



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/25/3364119

North Hill Farm, Aylesbury Road, Winslow, Buckingham MK18 3LF

- 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 J Barker against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00274/APP.
 - The development proposed is extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to dwelling at North Hill Farm, Aylesbury Road, Winslow, Buckingham MK18 3LF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00274/APP, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100_02 site location & block plan; 100_01 proposed extension plan & elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall be used solely in connection with the use of the dwelling as an agricultural worker's dwelling and shall not be used for any other purpose.

Main Issues

2. Whether the extended dwelling would remain commensurate in size with the established functional requirements of the farm holding.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a single storey extension to an existing dwelling at North Hill Farm, located within the countryside outside of Winslow. This newly built dwelling was allowed under the terms of Policy H3 of the Vale of Aylesbury District Local Plan (VALP). This applies what is now paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This requires decisions avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless, amongst other circumstances, there is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work.
4. There is an older farmhouse occupied by the appellant's father. Although he no longer plays an active role in the day to day running of the enterprise, this was not the case when the new

dwelling was permitted. The Council was nonetheless satisfied that the farm operation provided a functional need for a second dwelling. Permission was made subject to a standard agricultural occupancy condition, reflecting the fact that a dwelling unconnected with or not required in the essential interests of agriculture would not normally be granted.

5. VALP Policy H3 seeks that agricultural dwellings be commensurate in size to the established functional requirement. In determining the appropriate size of a dwelling, it states that the Council will consider the requirements of the enterprise rather than those of the owner or occupier. The policy resists dwellings that are unusually large in relation to the agricultural needs of the unit, with net useable floor space not normally larger than 180 square metres for the initial dwelling and 120 square metres for each dwelling thereafter. As the policy allows, permitted development rights were removed from the new dwelling approved at North Hill Farm to ensure it was not subsequently extended to a size exceeding its functional requirement.
6. The Council's decision is based on no other harm other than from the extended dwelling being an unsustainable form of development through becoming larger than would be commensurate with the established functional requirements of the holding. The appellant explains that he is now in full control of the farming enterprise and the new dwelling has thus become the main farmhouse. In this regard, the proposed extension meets the need to provide a dedicated office/study area, a client meeting space and a shower/boot room for biosecurity purposes.
7. There seems to be an entirely reasonable business case for the single storey extension proposed, which would still keep the dwelling below 180 square metres and not unusually large in relation to the agricultural needs of the farm unit. The proposal would therefore satisfy VALP Policy H3 which does not require the volume requirements to be applied entirely rigidly. The original farmhouse is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition and, not tied to the farm operation, could be sold separately. Therefore, only the new dwelling provides accommodation specifically for an agricultural worker, which lends further support for it exceeding the 120 square metre size threshold.
8. Even with a strict application of VALP Policy H3, there is no apparent harm caused from this relatively modest extension and nothing that would suggest it would comprise unsustainable development. As all proposals are assessed on their individual merits, allowing this proposal would not undermine what appears to be the intention of Policy H3, which is to avoid meeting rural worker's accommodation needs with disproportionately large dwellings in the countryside.

Conclusion

9. There is a reasonable need for the quite modest extensions proposed to what comprises the only secured agricultural worker's dwelling at North Hill Farm. As this is an extension to an existing dwelling, the agricultural occupancy condition continues to apply. The extended dwelling would remain commensurate in size with the established functional requirements of the farm holding.
10. Subject to conditions imposing the standard commencement time limit, plans compliance, matching materials and, to comply with VALP Policy H3, a use solely in connection with that of an agricultural worker's dwelling, I conclude that the appeal succeeds.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR