



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2023

by Hannah Guest BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3304815

The Barn, Broughton Lane, Bierton, Buckinghamshire HP22 5AW

- 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 Mrs Judith Taylor against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02061/APP, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is build a conservatory extension onto the rear elevation of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note that the name of the appellant is different from the name of the applicant stated on the application form. I have before me a letter confirming the applicant's wish to appeal and authorising an agent to act on their behalf. I have therefore referred to the applicant as the appellant in the banner heading above rather than the appellant as recorded on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, wider barn complex and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a barn conversion with a simple and traditional form and appearance. It has two gable pitched roofs and a mono-pitched roof and its external materials consist of black timber cladding on a short brick plinth, black timber windows and stable doors, and a grey slate tiled roof.
5. The proposed conservatory would be relatively modest in terms of its height and depth. However, would be approximately half the width of the host dwelling. It would consist largely of brick with black UPVC double glazed casement windows and French doors, and a double glazed UPVC and aluminium double hipped conservatory roof.
6. The proposed conservatory has been designed to replicate the brick work and lower wall height of the host dwelling, which would create some synergy between the proposed conservatory and existing house. Nevertheless, the proposed conservatory would erode the simple and traditional character of the host dwelling. The proposed materials, particularly the large amount of brick,

would not be in keeping with the existing black clad exterior and the hipped roof of the proposed conservatory would be at odds with the pitched roofs used on the host dwelling.

7. It may be that the glass, translucent roofs of conservatories are often not fully in keeping with the typical solid roof structure of their host dwelling. However, in this case, the proposed conservatory's width, form, and material palette together would result in a prominent and incongruous addition that would fail to preserve the characteristics of the traditional farm building and would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The host dwelling is set back quite a distance from the public highway and the proposed conservatory would be positioned behind the property, thus, views of it from the public highway would be very limited. However, despite being partly screened by hedging, it would be quite prominent in views from the access drive serving the host dwelling, the adjacent property known as Amberley and the paddocks to the south and west of the host dwelling.
9. Although now a house, the appeal property largely retains the appearance of a barn, which is an important characteristic of its immediate and wider rural surroundings. Given the proposed conservatory would erode the simple and traditional appearance of the barn, it would subsequently harm the character and appearance of the wider barn complex and surrounding area. Furthermore, I note that permitted development rights were removed when the barn conversion was approved to protect the traditional form of the building as well as the visual amenities of the locality.
10. Accordingly, for the reasons above, the proposed conservatory would result in a significant and alien addition which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the traditional rural barn conversion resulting in demonstrable harm to the visual amenities of the wider barn complex and surrounding area.
11. The Council have cited conflict with Policy C1 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021) (Local Plan) in their reason for refusal, which aims to ensure that any extension to the existing barn conversion is designed with sensitivity to the host dwelling and will enhance the character and appearance of the immediate surroundings. However, the criteria set out in Policy C1 of the Local Plan apply specifically when permitting the re-use of an existing building and, given the barn has already been converted, in this case, they are not applicable.
12. Nevertheless, Policy BE2 of the Local Plan is also before me. It has similar aims to Policy C1, seeking to ensure that development respects the existing character and visual amenity of rural landscapes and buildings, and it applies to all new development proposals. The proposed conservatory would therefore conflict with Policy BE2 and subsequently, the development plan read as a whole. It would also be contrary to the associated provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek to ensure well designed development that is, among other things, sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.
13. Furthermore, the proposed conservatory would conflict with the guidance on extension and additions to farm buildings, set out in the Council's Design Guide 2: The Conversion of Traditional Buildings (1990), which advises that farm buildings are preserved in their original form without alien additions and alterations.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Hannah Guest

INSPECTOR