



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3374979

Glebe Farmhouse, Stewkley Road, Wing, Buckinghamshire LU7 0JZ

- 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 Marchant against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 25/01826/APP.
 - The development proposed is the "construction of 2-bay carport and internal entrance feature"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters & Main Issue

3. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the original description accurately describes the appeal development and is therefore reflected above.
4. The third reason for refusal references the impact of the proposed development on nearby trees and hedgerows. I appreciate that the Council has not had sight of the tree survey due to the procedure for householder appeals. However, this is the only way the appellant can look to address the refusal reason. It appears that the two trees forming the basis of the Council's concerns have been subsequently removed. They were not protected and the appeal site is not in a conservation area. The tree survey suggests that the remaining trees and surrounding hedges would not be affected by the development. I am satisfied that an appropriately worded landscaping condition could secure the prevention measures detailed in the report along with the addition of new trees where required.
5. It appears that the walling for the new entrance way for Glebe Farmhouse and the hardstanding has already been set out but no works for the carport have been started, I have therefore considered the appeal on a part-retrospective basis. Resultantly, and taking into account the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area with specific regard to a Non Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Glebe Farmhouse and its adjoining stable buildings have since been granted permissions to be converted into residential dwellings sitting in a uniformed courtyard formation. Whilst the farmhouse has largely been altered from its apparent original form, its siting and relationship with the other buildings remains reflective of its past. Moreover, any later additions emulate and follow the traditional agrarian qualities of the group in terms of form and siting in a simplistic, historic and ordered way. There is a high-quality aesthetic to the placement and arrangement of the existing situation with the uniform and intact courtyard particularly distinctive. These matters, and the relationship the group of buildings has with the otherwise open rural landscape around them, contributes positively to their significance as the NDHA.
7. The car port would sit forward of the farmhouse, between it and the highway, adjacent the boundary formed by the existing hedgerow and fence. Its siting would not obscure the building; however, it would be completely divorced from the courtyard arrangement, which would unacceptably impinge on its quality as a NDHA by detracting from its core shape and historic arrangement. Moreover, it would present as something more domestic and as such would appear alien in the context of the wider site's surviving and clearly legible traditional agrarian qualities.
8. The car port would be constructed from high quality materials that may reflect those within the group, but this would not make up for the shortcomings of the scheme's siting and overall design. I am also unconvinced that the harm I have found in these regards would extend to the wider landscape given the scale of the scheme in context and the adjacent boundary treatments.
9. Typically, a courtyard development such as this would have one principal entrance. The introduction of walling and gates separating the farmhouse away from the rest of the group would formalise a contextually inappropriate segregation, appearing unacceptably unfamiliar. Its siting and separation would negatively erode some further character of the NDHA and harmfully impact the relationship between the buildings making up the group.
10. Taking all of the above together, the appeal scheme would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, which would extend to an unacceptable erosion of the traditional agrarian courtyard qualities of Glebe Farmhouse and its associated buildings as a NDHA. Even if the site was not a NDHA, the harm I have found would still be unacceptable given the qualities of the existing buildings as I have set them out above.
11. As such, there would be conflict with Policies BE1, BE2 and NE4 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021, Policy CGS1 of the Wing Neighbourhood Plan 2015, the guidance within the Aylesbury Vale Area Design Supplementary Planning Document 2023 and Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024. These policies amongst other things seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

12. The matter of the walling and gates enclosing the Farmhouse being permitted development is not for the matter of this appeal to determine. Nevertheless, the appellant has not provided any evidence to suggest either that the scheme would

meet the requirements in such a way that would give more than limited weight to this prospect.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced and the approach of the Framework, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR