
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2017

by David Walker MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/16/3163878

Mount Pleasant Farm, High Street, Burcott, Leighton Buzzard LU7 0JS

- 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 Gurmail Singh against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01872/APP, dated 18 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a large shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the countryside.

Reasons

3. The proposed large shed measuring 45 x 24 m would subsume a run of existing stables and feature roller doors together with an open sided sheltered area. It would be positioned behind the collection of buildings, hardstandings and enclosures of the farmhouse where it would be elevated in the rolling landform of the area.
4. An exposed position would allow the large shed to be plainly visible in landscape views from along the rights of way network and nearby highways. While it was apparent at my site inspection that the site had been levelled to approximately 1 m below the ground level of the stables, the proposal would be higher than the existing modest structures. In the absence of any surveyed levels it has not been demonstrated that the building would not also be higher and more prominent than the farmhouse.
5. In this rural setting, outside of the built confines of Burcott, the proposal would amount to a bulky and industrial scale building with a utilitarian appearance. Recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, as required at paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) it would have a harmful visual impact. I acknowledge that there are other large buildings in the wider area and these also have a harmful visual impact.
6. The Framework also supports the development of agriculture and other land-based rural businesses. However, beyond the need to store a tractor and

unspecified implements little justification for a building of the size proposed has been provided. In addition, other options for addressing security risks do not appear to have been considered.

7. I conclude that proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the countryside. As a result it would conflict with paragraph 109 of the Framework and the need to enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR