



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2025

by **J Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3360176

Bramley Cottage, 1 Claydon Place, Church Street, Twyford, Bucks MK18 4EU

- 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 Craig Taylor against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/03014/APP dated 7 October 2024, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2024.
 - The development proposed is Install a shed in a front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Accompanying the appellant's appeal statement, further revised plans and photographs have been submitted. The revised location/site plan shows the proposed shed stepped back from a common boundary. However, the common boundary is different to that indicated on the originally submitted plans because it is located further across in front of 2 Claydon Place. As No 2 is a listed building, a boundary change would be substantial and fundamental issue. There would also be procedural unfairness in that other parties have not had the opportunity to comment on this change. Consequently, the proposal has been considered on the basis of the originally submitted location/site plans.
3. For the elevational plan, there is no significant difference with that originally submitted whilst the photographs elaborate on the information already submitted. In both instances, there are no substantial or fundamental changes, and third parties and the Council would not be prejudiced through the consideration of such documentation in the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effects of the proposal on the settings of designated heritage assets, the Grade II listed 2 Claydon Place, Grade 1 listed Church of St Mary and Grade II listed Cross in the Churchyard of St Mary's Church.

Reasons

Heritage Assets

5. The appeal site comprises the front garden of 1 Claydon Place which includes lawn, perimeter shrubs and trees, and a vehicular drive. It is located at the end of a terrace of different styled dwellings. No 1 comprises a two storey end of terrace

which has a rendered/painted exterior and a slate type tile roof. The neighbouring listed dwelling at No 2 is constructed with red facing brick at the ground floor and a second floor within a thatched roof. The remaining part of the terrace at 3-4 Claydon Place is rendered/painted externally with plain tile roof.

6. The Claydon Place terrace fronts onto Church Street within the settlement of Twyford and nearby, on the opposite side of the street, there are the grounds and Church of St Mary. In front of the church, on the side furthest from the road, there is a listed stone Cross within a graveyard. The Grade II listed Red Lion (former Public House) is opposite the church and on the same side of the street as the appeal site.
7. The listed cottage at No 2 is traditionally constructed with casement windows and a prominent door. The cottage is late 18th century, with the statutory listing (listing number 1214979) indicating the building to be of a one bay construction, a brick stack to the left and with paired metal barred casements, the ground floor casement with a cut brick flat head and the upper one within the thatch. There is a ground floor board door with similar brick flat head and another small window to the right of the door. The simple design, traditional materials and features, including the use of thatch and casement windows, result in an attractive historic semi rural cottage. These architectural and historic qualities are of importance and value, and contribute to the significance of the heritage asset.
8. With its frontage design and layout, this small dwelling would have been accessed from Church Street, the main thoroughfare through the village. Its old construction, simple design with traditional materials, including thatch, location backing onto countryside within landscaped surroundings, result in a noticeable and attractive presence. The frontage areas of the Claydon Place, especially the more open parts of Nos 2 and 1 (the appeal site) enable its architectural and historic features, to be approached and appreciated.
9. There are garaging/outbuildings, in front of the remaining Claydon Place properties that do obscure views of the cottage and the ability to interpret the significance of the heritage asset. Parts of the garaging/outbuilding belong to another dwelling, The Forge, which is located further forward than the terrace in relation to Church Street. Nevertheless, such circumstances make the frontage areas in front of Nos 1 and 2, particularly sensitive to change, as they are the main areas where significance is appreciated. The front garden of No 2 is landscaped with vegetation which partially screens the façade of the listed cottage at No 1. However, during the winter, the vegetation would permit views and even in summer, with vegetation in leaf, there will be filtered views through to the cottage's façade, indicating the presence of the listed building.
10. The Grade 1 listed Church dates to the 12th century, with a 14th century tower altered in 15th Century. It is constructed with coursed rubble stone, tiled roof to chancel and lead to aisles. The statutory listing (listing number 1215009) details the tower in two stages with diagonal buttresses, moulded plinth, battlement parapet and 2-light openings to bell-chamber. On the south side, notable features include a fine 12th century doorway with round arch with chevron and beakhead ornament, carved impost, shafts with figure caps and jambs with sun motifs. The surrounding porch is dated between early 17 and early 19th century with a battlemented parapet and shallow pointed archway. The west side of the tower has chamfered arches to nave and aisles and has a moulded 4-centred arch with

restored flat-hood above. Such ecclesiastical architectural and historical qualities, with connections to the local community are of great importance and value, and contribute to the significance and special interest of this highly graded heritage asset.

11. The listed church has as a wide setting given its size and community use, with its south entrance facing Church Street, elaborately designed, being particularly important. Between this entrance and the road, there is a well defined pathway through the church grounds emphasising its importance. Around the perimeter of the church grounds, there are trees and vegetation but there are views through the entrance gates on Church Street. Historically and currently worshippers would have used these gates and pathway leading up to the south entrance of the church. As such views looking north along Church Street, past the frontages of Claydon Place, up to the church would be important in appreciating the significance of the church as a heritage asset.
12. The listed Church Cross lies in front of the church within its graveyard and is constructed of stone, with an octagonal shaft on a base with cusped niches and very worn figures to corners. Under its statutory listing (listing number 1215010), it is dated to the late 14th to early 15th century, and it has religious importance and group value with the church. The historical and simple architectural qualities contribute to the significance of the heritage asset. However, compared to the church, its setting is more restricted given its small size, siting within the graveyard and a lack of visibility in its wider surroundings.
13. The proposed shed would be sited in front of No 1, modest in size, approximately 13.5 square metres in area, and would be finished in timber, a material found commonly in the area. The roof colour would be black. An existing hedgerow on the road frontage would be retained and to reduce visibility, there would be a low-pitched roof. It would be designed to be temporary and reversible in that it could be easily dismantled and removed. However, it would have a modern prefabricated appearance with noticeable machine-formed timbers, exposed protruding timbers crossing over at the corners of the building, felt tile roof materials and a low pitched asymmetrical roof profile. Such a modern shed appearance would be further identified by the small triangular gable with the roof. Given its intended use as an office and/or storage, it would be likely to be present for a significant time period.
14. Directly facing the road, the end elevation would be of timber but the front and rear elevations would still be visible, especially from in front and along the public right of way (PROW) that leads up to the listed cottage at No 2 and around Nos 3 and 4. The shed would be sited partly in front of the listed cottage at No 2 alongside the common boundary with the neighbouring property, with the PROW on the other side of this. As such, the shed would be in a prominent location where its unsympathetic features would be visible.
15. The garage/outbuildings in front of Nos 3 and 4, also serve a neighbouring property The Forge, sited forward of Claydon Place. There is a single storey extension to the Forge, timber sheds adjacent to the side of No 4, three new dwellings alongside No 1 with garaging/outbuildings in front. In front of another listed building, The Red Lion, there is another detached forward sited building.
16. However, there are differences between these garages/outbuildings and the proposed shed being considered here. They are generally of far higher design

quality, with facing brick and textured weather boarding, and plain/clay tiles. In particular, the use of weather boarding gives many of these buildings a rustic appearance appropriate for a semi rural location. They are also not sited in proximity to a listed building (No 2) and alongside a common boundary adjacent to a PROW. The three dwellings are larger than the proposed shed but they follow the predominant building line along Church Street. Despite their recent construction, their appearance and character reflect traditional design principles, being constructed with facing brick, dark coloured timber like windows and tiled roof.

17. Every application has to be considered on its particular merits and in this case, the proposed shed's prefabricated design and use of materials would be markedly different from the examples of other development brought to my attention. For all these reasons, the proposed development would detract from the appreciation of the architectural and historical qualities, and significance of the heritage asset at No. 2, and the setting of the asset would be adversely affected.
18. In views northwards towards the church, the shed would be screened to large extent by buildings to the front, garaging/outbuilding and the two storey dwelling at the Forge. However, when you pass these buildings, the proposed shed would particularly stand out in views due to its unsympathetic construction and design, despite being on the non-church side of Church Street. In so doing, it would detract from understanding the architectural and historical qualities of the church and its significance. There are dwellings and garaging/outbuildings along the frontage of Church Street but for the reasons indicated, these buildings are much more in keeping with their surroundings through the better use of materials and design. The listed Cross is a small structure that is integrated into the churchyard and hard to identify in views, even within the grounds of the church, due to its low height. It is also located to one side of the church furthest from Church Street. As a result, the proposed shed would not harm the setting of the Cross in views down Church Street.
19. For all these reasons, there would be harm to settings of the Grade II listed Claydon Place and the Grade I listed Church of St. Mary. Accordingly, there would be a conflict with Policy BE1 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2021, which amongst other matters, requires proposals to be assessed in proportion to the significance of the Heritage Asset and to conserve assets in a manner appropriate for their significance. For each listed building, such harm would be less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other matters

20. Paragraph 208 of the Framework states where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
21. However, the appeal proposal would adversely affect the setting of listed buildings at 2 Claydon Place and Church of St Mary. In considering whether to grant planning permission, s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The shed would be used as an office and/or

storage. Homeworking has public benefits in reducing travel and greenhouse emissions, and the shed, with homeworking capacity, would also enhance the modern day living attributes of the dwelling. However, such a public benefit would be limited given the small scale nature of the proposal. In light of the forgoing, the public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified and the considerable importance and weight this carries in the individual heritage balances for each listed building.

22. The appellant has indicated excavation would be limited due to the use of a raft timber foundation construction, and therefore, despite the shed being in proximity to a tree, there would be no adverse effects on its health. A planning condition could be imposed to secure and implement acceptable details.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

23. There would be harm to the setting of 2 Claydon Place and the Church of St Mary, in conflict with Policy BE1 of the VALP and the development plan, taken as a whole. There would be no material considerations that indicate that it should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR