



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3351494

Grove Barn, Grove Lane, Great Kimble, Aylesbury HP17 9TR

- 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 Mr and Mrs Buckthorpe against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - West Area (Wycombe).
 - The application Ref is 24/05180/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "demolition of two garden outbuildings and erection of a home office/garage/carport with first floor playroom and solar panels to front/side, creation of swimming pool to rear and detached summer room/store to rear. Associated hard and soft landscaping."
-

Decision

1. This 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.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The appeal form uses the description on the decision notice acknowledging changes were made without consent of the appellant. However, I am satisfied that the description on the application form, which I have used above, accurately describes the development to which the appeal relates.
4. The Council do not object to the swimming pool and the detached summer room to the rear of the property. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. My recommendation therefore focusses on the home office/garage/carport element and, specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The proposed development's host dwelling is a converted barn in amongst a development of similar low lying former agricultural buildings. It appears to have been largely unaltered in general form and character terms. The collection and arrangement of the buildings, their natural materials and scale contribute positively to a traditional agrarian feel. Along with the rurality of the wider area, there is a high quality to the distinctiveness and strong sense of openness to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The detached building in question would have a substantial land take. The parcel it would sit on currently has some tree cover, but it nonetheless contributes to the quality of the wider area's openness and rurality. The scale of the building would erode the feeling of openness and compete for dominance with the host building, being of a broad footprint and close to its height. Some additional landscaping might assist in screening or softening the effect of the building, but this would also serve as an enclosing feature in itself. It would, in any case, not make up for the effect the scheme would have on the character of the area in the above terms even if it could be effectively hidden.
7. Due to the siting of the building forward of the host, it would be visually prominent, particularly on approach to the wider complex from the public realm. This level of visibility would emphasise the incongruity of its size in relation to the host building and the traditional attractiveness of the wider group.
8. With this in mind, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus conflict with Policies CP9, DM35, DM36 and DM44 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019, Policy KIM2 of the Great and Little Kimble Cum Marsh Neighbourhood Plan 2021, Sections 6, 12 and 17 of the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2020 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard, amongst other things.

Other Matters

9. I appreciate the appellant's desire to provide covered parking but remain to be convinced that the appeal scheme is the only way to achieve that outcome. It would be built of materials suitable for its setting and, in and of itself, its design would not be of poor quality. These would however be a lack of harm and thus incapable of weighing against that which I have found.
10. Both parties have raised disputes surrounding the residential curtilage and non-compliance with a previous permission's condition. For this appeal, it has been concluded by the Council that all elements of the proposal are within the residential curtilage. I have no reason to disagree. In relation to the non-compliance of a previous condition this is a matter to be resolved outside of this appeal.
11. The Council's second reason for refusal enters a balancing exercise around the public benefits of the proposal. However, there is no requirement to engage in this duty as the proposal is not sited within the historic environment. Whilst any biodiversity enhancements would be welcome, I have not been shown any specifics thereof and the scale of the proposals would be limited in the grand scheme. I can therefore only afford them limited weight.
12. The appellant has used the neighbouring barn of The Old Stable as a differing form of extension and garage addition. I am, however, unaware of their planning status and the finer details such as the circumstances which prevailed at the time or matters taken into account. Notwithstanding this, they are not comparable schemes due to the scale and siting of the proposal before me. They do not therefore result in a sufficiently significant material consideration which would lead me to recommending the appeal be allowed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and 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

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR