
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/20/3247264

Valley Barn, Middle End, Leckhampstead MK18 5NS

- 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 & Mrs Mark Salisbury against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03432/APP, dated 22 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. While I note the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 Proposed Submission Plan (November 2017) as Proposed to be Modified (October 2019) (showing main and additional modifications), since there is no certainty that the policies within will be adopted in their current form, I attribute them limited weight.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a converted single storey barn that retains its agricultural character.
5. The proposed extension would be situated on the front elevation of the host property near the western end of the linear building. The ridge of the proposed roof would be perpendicular to the existing roof such that the extension would project from the front of the host building.
6. The eaves and ridge height of the proposed extension would match the roof of the host dwelling and I note the floorspace and volume of the proposed extension compared with the host building. However, while the width of the front elevation of the extension would not appear significant when viewed against the length of the host property, it would have a considerable depth that would be similar to the depth of the existing building.
7. As such, while I acknowledge the comparison made by the appellant with the extract image from Design Guide 2 The Conversion of Traditional Farm

Buildings (DG2), in my view the extension would project significantly further in front of the principle elevation than shown in that image. Therefore, the proposal would appear bulky and incongruous against the simple linear form of the host dwelling, thereby significantly diminishing the agricultural character and appearance of the host building.

8. I acknowledge that the proposed materials would include matching natural stone and timber cladding as well as natural blue/grey slate and timber framed doors and windows. I also note that the proposed full height fenestration would reflect the type of large openings often associated with barns. However, given the depth of the proposed extension and its position on the principle elevation, the proposal would nevertheless appear incongruous against the existing barn conversion and would adversely affect its agricultural character and appearance.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host building. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies GP9, GP35 and RA11 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan Written Statement Part 1 January 2004 which together require extensions to respect the character and appearance of the dwelling as well as the building tradition of the locality. It would also conflict with Design Guide Residential Extensions and DG2 in this particular respect. It would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the evidence regarding the visibility and appearance of the proposal from the public footpath and Middle End. I also note the Parish Council's support for the proposal. However, given the harm identified above, these matters have not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR