



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 November 2022

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/22/3292978

Tudor Cottage, 18 North End Road, Steeple Claydon, MK18 2PG

- 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 Christopher Thomas against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref. 21/01173/APP, dated 21 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a rear single storey extension (with mezzanine) to an existing outbuilding.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/Y/22/3290804

Tudor Cottage, 18 North End Road, Steeple Claydon, MK18 2PG

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Christopher Thomas against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref. 21/01174/ALB, dated 21 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2021.
 - The works proposed are a rear single storey extension (with mezzanine) to an existing outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The outbuilding the subject of this appeal is not listed in its own right but is a curtilage listed building associated with Tudor Cottage.
3. As the proposal involves a listed building I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the curtilage listed outbuilding, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses; and whether the proposal would preserve the setting of a Grade II listed building, Tudor Cottage, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a timber framed cottage with a thatched roof which dates from the 17th Century. It is set back from the street behind a small front garden with a driveway and hard surfaced yard to the side and rear. Within the yard, on the opposite side of the driveway is a range of ancillary red brick outbuildings under a clay tiled roof and with side hung timber doors, which also appears to be of some considerable age. These buildings are curtilage listed. The buildings stand within a relatively spacious plot, with the principal listed building as the centre piece standing prominently within the street scene.
6. The listed building derives much of its special interest from its age and the traditional form of construction and materials apparent. The ancillary outbuildings subject of this appeal are very much incidental to the principal building, being far more modest in scale and utilitarian in appearance, albeit that they contribute to its traditional character and appearance.

Curtilage listed outbuilding

7. The proposed works would significantly increase the footprint, size, and scale of the outbuildings and alter their simple linear form. A substantial extension would run perpendicular to the existing building under a steeply pitched roof. Windows and roof lights would domesticate the appearance of the outbuildings, diminishing their ancillary utilitarian role and appearance. The proposed building would also extend much closer to the principal building, reducing the gap and visual distinction between the two. The outbuildings modest and utilitarian appearance would be entirely lost.
8. The harm arising would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) but is nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. I note the appellant's desire to stay living in the property and for additional space but the benefits arising in this case would be private ones. No public benefits have been identified that can be weighed against the identified harm.

Tudor Cottage

9. The building created by the proposed scheme would no longer appear as a small utilitarian outbuilding to the appeal property. The resulting building would be entirely disproportionate in size and scale, appearing to be an independent dwelling within the grounds of the cottage and competing with its prominence. The open nature and spaciousness of the site would be lost.
10. The harm arising would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) but is nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. I note the appellant's desire to stay living in the property and for additional space but the benefits arising in this case would be private ones. No public benefits have been identified that can be weighed against the identified harm.

Conclusion

11. As such, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the curtilage listed building and the listed house. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 197 of the Framework and conflict with policies BE1 and BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury

Local Plan (2021) that seek, among other things, to ensure good design and the preservation or enhancement of heritage assets. As a result, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.

12. In light of the above, the appeals are dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR