



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/22/3301158

**Land north of Bletchley Road, Great Horwood MK11 9HW - Easting 478533
Northing 232432**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 – as amended.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Charlie Randall against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01761/AGN, dated 13 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2022. The development proposed is a general purpose agricultural building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Within the evidence submitted in support of the appeal, reference is made to a crushed concrete track. At the time of my site visit, the crushed concrete track was not apparent within the appeal site. The application form indicates that the development proposal is for a general-purpose agricultural building. No reference is made to a proposal for an access track within the application form. The Council have determined the application on the basis of the description of development identified within the banner above, and the appellant has subsequently confirmed that the proposal does not include the provision of an access track. I have therefore determined this appeal on the basis that the proposal is limited to that outlined within the banner.
3. It is not disputed by the main parties that the proposal would not conflict with the requirements of A.1 of Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 – as amended (the GPDO).
4. Accordingly, the dispute before me solely centres on condition A.2 (2) (i) dealing with the prior approval of the siting, design and external appearance of the building, which was considered by the Council as required, and was subsequently refused for reasons relating to harm to the character and appearance of the area as defined within their decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to its siting, design and external appearance.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located within a large and open agricultural field, which is bounded by mature hedgerows and trees. It is within a countryside location. Beyond the ditch which runs across the field, the ground level slopes gently upwards and away from the adjacent A421 road. The openness of the large field contributes positively to the pleasant rural character and appearance of the area.
7. Amongst other things, policy E9 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021 (the Local Plan) indicates that new agricultural buildings should be sited close to existing buildings; designed in order to minimise adverse impact on the openness of the countryside and landscape character; and, to reflect the operational requirements of the holding.
8. Although some buildings can be seen from the road when passing the appeal site, such buildings are located at a greater distance from the road than the appeal site, and are at least partially obscured from view by existing trees and hedgerows. There are no buildings within the part of the field within which it is proposed that the development be undertaken. The site upon which the building would be located is highly visible from public vantages along A421 when passing the site. This is due to the A421 road and layby being elevated above the intervening roadside hedgerow; the lack of any other intervening landscape features interrupting views of the appeal site; and the proximity of the site to the road. Although the presence of the hedgerow close to the proposed building would reduce the prominence of the development for users of the road travelling in a westerly direction, this would not be the case for those travelling in an easterly direction or using the layby.
9. I have been provided with no reason to doubt that the design and external appearance of the proposed building is inherently suitable for its specified purposes, i.e. the storage of seeds, fertiliser and machinery, and to store crops following harvesting. However, no compelling evidence has been submitted demonstrating the need for it to be sited as proposed. Located in a prominent position and away from other buildings, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the distinctive openness of the area.
10. There is no general provision within the GPDO to impose conditions other than those which are indicated within the relevant part of the Order. Whilst some individual parts of the GPDO make provision for conditions to be imposed which relate to matters for which prior approval is required, part 6 contains no such provision. Therefore, and even if I were to find that the harmful effects of the development could be mitigated by the imposition of suitably worded landscaping conditions, the GPDO confers no rights for additional conditions to be imposed in this case.
11. For the afore reasons, and due to its siting, design and external appearance, the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with the parts of Policies E9 and BE2 of the Local Plan, where they seek to ensure that development is of a good design which respects and complements the site and its setting, and that new agricultural buildings are sited close to existing buildings.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR