



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/20/3256031

Barrettstown Stud Farm, Oving Road, Whitchurch HP22 4ES

- 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 Nigel Leheup of Reeves Farm Ltd against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00167/APP, dated 15 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is front extensions to provide an additional bedroom and self contained kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Aylesbury Vale District Council merged with a number of other local planning authorities into Buckinghamshire Council. Aylesbury Vale District Council is now called Buckinghamshire Council-Aylesbury area.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a converted stable block located within a complex of rural buildings. The dwelling is set back from a neighbouring building and is set at a lower level. It adjoins an existing two storey dwelling. Aside from modern glazing the stable building retains its simple traditional rural appearance.
6. Whilst the proposed development would result in a small increase in the overall size of the building and views of it would be localised, the height, width and projection of the extensions extending across most of the front elevation would unduly dominate its simple rural form appearing as incongruous features.

7. I acknowledge that rural buildings can be extended and adapted over time. However, the extensions due to their scale, form and detailing would not complement the property or be reflective of historic additions or of a small stable complex. Rather the proposal would be unsympathetic domestic style features, reflected by the height, varying depths of the projections and small windows which would significantly diminish the traditional form and appearance of the building. The use of sympathetic materials would not overcome the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other barn conversions and extensions in the area. However, these examples do not lead me to a different overall conclusion that the proposal would be unacceptable as a result of the harm that I have already described.
9. Consequently, the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property contrary to Policies RA11 and GP.9 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (2004) which, amongst other things, requires conversion works not to involve significant extensions and should respect the character and the building and its setting. It would be contrary to Policies C1 and BE2 of the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan which, amongst other things, require new development proposals to respect and complement local distinctiveness and vernacular character and extensions to converted rural buildings should be modest in scale, ancillary in nature, subordinate to the main building, and in keeping with the rural character, designed with sensitivity to the host building and enhance the character and appearance of its immediate surroundings.
10. It would also be contrary to guidance set out in the Council's Design Guide for Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings which, amongst other things, states that the functional simplicity of farm buildings should be preserved without alien additions or alterations and the Design Guide for Residential Extensions which, amongst other things, states that in respect of front extensions only small additions which will not harm the quality or character of the building are generally permissible.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR