



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J0405/W/25/3363332

3 High Street, Whaddon, Buckinghamshire MK17 0NA

- 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 Mrs K Riley against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/03251/APP.
 - The development proposed is internal and external alterations to the existing garage and the construction of a detached car port with associated works.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J0405/Y/25/3363333

3 High Street, Whaddon, Buckinghamshire MK17 0NA

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs K Riley against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/03252/ALB.
 - The works proposed is a garage conversion to habitable space, front porch and fenestration alterations.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed

Preliminary Matters

3. In the interest of clarity, the above description of works for Appeal B is taken from the Council's decision notice, which removed reference to the detached car port. This is because it was concluded that this element of the proposal did not require listed building consent.
4. The appeal property is the Grade II listed building known as 'No 3 High Street, Whaddon', which is located within the Whaddon Conservation Area (CA). In reaching my decisions, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
5. The appeals concern the same site and, other than the car port, the same scheme. Although the remit of planning permission (Appeal A) and listed building consent (Appeal B) regimes are different, to reduce repetition, I have dealt with both appeals together in a single decision letter.

Main Issues

6. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, in addition to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Whaddon CA.

Reasons

7. The appeal site consists of a Grade II listed detached dwelling located within the settlement of Whaddon. The 2 storey property was added to the statutory list in 1984 and is a 17th Century L-plan timber-framed house, with a tiled roof. The original timber frame is evident on the eastern side gable. The fine symmetric frontage of the property has timber casement windows and 2 bays with a stone plinth and rendered quoins. A design feature of the historic core of the building is a fairly high solid to void ratio. There is a notable central flush-panelled door with a barred rectangular fanlight in a rendered surround of Doric pilasters, plain entablature and pediment.
8. The listing description¹ sets out that the property was re-fronted with brick in the 19th century, and the internal layout of the house altered with the insertion of a central hall and staircase. A rear brick extension was also added to create a double pile plan. On the western side of the rear wing there is a single storey brick extension, which the submitted heritage statement² identifies as appearing to be a rebuilding of a structure shown in this location on historic maps.
9. A single storey 1980's attached garage extends on the eastern side of the property. The garage projection is clearly a modern addition and is of negligible historic interest, however its use of suitable brick and tile and its relatively modest and subservient scale results in a structure largely sensitive to the building's historic aesthetics.
10. Given the above, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests in exemplifying a vernacular domestic property which has evolved over time. Important contributors in these regards which allude to the building's phased development and are pertinent to the appeals are its use of traditional methods of construction and materials; surviving historic fabric and floor plan; and pleasing architectural form and design, including key features and detailing.
11. The setting of No 3 High Street is made up of varied residential properties along the High Street, including nondescript modern dwellings, in addition to open countryside to the rear. As such, the wider setting has a negligible role in the significance of the heritage asset. Its immediate setting of the domestic garden area however, allows its historic form to be experienced and therefore contributes in a positive way to its special interest.
12. The character and appearance and therefore the special interest and significance of the Whaddon CA are mainly derived from its landscape setting, mainly linear form, rich variety of historic buildings that denote its evolution and, as set out in the Whaddon Conservation Area document (2007), the use of brick for the construction of buildings and boundary walls which creates a visual unity. The

¹ List Entry Number 1287669

² by JP Heritage October 2024

significance of the High Street element of the CA in part derives from its vernacular character and the linear pattern of development emphasized by the building and boundary lines which create a strong sense of enclosure.

13. As a good example of a vernacular historic building, No 3 High Street contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
14. The proposal involves a new detached car port sited in the north east corner of the site, in addition to the conversion of the garage. The conversion of the garage involves internal alterations and insertion of new windows and a porch.
15. The proposed car port would be set some distance from the property, opposite the modern garage rather than the historic building. It would be seen from the dwelling in the same context as the modern neighbouring property behind that appears over the boundary hedging, in addition to the other road fronting dwellings of mixed character. Its siting, simple timber frame design and modest scale would not detract from the ability to appreciate or experience the historic form of the listed building. The car port would therefore preserve its setting and would not harm the asset's significance.
16. The internal alterations would involve the removal of part of a utility room and garage wall and the insertion of windows to the rear. However, these insertions and interventions are modest and located within the modern extension and so there would be no loss of historic fabric.
17. The existing garage doors are visually recessive on account of their solid form and muted colour. Their replacement with glazing would result in windows of a significant scale. Rather than resembling an open fronted shed or converted traditional outbuilding as set out by the appellant, it would result in an overtly contemporary design that would be incongruous in the context of the existing pattern of casement windows on the frontage of the property.
18. Their scale, reflectivity and, particularly at night, level of illumination, would dominate and overwhelm the modest character of the existing extension. The resultant extension would have a new prominence that would draw the eye and compete with and distract from the simpler form and character of the original building frontage. Its existing fine symmetric character would be diminished, and the existing solid to void ratio would be compromised.
19. This visual impact would be exacerbated by the proposed porch, by virtue of its large decorative projecting hood. This would also, by emphasising the second doorway to the frontage, diminish the importance of the existing historic central door and would undermine the historic hierarchy of entrances and spaces.
20. I conclude that these developments and works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, No 3 High Street and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
21. The above harm to significance would result in some residual harmful effect to the character and appearance of the CA. It would not therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
22. Given the fairly localised nature of the development and works relative to the building and CA as a whole, I find the harm to both heritage assets to be,

individually and cumulatively, at a minor level of 'less than substantial' but nevertheless is of considerable importance and weight.

23. The removal of the modest existing window next to the door of the garage would be seen in the context of the adjacent substantial new glazing. Any heritage benefit therefore is limited.
24. There would be some economic benefits however brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Social benefits would also be gained through improvements to the local housing stock. Given the scale of development and works, these benefits would be small. There is no substantive evidence before me that the development and works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the listed building.
25. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the public benefits which would accrue from the proposal, is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm to significance I have found.
26. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works and development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policy BE1 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 (2021), which seeks to conserve and enhance heritage assets.

Other Matters

27. The submitted evidence refers to the presence of Grade II listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, including Lowndes Arms Public House³, No 2 High Street⁴ and The Laurels⁵. The special interest and significance of these assets largely stem from their historic and architectural interest, but are also derived, in part, from their domestic and village settings. Given the position and nature of the proposed development and works, the settings of these designated heritage assets would be preserved and their significance would not be harmed. It is noteworthy that the Council have not raised any objection in this respect. A lack of harm in these regards, however, does not alter my conclusions.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR

³ List Entry Number 1287547

⁴ List Entry Number 1216643

⁵ List Entry Number 1287537