
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: 26 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3374684

Church Farm, 4 Stratford Road, Nash, Buckinghamshire MK17 0ES

- 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 Simon Lascelles against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 25/02085/APP.
 - The development proposed is the described as the demolition of existing stable block and storeroom. Erection of an Annex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Preliminary Matter

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. The description for which 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 minus the superfluous elements referencing the planning history. Whilst I have not mentioned it above, I have taken it into account.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area with specific regard to the Nash Conservation Area (NCA) and the setting of nearby listed buildings; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Numbers 1 and 3 All Saints Close with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. Church Farm is a group of buildings that form part of an historic farmstead in the centre of the village. It currently comprises a large and substantially altered two storey brick and part rendered dwelling. It returns as a timber clad two storey, part glazed structure to the back edge of Stratford Road. The entire building is elongated along the eastern boundary of the appeal site. The appeal building relates to what is left of an outbuilding which was historically used as stabling amongst other functions associated with the appeal site's agrarian past. It is constructed mostly in timber with gabled slate roofs. It is in very poor condition.

5. The evidence suggests that the buildings were partially rebuilt in both the 19th and 20th centuries. Despite this, and extensive works to the associated dwelling which resulted in it being delisted, the collection of structures on the appeal site have, at the very least, some illustrative value as to the historic functional that they had. The shape of the buildings, their general composition, some original materials and clear scale hierarchy still hark to a traditional farmstead layout, facing into a courtyard of sorts. Evolution of them aside, the appeal site and its buildings (and what they mean to each other) contribute positively to the historical, rural and agricultural significance of the village and, by association, the NCA.
6. All Saints Church is opposite the appeal site. It is grade II listed. As is Number 1 Stratford Road. The latter is a timber framed thatched cottage directly abutting the back edge of the road. The former is a stone church set within a cemetery and exposed to the roadside behind a low brick wall. There is also a single storey former schoolhouse next door to the church grounds which is currently used as the village hall. It is a diminutive building finished in coursed rubble stone with associated dressings and a prominent chimney stack. It is also grade II listed.
7. These three buildings have significant social and cultural value as a collective within the NCA. Along with the architectural composition of the appeal site, they stand as surviving examples of the history of the village. The appeal site, and its remaining legible functional role as one historically associated with traditional agricultural practices, forms a key part of the historical significance of the setting of these listed buildings.
8. The principle of the appeal scheme in the replacement of the stable/outbuilding block is acceptable. Not only has a scheme been approved for such before, but it is also clear to see they are in a state of obvious deterioration. I do however have concerns over the size of the proposals and specific design elements.
9. The new building would follow, broadly speaking, the existing footprint. The additional height, marginal though it would be in the grand scheme, would occur over a greater amount of the structures altogether. This would increase their scale. Along with the use of any balcony, rooflights and other features, the impression of the buildings' scale would be noticeably increased. This would compete for dominance across the site and unacceptably erode the historical and character defining hierarchical relationship between the two sets of buildings. The extensive use of single span glazing along the inward facing sections of the ground floor would be overtly modern and all but erase any feel of agricultural/stable type uses and thus depart from the buildings' historical functions.
10. The scheme would include a flat roofed element which would unacceptably jar with the traditional use of gables. The flat roof would abut the back edge of the road and thus be highly visible in the street scene. Further attention would be drawn to this element with the addition of an external staircase, and the over domestication of this section of the buildings would be emphasised by using the flat roofed section as what would appear to be a balcony. All that this would entail would cause a further unacceptable dilution of the building's historical functions and relationship with the dwelling.
11. As a replacement building, a proposal would always be a facsimile of what was and is there currently. That said, and for the above reasons, the design and use of certain modern overly domestic elements would be inappropriate in the context of

the appeal site's illustrative contribution to not only the significance of the NCA but also the collective setting of the aforementioned listed buildings.

12. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 explains that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. In addition, Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.
13. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) places emphasis on great weight being given to an asset's conservation. Given the above assessment, the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the NCA. It would also unacceptably impinge on the significance of the setting of listed buildings. Due to the scale and nature/design of the development in context, and the extent of the influence of its effects, the harm would be at the middle range of less than substantial and, given the above, I would ascribe it significant weight. As directed by paragraph 215 of the Framework, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
14. The proposal would regenerate and redevelop the existing dilapidated buildings, ensuring a longer-term survival of the character of the site as a whole and what it means to the history of the rural village. I would ascribe this limited weight however as it would be at the expense of the above harms and I remain to be convinced, on the evidence, that the proposed scheme is the only way of achieving an acceptable regeneration.
15. Whilst local materials and workmanship would be employed this would only be of a modest overall effect and arguably expected given the importance of the site. Renewable energy provision such as solar panels would have some local environmental benefit but this would be limited in the public sense given the scale and effect of said panels. The annexe is for an elderly relative. This has the potential to reduce the pressure on local housing stock. This would only however be by the power of one and as such worthy of limited weight.
16. Overall, the public benefits provided would be limited and it is clear, given the above, that they would not be sufficient to outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of the NCA and the preservation of the setting of surrounding listed buildings. As such, there would be conflict with Policies BE1 & BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021 (LP), Policies NNP2 and NNP3 of the Nash Neighbourhood Plan. Together, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and conserve the historic environment, amongst other things. The scheme would also fail to accord with principles DES23 and DES37 of the Vale of Aylesbury Design Supplementary Planning Document and Sections 12 and 16 of the Framework which broadly seek the same goals.

Living Conditions

17. Numbers 1 and 3 All Saints Close (No 1 and 3) are sited within an existing cul-de-sac with their front elevations facing towards the existing dilapidated outbuilding and what would be the rear elevation of its replacement. By virtue of the proposal there would be an increase in height of the outbuilding along a noticeable amount of its range, with the full length being an unbroken and blank elevation. Due to the narrow single carriageway road accessing Nos 1 and 3 and the resulting close

proximity of the houses, the façade would appear as looming and oppressive with no visual interest. It would unacceptably impinge on the views experienced from the front living space of the two properties and, as a result, lead to a poorer quality outlook than the current situation. The flat roof element would not be sufficient to make the scheme acceptable in this regard.

18. The appeal proposal would introduce a roof top area which would be viewed from No 1. The appellants have contended that the flat roof element is not a balcony, however, it appears that there is a staircase to access it with some solar panel privacy screening. The presence of the flat roof with the screening would give the impression of overlooking. As the privacy screening would be modest in height, any adult standing on the flat roof would have full view into the upper floor windows of No 1 which would result in an unacceptable effect on the privacy experienced by occupiers.
19. Resultantly, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 1 and 3 All Saints Close. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE3 of the VALP and Section 12 of the Framework which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that living conditions of the occupiers of properties are protected.

Other Matters

20. As I have alluded to above, planning permission was granted for the site in 2009 on a similar footprint to the proposal. The appellant claims that this has since been implemented and is comparable to the appeal scheme before me. I have limited information on whether the works have been started with no lawful development certificate to support the notion. It is not for me to determine the lawful status of the previous scheme in any event. Whilst I can afford it some weight, this would relate to the principle of it only and, having seen the plans for it, it would have resulted in a far more contextually appropriate and sensitive outcome than the scheme before me. Only addresses and descriptions of development have been given in regard to other cited examples and therefore I am not able to sufficiently compare them to the proposals here.
21. The lack of objection from Parish Council or neighbouring occupiers would be neutral since it would be a lack of harm. In any case, it would not absolve me from making an assessment as to the proposals' impact under the main issues. I have very limited information on how and why some elements would be permitted development. I have approached the scheme as the works in their totality as requiring express planning permission. There has been some dispute between the neighbouring properties and the appellant surrounding both the boundary fencing and the Party Wall act. However, these private civil matters are for the parties to determine outside of the appeal process.
22. The proposals are not for a new dwelling and thus, even if the Council was unable to demonstrate the required supply of housing sites, I would not be taken to the circumstances of paragraph 11 of the Framework. There is no other sufficiently compelling case as to whether there would be another reason that the most important policies might be out of date and thus to consider the appeal scheme under the presumption in favour of sustainable development. In any case, the proposals would give rise to unresolved harm to designated heritage assets which, amongst other things, would provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

23. The scheme would conflict with the development plan for the reasons I have set out. Material considerations, including the approach of the Framework, do not indicate a decision other than in accordance. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR