantial farm buildings. The significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is that Mock Beggar Hall is one of the earliest buildings in the village and, therefore, contributes to the historical and aesthetic value of the CA.

*Effect of the works on the listed building*

12. The two-storey building consists of a range facing the street, with the 'shippon' to the front, and a long service wing to the rear. This is linear in form and consists of two periods of building. A modern porch and a rebuilt stair tower are attached to the later section. Drawings of the existing east and west elevations show the variation in roof forms and building heights, which increase from the front of the site to the rear following the rise in ground levels.
13. The proposed single storey extension would be located next to the northern gable of the listed building. This elevation is blank, although I saw a blocked up former window opening. There is no dispute that the proposal would be attached to that part of the building with the lowest significance, away from the historic frontage, and that some of the quoins, and the upper part of the gable would remain visible. However, it would be constructed beyond the existing east and west elevations, in line with the porch on one side and the northern elevation of the stair tower on the other.
14. Therefore, the proposed extension would disrupt the overall linearity of the existing two storey rear wing, particularly because of its existing stepped form and the rising height of the building towards the rear. Whilst the appellants contend that the proposed annexe would appear as an outbuilding, constructing it beyond the existing building line would result in an incongruous addition, rather than a natural progression of the building form.
15. Although single storey in height, because of the rise in land levels and the form of the extension, it would not appear subservient to the host building. Instead, it would be disproportionately large, despite a double pitched roof being used to reduce the massing of the extension. Moreover, this would be at odds with the existing roof forms and not respect the character of the building.
16. The appellants refer to using local contractors, who have experience of vernacular buildings and working within the Yorkshire Dales National Park (NP), and that the extension with irregular windows and doors would replicate a converted 'shippon'. Notwithstanding that the building would be constructed of traditional materials, with reference to the local vernacular, it would extend the building in a non-historic form. Although visually disconnected from the historic frontage, the whole of the building is listed. While the appellants contend that the extension would not be widely visible, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest, irrespective of whether public views of the building can be gained. Consequently, the extension would harm the appearance of the building.
17. Given the above, I find that the proposed works would fail to preserve the listed building and its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This would harm the significance of the heritage asset.

Consequently, I give this harm considerable importance and weight in the planning balance of these appeals.

### *Effect on the CA*

18. The boundary of the CA cuts across the rear of the garden of Mock Beggar Hall and extends into the field behind the site. The CA contains many listed buildings, particularly in a village of this size, with the appeal site being an important component of the CA because of its age, appearance and history. The proposed extension would be single storey and at the rear of the property, affecting only a small part of the CA. However, as an unacceptable addition to the building, it leads to harm through the erosion of historic and architectural detail. As a result, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

### **Other Matters**

19. The site is within the NP where there is a statutory duty upon relevant authorities exercising their function to seek to further the purposes for which National Parks are designated. This includes conserving and enhancing their natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. Paragraph 189 of the Framework requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, as well as the conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage.
20. Policy C8 of the LP covers the provision of residential accommodation for elderly persons. However, as no relevant information was submitted with the application, the policy was not considered by the Authority. Part a) of this policy permits such accommodation for 'adaptations and extensions to the existing housing stock where they satisfy the requirements of policy SP4'. LP policy SP4 requires development that conserves or enhances the archaeological, architectural and historical character and appearance of the site and its setting. Notwithstanding these policies, as I have determined that the proposal would harm the listed building, it would not conform with policy C8.
21. Reference is made by the main parties to LP policy SP3 which states that new development will be located within or adjacent to a list of settlements, which includes Appletreewick, a service village. Whilst the Council discussed this policy, it was not refused on this basis, and so I have not considered it.
22. The appellants provided an occupancy restriction statement with their application, which restricts the proposal to local occupancy. This is, however, subject to a section 106 legal agreement which has not been submitted. Nevertheless, as I am dismissing the appeal, I do not need to consider this further.
23. There is no dispute between the main parties regarding the provision of adequate parking, the retention of a suitable garden area, and that the building would have level access. A neighbour has provided support for the extension, as the house would be used for more than one family, thereby introducing more life to the village. This provides some limited support for the proposal.
24. Several examples of properties within the village that have had extensions have been included in the evidence. However, as I do not have full details of these proposals, I cannot be sure of the circumstances of such cases. Additionally, I

have no evidence that any of these buildings are listed and, therefore, comparable to the appeal before me.

## **Public Benefits**

25. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have clear and convincing justification. I find the harm to the listed building to be less than substantial and at the lower end of the scale, and the harm to the CA, whilst also less than substantial, to be very limited in scale. Nevertheless, these harms to the significance of the designated heritage assets are of considerable importance and weight in the planning balance of these appeals.
26. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
27. The appellants require, because of age related health and disability issues, single storey accommodation with separate bedrooms and bathrooms. The proposal would enable the main house to be occupied by the appellant's family who would be able to provide care and support. The appellants consider that the impact of the proposal would be minimal and that the benefits would outweigh any impacts on heritage assets.
28. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out in s149 of the Equality Act 2010. The development is required to meet the needs of persons who have protected characteristics due to their disability.
29. I have also taken into consideration the Human Rights Act (HRA), 1998, and recognise that the dismissal of the appeal would interfere with some of the appellants' rights under Article 8 of the First Protocol. Article 8(1) states that everyone has a right to respect for their private and family life, their home and their correspondence.
30. The proposed annexe includes underfloor heating, an air source heat pump, a mechanical heat recovery system and photovoltaic panels on the roof which would be sited on the inner roof slopes to reduce visibility. I give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions. However, the overall benefits from such a small building would be very limited in scale and not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
31. Four nest boxes would be built within the eaves of the annexe and four cherry trees planted, which would provide some small ecological enhancement. In addition, there would be some limited economic benefits during the period of construction of the annexe.
32. I appreciate the social benefits that creating additional living space would provide to the needs of the appellants. Whilst this is primarily a private benefit, it would enable the appellants to continue to live in the village and on the same site that they have occupied for many years. However, while the benefits attract moderate

weight, they are not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I give to the harm to the heritage asset.

33. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 212 of the Framework. Additionally, it would conflict with LP policy SP2 which requires development to further the statutory purpose of the NP, including conserving and enhancing cultural heritage, policy L1 which requires proposals affecting a designated heritage asset to conserve and enhance its significance, and policy SP4, as set out above.

### **Balance and Conclusion**

34. In the context of the HRA and the PSED, the personal circumstances of the appellants are a substantial consideration in favour of the appeal. Whilst I am sympathetic to the owners' situation, I must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special or architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and the character or appearance of the CA. However, in this instance, the considerations would not outweigh the conflict with the development plan as a whole.
35. Consequently, I consider that it is in the wider public interest to interfere with the qualified rights under Article 8 in order to remedy the harm to the significance of the listed building and the CA. In making this decision, I consider that any interference with those rights is necessary and proportionate and in accordance with the law.
36. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and that warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.
37. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

*M J Francis*

INSPECTOR