



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020 by John Gunn DipTP Dip DBE MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/20/3257713

North Stables, Horton Road, Horton, Buckinghamshire LU7 0QR

- 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 Michael McVeigh against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref 20/00227/APP, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed ground floor rear extension to provide a new day room'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The address of the appeal site given on the planning application and appeal form indicates that the property lies within Bedfordshire, whereas the decision notice states that it is within Buckinghamshire. The appellant has confirmed that the correct address is Buckinghamshire and I have assessed the proposal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within a small residential settlement located within a rural area. It forms part of a scheme that involved the conversion and extension of former agricultural buildings, grouped around Horton House, a non-designated heritage asset.
5. On my site visit I noted that the host property, and its immediate neighbour had a simple form, incorporating steep pitched roofs and a limited pallet of materials, that reflected the agricultural buildings in the locality. The proposed development would incorporate a flat roof which would contrast significantly with the host buildings. As a result, it would appear as a discordant feature that would be harmful to the appearance of the host property.
6. Whilst the new extension would not be clearly visible from Horton Road, it would be apparent from the adjoining property at South Stables. Moreover, it is

likely that the upper parts of the proposal would be seen from Horton Road if the existing hedge on the common boundary with The Vines, and which is not in the control of the appellant, were removed or significantly reduced in height. As a result, its incongruous design would be seen in the context of the traditionally designed host property and its immediate neighbours.

7. Given my findings, the contribution the host property as extended would make to the character and appearance of the area would be diminished. Harm to the character and appearance of the area would occur as a result.
8. I acknowledge that alternative options for development, that accord with the Design Guide 2 – the Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings (SPG), may impact on the existing solar panel. Furthermore, consideration would need to be given to the impact of any alternative development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, I do not consider that these are insurmountable matters and do not justify allowing harmful development.
9. I have also taken into account the impact on the setting of Horton House. The Council's Heritage Officer considers that the proposed extension would cause no harm to the significance of this non-designated asset and from what I have seen and read I have no reason to disagree with that view. The absence of harm in this regard does not provide justification for the proposal.
10. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to saved Policies GP.9 and GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan January 2004 Part 1 (LP), Policy BE2 of 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) (ELP) and Policy SPL6 of the Slapton Neighbourhood Plan which jointly require extensions to respect the appearance of the dwelling and its setting and other buildings in their locality.
11. The proposed development would not be contrary to Policy RA.11 of the LP or Policy C1 of the ELP as these relate to the conversion of existing buildings, which is not the case here.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that the appellants have expressed concern about the lack of communication from the Council and would appreciate its opinion as to what might be acceptable development. Such issues should be taken up directly with the Council. This matter does not alter the conclusions that I have reached.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

J Gunn

APPEAL 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.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR