The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/21/3288852
Emerald Barn, Cobblershill Lane, Wendover Dene HP22 6QD

- 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 David Vigor against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
- The application Ref 21/03615/APP, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2021.
- The development proposed is single storey pitched roof extension with gable end providing extended living area and office.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The site is located within the Green Belt, and it is common ground between the main parties that the development proposed would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Given the scale of the original building and the limited size of the proposal I concur that the proposed extension would not be a disproportionate addition to the original building and thus not inappropriate development it the Green Belt.

4. The site is located within The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Council has concluded that because the proposal would be viewed within the context of the existing dwelling that the extension would not harm the character and appearance of the AONB. Based on the information before me the proposal would preserve the landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB, and I see no reason to disagree with the Council on this matter.

5. In the interest of accuracy, I have used the post code from the appeal form in the banner heading rather than the post code from the application form because it is the most accurate post code for the site.

Main Issue

6. The effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. Emerald Barn is a converted workshop that has a narrow linear form and has timber cladding with a pitched roof. The aesthetic value of the converted building lies in its linear form. The visual interest of the building centred around the front elevation which is mostly glazed and opens out onto a patio.

8. The proposed extension would extend out from the flank wall of the dwelling and the roof would be set down from the ridge of the host dwelling. This alongside the overall size of the proposal would ensure that the extension would not be a disproportionate addition to the converted building. However, the Residential Extensions Design Guide (1991) states that extensions that would distort the shape of the existing house are less acceptable than those that respect the roof pitch and span depth of the original.

9. The extension would extend out from the flank wall of the dwelling and consequently it would have an awkward relationship with the converted building. This would fail to respect the linear form of the building and would fundamentally alter the shape of it. This would be an unduly dominant component of the scheme and would challenge the prominence of the host dwelling as well as the front elevation and would not be subordinate to the main building. This would erode the legibility of the original form of the building and fail to replicate and complement the existing form of the building. The proposal would be well screened from the wider surrounding area however, the extension would be visually prominent within the immediate setting, particularly to any visitors to the site. The proposal would be an incongruous feature that would detract from the character and appearance of the immediate surrounding area.

10. The proposed materials and detailed design of the extension, in isolation, would be similar to the host dwelling and as a result, these elements of the extension would appear harmonious with the dwelling. Moreover, given the size of the associated plot, the proposal would not overdevelop it. These matters however, would not overcome the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate surrounding area.

11. Policy C1 of The Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (LP) (Adopted 2021) has several criteria that conversions of rural buildings must accord with, including extensions to said buildings. The proposal would be modest in scale and ancillary in nature, but it would not be necessary to meet the essential functional requirements of its intended re-use, given that neither of the proposed rooms would be essential for the building to function. The proposal would contribute to the continued functional requirements of the house. Nonetheless, for the reasons given above the proposal would not be subordinate to the main building.

12. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would consequently conflict with LP Policies BE2 and C1 as well as Policy SD1 of the Wendover Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2020). These policies seek to ensure new developments respect and complement local distinctiveness and vernacular character of the locality, in terms of ordering, form, proportions, architectural detailing and materials. Whilst the dwelling is not a traditional barn conversion the house is a converted building and the advice set out in The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings (1990) is relevant insofar as it identifies that flank

extensions to converted buildings would typically be resisted as they would fail to preserve the building in their original form and the proposal would conflict with this. Moreover, the proposal also would not accord with the aim of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure development creates high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places and is sympathetic to local character and history.

Other Matters

13. The converted dwelling is limited by the size of the original building, and the proposal would create a more adaptable living space for the appellant. Nevertheless, there is no substantive evidence that the extension as proposed, with the associated harm, would be the only scheme that could achieve the desired outcome.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR