



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2026

by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd February 2026

Appeal: APP/J0405/Y/25/3374494

25a Brook End, Weston Turville, Buckinghamshire HP22 5RF

- 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 Sarah Harlow against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application reference is 25/01018/ALB.
 - The works proposed are described as 'rear single storey extension to existing listed dwelling'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision notice refers to the requirements of section 16 and section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (the Act). However, as this application and appeal concern whether to grant listed building consent for any works only, and not whether to grant planning permission, the proposal requires to be assessed only against section 16(2) of the Act.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building known as "25, 25A and 27, Brook End" (Ref: 1118392) (the LB), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal relates to the middle of three adjoining cottages that together comprise the LB. The LB is said to date from 17th century with 19th century alterations. It is a timber framed building with colour washed brick infill to the front, exposed brick to the rear and a tiled roof. The left-hand flank wall is chequer brick. No 27 is the right-hand bay and is said to have been added in the 19th century. In addition, I note that the LB has been variously extended, altering the appearance of the rear of the LB in particular. Nonetheless, I find that the special interest of the LB, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily derived from its illustration of a 17th century house with later additions, in a vernacular style. Important contributions are the legibility of its historic plan form and the hierarchy of built form across the LB.
5. Nos 27 and 25 have two storey, rear facing gables, whereas No 25A does not. In addition, although the existing single storey extension to No 25A projects beyond the rear building line of those gables, is just shorter than the single storey rear

extensions to Nos 25 and 27. Consequently the appearance and footprint of No 25A remains subservient to that of its adjoining neighbours. This reflects the hierarchy of the listed building's historic form. In addition, the rear wall of the existing single storey extension to No 25A is perpendicular to its two storey rear wall. This results in the existing extension having a pleasing simplicity of form that is apparent from its first floor rear windows and its rear garden.

6. The proposed single storey extension would allow the historic two storey element of No 25A to remain visible. Given the contemporary form of the proposal, I consider that the use of larger format windows on the extension would not appear out of place in this instance. However as described above, the footprint of No 25A is historically more modest than Nos 25 and 27 due to their rear projecting gables. Whereas the proposal would bring the footprint of the existing single storey extension at No 25A beyond the rear building line of the neighbouring rear extensions.
7. In addition, the proposed footprint of the extension would be angled such that it would partially project in front of the rear extension of No 27. Although a modest extension in its own right, this would tip the balance such that the footprint of No 25A would no longer appear subservient to its adjoining neighbours. This would disrupt the historic hierarchy of built form across the LB. Furthermore, in combination with the existing single storey footprint at No 25A, the proposed single storey built form would dominate relative to the modest footprint of its historic two storey form. This would diminish the legibility of the historic plan form.
8. Reference is made to an extension to No 25 that is said to have been supported by the Council's heritage officer. However, details of that proposal are not before me to enable me to make a meaningful comparison. In any event, I have assessed the proposal in light of the current built form, including existing extensions. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would not harm the listed building because it would not be more widely visible. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained.
9. Given the above, I find that the proposal would harm the special interest of the LB. Consequently, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building, and I give this harm great weight in the planning balance of this appeal.
10. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
11. Given the scope of the works, I find the harm to be at the lower end of less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
12. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because it would improve the living space for its occupants without harming neighbours' living

conditions. However, improved living space is a private benefit and is consequently beyond the scope of this test.

13. Therefore, I do not find that public benefits outweigh the harm that I have identified in this instance. I also note that the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.
14. Given the above and in the absence of public benefits that would outweigh the harm that would be caused, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building.
15. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 210(a) of the Framework. Insofar as relevant, the proposal would not accord with policies BE1 and BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021). These seek, among other things, to ensure that proposals are designed having regard to the characteristics of their surroundings and that any harm to designated heritage assets is balanced against its public benefits.

Conclusion

16. Given the above and considering all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR