



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/20/3247208

Fulbrook Barn, Hogshaw MK18 3JY

- 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 Ralph Franklin against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03915/APP, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the existing building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by an L-shaped, single storey, detached dwelling, which has been converted from a barn. It is located in a rural and isolated environment and is set back significantly from the main road with access via a private track road. It is also located within an Area of Attractive Landscape as defined by the Council in recognition of its scenic quality. The proposal would extend the dwelling to the side to create a T-shaped building.
5. Although the dwelling is some distance from the main road, it is located at an elevated position due to the sloping ground level and therefore is visible from the public realm. It is not possible to see the rear section of the building or its L-shape form from the road. However, the proposed extension would adjoin the main front section of the building, with a matching design and scale. The extension to this main section would create an elongated appearance of the building and would increase its size considerably. It would be highly visible from the road, resulting in a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

6. It is noted that a subsidiary extension may lead to structural complications. However, the significant width and height of the extension would result in a dwelling which would be imposing on the open and rural landscape. It would also be out of keeping with the current modest appearance of the converted farm building to the detriment of the countryside location and Area of Attractive Landscape in which it is situated.
7. It has been stated that the proposal is intended to resolve the junction between the two wings in a more satisfactory manner and that the proposal would simplify the form of the current building. However, in my view, this should not be undertaken to the detriment of the character and appearance of the current building and the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has also stated that historic maps show that the site was previously occupied by a larger building and the proposed extension would create a building which would be less than the previous extent. However, the proposal should primarily be assessed on the appeal site in its current form and any larger historic additions would not overcome the present harm found.
9. For the reasons above I consider that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would be contrary to Policies GP9, GP35 and RA8 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (2004). These seek to ensure extensions respect the appearance of the dwelling, complement the building tradition, ordering, form and materials of the locality whilst also respecting the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to the general design principles of the Aylesbury Vale District Council Residential Extensions Design Guide (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. It would also be contrary to Policies BE2 and C1 of the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 (2019) which require new development to respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings with any extensions to existing barn conversions being modest in scale, ancillary in nature and subordinate to the main building.
11. Policy RA11 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (2004) and Aylesbury Vale District Council The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings Design Guide (1990) relates to the conversion of existing buildings, as the conversion of the building into a residential dwelling has already been granted planning permission and undertaken, this policy are not relevant to the appeal before me.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has highlighted several errors within the Council's report including the number of bedrooms currently in the property and the use of the term 'wing' to describe the proposed development. These small factual errors do not affect the assessment of the appeal and therefore have no bearing on my consideration.

Conclusions and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR