



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/25/3375782

Twin Trees Farm, Rowley Lane, Wexham, Buckinghamshire SL3 6PB

- 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 Marco D'Auria against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - South Area (South Bucks).
 - The application Ref is PL/23/4146/FA.
 - The development is an agricultural building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an agricultural building at Twin Trees Farm, Rowley Lane, Wexham, Buckinghamshire SL3 6PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/23/4146/FA, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development to which this planning permission relates shall be undertaken solely in accordance with the following drawings: PL/01 – Block Plan, PL/02 – Site Location Plan, PL/02 Existing Drawings – Floor Plans and PL/03 Existing Drawings – Elevations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given above is taken from the application form, however I have removed the term “retrospective” as it is not an act of development. Nevertheless, the application form indicates that work has been completed, therefore, the appeal is being considered retrospectively.
3. While amended plans were submitted during the course of the application, I observed at my site visit that the development that has taken place reflects the drawings originally submitted. Moreover, the appeal submissions indicate that it is these drawings on which the application was determined. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans originally submitted as part of the application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

5. The Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special

- circumstances. Paragraph 154 of the Framework sets out that development in the Green Belt is not inappropriate where specific exceptions listed apply, these include a) buildings for agriculture and forestry.
6. Policy GB1 of the South Bucks District Local Plan, adopted March 1999 (SBDLP) permits certain forms of development within the Green Belt, including development for agriculture or forestry, in accordance with other policies in the plan.
 7. The appeal site forms part of the appellant's land holding at Twin Trees Farm. In addition to the appeal building, the wider site comprises land and buildings which are used for various commercial/storage uses. It also includes a parcel of agricultural land adjoining the appeal building, used for the grazing of livestock, which the Council indicates covers 0.9 hectares. While there were no alpacas at the site at the time of my visit, livestock present included various poultry including chickens, rheas and guinea fowl, together with pigs, pigmy goats and donkeys. The appeal submissions also indicate that the appellant owns an additional 8.9 hectares of land at Stoke Poges, which includes woodland and grassland.
 8. The appeal building is of a utilitarian design, constructed with a timber frame with steel cladding to the walls and roof. It is largely open plan with a mezzanine floor above a ground floor workshop at one end of the building. It is used for the secure storage of hay, some of which is bought in from elsewhere, feed and bedding, as well as tractors and machinery. There is no clear evidence that the type or amount of machinery and associated paraphernalia would be at odds with that expected in connection with the maintenance and operation of a smallholding of this size, in addition to the appellant's land elsewhere, or that the size or height of the building to accommodate it would be unduly excessive.
 9. At my site visit the mezzanine within the building was in use for the storage of hay bales, as shown on the submitted floor plans, with access to it from both within the building as well as via a first-floor external door. The Council accept the storage of hay at a higher level is not an unusual arrangement as large hay bales can be lifted to these heights. Moreover, there is no substantive evidence that the first floor pedestrian door, together with the large roller shutter door opening in the side elevation of the building, adjacent to the mezzanine, would not provide adequate ventilation so as to avoid any significant risk of fire, particularly given the relatively modest volume of hay which is likely to be stored in this area due to its overall size.
 10. Thus, while I acknowledge the Council's concern regarding the layout of the building, there is no clear reason why the design of the building would make it impractical for use for agricultural purposes, or that the volume and height is excessive given the nature of machinery stored in the building. Furthermore, when considering the merits of a planning application seeking permission for an agricultural building in the Green Belt, the Framework does not set out any limiting criteria relating to size or any other matters, including the quality of the agricultural land.
 11. Despite various other uses on the wider site, the appeal building is clearly in use for the storage of agricultural accoutrements including equipment and machinery as well as animal feed, hay and bedding for use in association with the adjoining agricultural land and livestock. In addition, the appellant indicates that the equipment would also be used to maintain the land they own at Stoke Poges. In light of the above considerations, there is no compelling evidence before me to

firmly indicate that the building is not used for its intended purpose or to suggest it would not continue to be used for such purposes.

12. Consequently, as the building is for agricultural use it would meet the exception listed in Paragraph 154 a) of the Framework and would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In that regard, it would not conflict with Policy GB1 of the SBDLP. Given that I have concluded that the development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, there is no requirement to assess the impact on the openness of the Green Belt or whether there are other considerations that amount to very special circumstances that justify the development.

Other Matters

13. While the agricultural building may be seen in views from nearby residential properties, the Council has not objected to the proposal having regard to the effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties. Given the overall scale and height of the building and the separation distance between it and the neighbouring residential properties, I am not drawn to reach a different conclusion.
14. The Council is satisfied that; the agricultural building is a suitable distance from the nearby ancient woodland so as not to give rise to adverse effects in that regard. From the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree.
15. The appellants indicate that, given the existing agricultural use of the land, the agricultural building does not give rise to any additional vehicular movements, as it is ancillary to the existing agricultural activity at the site. Accordingly, it has not been demonstrated that the agricultural building, in this location, would be to the detriment of the local highway network in terms of capacity or increased noise, dust, fumes or vibration generated by the type or number of vehicular trips associated with the development.
16. The lawfulness or otherwise of the existing uses at the wider site, and any subsequent effects of such, are beyond the remit of the appeal before me. The retrospective nature of the appeal does not alter the assessment of the planning merits of the development.

Conditions

17. Given the retrospective nature of the appeal a condition relating to the timeframe for the implementation of the permission is not necessary. I have imposed a condition specifying the drawing numbers in the interests of clarity.
18. The Council has requested a condition to restrict the use of the building to agricultural purposes at the holding and for no other business purpose. The reason given for the condition is the Green Belt location of the site and the need to preserve openness. The Framework states that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use may not pass the test of reasonableness or necessity. In the absence of any compelling evidence that a future change of use of the building would have such an effect on the openness of the Green Belt, or its purposes, I find that a condition to restrict the future uses of the building is not justified in the interests of protecting the Green Belt.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR