Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/25/3374068
Aylesbury Adventure Golf Ltd at Aylesbury Golf Centre, Bierton, Buckinghamshire HP22 5GA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mr Paul Mazzetta of Aylesbury Adventure Golf Ltd against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
- The application Ref is 25/02293/VRC.
- The application sought planning permission for mini golf and additional car parking without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 21/03644/APP, dated 25 May 2023.
- The condition in dispute is No 5 which states that:
  Prior to the occupation of the development, details of the provision of electric charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the electric charging points shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained as approved.
- The reason given for the condition is: To ensure adequate provision is made for electric vehicles and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies T6 and T8 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my visit, while the premises were closed, there was clearly a mini golf course in place and parties have indicated that the development has begun. Although I cannot be certain that the layout of the site is as shown on the approved plans, I have considered the appeal as the condition having already been breached. While comments have been made about the status of other conditions, these are not a matter for this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the condition is reasonable and necessary with regard to provision for sustainable transport modes.

Reasons

4. The original permission included a condition, not planning obligation, requiring the provision of electric charging points. While it did not stipulate the number, or type, details were to be submitted and agreed prior to the occupation of the development. Rather than being imprecise this wording gives an element of

flexibility. The wording of the condition sets out what is required and when. As such, any breach of the condition could be identified and enforceable.

5. The absence of chargers would not lead to highway or pedestrian safety concerns. Nonetheless, the supporting text of Policy T8 of the VALP[1] states that it is important that electric vehicle charging infrastructure supports this growing mode of transport, encouraging continued growth and supporting existing and future users of electric vehicles. This aligns with the National Planning Policy Framework where it states local parking standards should take into account the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for, and that developments should be designed to enable, charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

6. Policy T8 states that for developments with the level of parking provision such as the appeal scheme, at least two parking bays shall be marked out for use by electric vehicles only, together with charging infrastructure and cabling. The policy does not differentiate between types of development other than residential for the number of charging spaces or the scale of the development, other than number of parking spaces proposed.

7. Although the studies highlighted suggest that chargers at leisure locations are not well used, I do not have full details of them. Whether or not there are linked trips with the other facilities at the wider site or the site is within a rural context, Policy T8 refers to high turnover parking at leisure facilities due to the short time spent at such locations. The likely short period of stays at the site is something the appellant highlights as being typical.

8. Moreover, while not a 'leisure centre' as quoted in some of the evidence, given the nature of the use, with people visiting for leisure purposes, the mini golf would be a 'leisure facility' as referred to in Policy T8. Therefore, for the mini golf scheme, the provision of chargers, and fast chargers would be a policy requirement, and the condition is relevant to the proposal. The policy does not indicate that other types of chargers should be used at such locations.

9. The appellant considers the provision of fast chargers is not viable and electricity capacity at a site will have its limits. However, other than an estimate for the upgrading of the supply, there is no detailed breakdown of the costs involved for this or the charger provision. The scale of the facility would limit the income from the business as would seasonal and weekend opening, although this is not restricted by planning condition. Nevertheless, again, no detailed information of the income and profit of the course have been submitted.

10. Therefore, on the basis of the information before me, irrespective of whether the chargers enhance the site's appeal, it has not been demonstrated that the provision of charging facilities would be commercially unviable. The appellant also indicates that the proposal does not fall under Building Regulations EV provisions and so the condition would not duplicate other legislation.

11. As such, the condition is reasonable and necessary with regard to provision for sustainable transport modes. The removal of the condition would be contrary to the local and national policies referred to above. Policy T6 of the VALP relates to the level of parking, rather than electric charging provision so is not directly relevant to this main issue.

[1] Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan

Other Matters

12. I do not have full details of the other appeal decisions referred to. They relate to different planning authorities and locations, and the nature of the developments are unclear. Therefore, they would have a different local policy context and are not directly comparable to the scheme before me.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeals should be decided other than in accordance with it.

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR