The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:21ST March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3291221
Cedar Barn Hollingdon Road Soulbury LU7 0DN

- 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 Jason Marchant against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
- The application Ref 21/01274/APP, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2021.
- The development proposed is the erection of a detached car port.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached car port at Cedar Barn Hollingdon Road Soulbury LU7 0DN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01274/APP, dated 25 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Car Port Plan and Elevations (March 2021), Proposed Site Plan (March 2021) and Site Location and Block Plan (March 2021).

   3) Prior to development, samples of the materials to be used in the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The samples are to be made available on site. The development shall be carried out using the approved details.

   4) The car port hereby permitted shall not be used or occupied for any purposes other than ancillary to the residential use of the property on the site currently known as Cedar Barn, Hollingdon Road, Soulbury LU7 0DN.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single storey barn conversion and one of three properties located around a central shared courtyard to the rear of Upper Hollingdon Farmhouse. Permitted development rights removing the right to

erect garages, extensions and other enclosures without the need for planning permission were imposed at the time of the conversion of the agricultural buildings. There is an open aspect on the north eastern boundary of the courtyard where the proposed car port would be sited. Historical images indicate that an agricultural building was previously sited in this location.

4. The proposed car port would represent approximately 29% of the existing floor space of Cedar Barn. However, its length would be substantially less than that of Cedar Barn and would reflect the elongated nature of the buildings in the courtyard complex. Its eaves and ridge heights would be lower than Cedar Barn. Further, the open aspect would reduce its massing as well as reflecting its ancillary use. These design features would ensure that, notwithstanding that Cedar Barn is also a single storey structure, the proposed car port would not compete in scale and would appear subordinate in nature to it.

5. The proposal would introduce a further domestic building into this location. However, its design and style would reflect the rural heritage of the site and its linear form would not be dissimilar to that found in typical farmyard layouts. Its scale and relationship to the original agricultural building would be acceptable. As such it would not be at odds with the character of Cedar Barn, the other properties within the development or the wider rural setting.

6. Due to the juxtaposition of Upper Hollingdon Farmhouse, the access to the courtyard and the proposed siting of the car port at the rear of the courtyard, views of the proposal would be limited from Hollingdon Road. The views which would be obtained would be that of a courtyard setting appropriate to a rural location, and the proposed car port would not be unduly prominent. The more substantial views of the proposed car port would be observed from the public footpath to the east of Cedar Barn. In this instance the open aspect of the courtyard currently seen would be blocked by the erection of the car port. However, this would not in my view be necessarily harmful. The building would be seen as a typical building to be expected within a rural setting and it would block out views of any parked cars and any domestic paraphernalia within the courtyard. In addition, it would reflect the historical pattern of development previously seen in this location.

7. The Council's Design Guide on The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings (Design Guide) seeks to retain the character and appearance of traditional farm buildings and that they retain a farm like setting. The design, scale and siting of the proposed car port would be seen as a coherent part of the design and layout of the former farm complex. As such it would not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the curtilage of the courtyard which would retain a farm like setting.

8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of Cedar Barn and the area. Accordingly, the proposal would be in accordance with Policies BE2 and NE4 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (LP). These policies amongst other matters, together require new development to respect and complement local character, the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings and preserve local distinctiveness. The proposal would also be in accordance with Policy C1 of the LP which requires any extension to an existing barn conversion to be ancillary in nature, subordinate to the main building and in keeping with the rural character. In addition, the proposal would be in accordance with the Design Guide in that it would preserve the

farm like setting of the former farm complex. Further, it would not be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions in respect of timescales and approved plans as these are necessary to provide certainty. I have amended the condition to ensure that all materials to be used are approved prior to development. This condition is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory. A condition to ensure use of the building remains ancillary to the host dwelling and in line with the development for which permission was sought is also necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed as set out in the formal decision above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR