



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/24/3346053

Acorn Barn, Broad Oak Farm, Leighton Road, Three Locks, Soulbury, Buckinghamshire LU7 0DX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Steve Katasi against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 23/03397/APP.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey rear extension"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Despite apparently being subject to substantial reconstruction works during its conversion, the appeal building appears to have been largely unaltered since. This aside, and together with the remainders in the connected group, the dwellings form a high quality two and single storey courtyard development. This typical agrarian pattern lends a pleasant traditionality to the immediate area which, accordingly, contributes positively to its character and appearance.
5. The proposed extension would attach to the outbuilding referred to in the evidence. This has yet to be constructed. The appeal proposal would be of a modest height. However, and in conjunction with the outbuilding, it would be significant in length, competing with the land take of the original building and as such would not be a clearly subservient addition. This, coupled with the position of the extension, would detract from the traditional quality of the courtyard shape of the buildings. As a result, it would appear unnatural and discordant. Whilst it would be to the rear of the property and not immediately obvious, this would not acceptably reduce the adverse effect the scheme would have, for the above reasons, on the character and appearance of the area.

-
6. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policies C1 and BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021, Chapters 8 and 9 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Design Supplementary Planning Document, the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 and sections C1, I1 and I2 of the National Design Guide 2021 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard, amongst other things.

Other Matters

7. It is not sufficiently clear that the proposed development is the only way of meeting the increased internal space requirements of the incumbent family. I therefore attach limited weight to this personal need. The appellants have raised concerns with the handling of the original application. This is a matter that is for the appellant to resolve with the Council directly having regard to the submissions before me in this appeal.
8. It seems clear that the detached outbuilding will be erected regardless of the outcome of this appeal. Indeed, there is no controlling mechanism in so considering it that could ensure it is or restrict it being so. That aside, and whilst I appreciate the proposed extension would be of a contextually small scale in and of itself, when placed in the above context it would give rise to the harm I have identified.
9. The Council is satisfied that there would be no harm to the setting of the grade II listed Broad Oak Farm by virtue of the separation distance between it and the proposals along with the intervening buildings and existing boundary treatments. With this and Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. There is no disagreement between the main parties concerning the effect of the scheme on the Brickhills Area of Attractive Landscape. Given the scale of the scheme along with how contained it would be in broader landscape terms, I am satisfied the harm I have found would not extend to its particular qualities.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan. I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR