



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2025

**by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 06 August 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/25/3368040**

**Harewood Barn, Kimblewick Road, Great Kimble, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8TB**

- 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 Mr Stuart and Mrs Carol Pearce against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
  - The application reference is 25/05458/FUL.
  - The development proposed is an open front entrance porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property, street scene and locality.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is a barn conversion which forms part of a cluster of dwellings located off Kimblewick Road which stand within a rural countryside setting back from the road. The proposal before me seeks full planning permission for the construction of an open front entrance porch and I note, from the Council's delegated report, that permission for the dwelling itself was by virtue of permission reference 05/05807/FUL whereby permitted development rights were removed by condition. The removal of such rights included the removal of Class D, Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as it now is) which relates to porches.
5. The removal of permitted development is stated, by the Council, to be in order to protect the site from being domesticated and retaining the rural characteristic of a rural setting. I do not find that the removal of permitted development rights should prevent further alterations on a blanket basis but should be to allow control and consideration of such proposals, on their own merits, against the objectives of both the original proposals, and the reasoning for the condition in question as well as the character of the area (and any subsequent evolution of the site).
6. The proposal would be oak framed with a dual pitched gable end with a height in the region of 3.8 metres, eaves in the region of 2.6 metres and a floor area in the

region of 3.4 metres by 1 metre. The host dwelling currently has a very simple format which retains clear indication, and acknowledgement, as to its former use as a rural building. The proposal would stand below the existing eave height of the host dwelling but the apex of the gabled roof of the porch would stand above the eaves which I do not find would integrate comfortably with the host dwelling. Whilst the porch itself would be relatively modest in size I find that the proposal would erode the character and appearance of the faux barn door as a result of being sited directly in front of it.

7. I note that the appeal site, and the proposal itself, would be set back significantly from the highway but views of the proposal are possible towards the development from the northwest along Kimblewick Road. In such views I find that the proposal would result in an alien feature in the context of the host dwelling itself as well as the cluster of buildings within which it stands. The existing entrance, when viewed from Kimblewick Road, visually presents as a barn door which I find to be appropriate for the host dwelling and its setting. This would, as outlined above, be lost as a result of a porch being sited directly in front of it.
8. I note that the appellant has stated that the Council has refused the proposal based upon their opinion only, however, the Council are the determining body for applications of this nature, and I find they have set out their analysis of the proposal with regard to the host dwelling itself and its setting. Whilst no objections were submitted, a lack of objection is a neutral consideration. The appellant's statement outlines that Harewood Barn cannot be seen from Kimblewick Road, however, the appellant's appeal form (and that of the Council) confirmed that the proposal can be seen from public land. I found, at the time of my site visit, that views of the proposal and the host dwelling were available from Kimblewick Road and I acknowledge the adjacent fields are not accessible by public footpaths.
9. The proposal is acknowledged to have no impact upon neighbouring properties, however, a lack of impact to neighbouring residential amenity does not, unfortunately, justify the proposal in terms of character and appearance of the host dwelling itself and even if I had agreed that the proposal was not visible from Kimblewick Road this is a separate matter in terms of character and appearance of the immediate area to character and appearance of the host dwelling itself and its presence within the cluster of residential dwellings.
10. I acknowledge that the pitch of the roof and materials have been selected to match the existing buildings, that Harewood Barn is a large structure and that the proposed porch would, overall, be limited in scale in isolation, however, I do not find that its limited scale would have insignificant impact on the overall barn style due to its location and the issues that I have outlined. I do not find that the proposal would complement the barn nor that the long flat principle elevation is unacceptable as it stands, as a barn conversion property, nor that it is required to provide more character – the character of the building as it stands is utilitarian and barn like as acknowledgment towards its former use. The proposed porch by virtue of its siting and design would result in an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the dwelling which, whilst would be subservient in scale to the barn itself, would fail to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding built form of the immediate locality.
11. The proposal would domesticate the appearance of the barn style dwelling, result in the loss of the current faux barn door and would appear out of character for the

rural area and context with the other barn converted dwellings on the wider site. The proposal would not respond positively to the rural location and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself, the street scene and immediate locality. The proposal would be contrary to Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 Policy CP9 which seeks to deliver a distinctive high quality sense of place which contributes positively and which takes the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and Policy DM35 which requires development to improve the character of the area and demonstrate attractive and high quality design and appropriate character in the scale, form, layout and detailed design of buildings and the structures and spaces around them.

12. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy DM36 which requires proposals to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area. As I have found the proposal to be inconsistent with Policy DM36 the proposal is, by default, inconsistent with Policy DM44. The proposal would also be inconsistent with (Wycombe District Council) Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2020 which advises that a small porch would generally be acceptable provided that it does not dominate other architectural features on the building as would be the case with the proposal before me in relation to the barn like door at the current entrance to the property.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Eleni Marshall*

INSPECTOR