



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3373737

The Old Barn, Lenborough Road, Gawcott, Buckinghamshire MK18 4BP

- 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 & Mrs H Pritchard-Law against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application reference is 25/01927/APP.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension link to proposed converted garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension link to proposed converted garage at The Old Barn, Lenborough Road, Gawcott, Buckinghamshire MK18 4BP in accordance with the terms of the application reference 25/01927/APP and the plans submitted with it, 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 drawing nos AL(10)001 - Existing Site Location & Proposed Site Block Plan, AL(10)002 - Existing & Proposed Ground Floor Layout, AL(10)003 - Existing Elevations, AL(10)004 - Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be carried out as approved. In this condition "retained trees" means an existing tree, marked T1, which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars and the tree covered by the Tree Preservation Order adjacent to the garage.
 - 4) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits within open countryside. The site is set back from the nearest public highway, Lenborough Road. There are other traditional buildings of an agrarian character adjacent to this road, relatively near to the appeal site, many of which appear to have been converted to residential use. The conversions, including Stable Barn and Hill Brick Barn on the north side of Lenborough Road, are of an asymmetrical U-shaped footprint arranged around a former crewyard. Other traditional buildings on the south side of the road are more organic and complex in layout.
4. Map regression evidence produced by the appellant indicates that there was originally a barn occupying the appeal site, U-shaped in footprint, with two short wings projecting southwards from a main range. However, the dwelling now comprises of a converted rectangular range, faced in timber shiplap boarding, and a much more recent addition projecting northwards from its eastern end to create an L-shaped footprint. The extension, a detached garage and the glazed windows have diluted the legibility of the original footprint and agricultural use to a degree, albeit the overall agrarian character prevails. There are 2 trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) close to the host dwelling, these trees adding to the rural and agrarian character of the site and its setting.
5. The proposal seeks to provide an internal connection to, and conversion of, the garage into additional primary living accommodation. In doing so, it would result in a single irregular U-shaped footprint and a roofscape of connecting gabled roofs of different orientations and sizes. The garage's current juxtaposition with the dwelling means it already reads in plan and on site as part of the same complex. There is a degree of increased complexity arising from the proposed link. However, as per the appellant's evidence and my observations on site, the complexity would not be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of buildings within the locality of the site. The visual containment of the proposed link between the two existing buildings also avoids sprawl that would otherwise be out of character with the area.
6. The proposed link's eaves and ridge heights would be lower than the buildings it is proposed to connect. The additional floorspace in this link would also be a small fraction of the existing floorspace. As such it would be subservient and subordinate in scale to the host dwelling. The designs of the link and garage conversion would be simple, with materials to match those existing, referencing the prevailing character and appearance, and avoiding modern and incongruous forms. Visually, the principal receptors on the ground would be along the driveway from Lenborough Road as this is how visitors would approach the dwelling. From these receptors the proposed connection would not be readily apparent because of the siting of the link to the rear of the original range, its positioning set in from the host dwelling's gable end, and its subservient height to existing buildings. Overall, the historic and aesthetic values of the original barn range would be preserved with no harm to its character and appearance. Its primacy, aesthetic and historical values related to its original agrarian use would be preserved.
7. There are 2 trees the subject of the same TPO which could potentially be affected by different elements of the proposal. The Council's Tree Officer, cited in their evidence, advised that the root protection area (RPA) of the tree, outside of the appeal site to the north of the garage, could extend to the area proposed for the link. Similarly, they advised that an area of proposed car parking to the front of the

existing buildings within the appeal site would encroach into the RPA of another protected tree. Given that these trees contribute strongly to the character and appearance of the area, their loss would result in significant harm when assessed against these matters. Nevertheless, I have no evidence before me to find that the impact of the proposed development in the RPAs of both trees could not be acceptably mitigated by the adherence to measures contained within an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Constraints Plan (in accordance with BS5837:2012) during the construction phase.

8. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposed development will not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such there is accordance with policies C1 and BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2021. These policies require that proposals should not involve major reconstruction or significant extensions with extensions being modest in scale, subordinate to the main building, in keeping with the rural character, designed with sensitivity to the host building and that they should enhance the character and appearance of their immediate surroundings. In reaching my conclusion, I have also had regard to the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Design Supplementary Planning Document (2023), particularly sections 8 and 9 which provide guidance in relation to household extensions and building conversions respectively. My conclusion against the development plan has also been informed by the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and parts C1, I1 and I2 of the National Design Guide (2021). I have also had reference to the dismissal decision for a previous appeal at the site (reference 3360944), the proposal being materially different to that development in terms of siting, design and scale.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed a condition for matching materials as this is necessary to ensure no determinative levels of harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
10. Finally, I have imposed a condition requiring a tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement to be submitted to and approved by the Council and for the development to be carried out adhering to the latter. The wording is different to that suggested by the Council in their evidence, but its effect is the same and it provides the necessary addressing of the points raised by the Council's Tree Officer in relation to the RPAs of the two protected trees potentially being affected.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons set out above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable and there are no material considerations that indicate otherwise. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

S Sharp

INSPECTOR