Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 28 July 2026

Site visit made on 28 July 2026

by Lewis Condé BSc, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007290
Land adjacent to Hampden Farm Barn, Greenlands Lane, Prestwood, HP16 9QX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Kirby against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
- The application Ref is PL/25/1732/OA.
- The development proposed is the erection of 18 dwellings including 9 affordable units.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the original application form, albeit with wording removed that does not relate to acts of development.

3. The appeal scheme is submitted in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration, except access. I have therefore taken any indication of reserved matters, other than access, to be illustrative.

4. At the outset of the appeal, the appellant submitted an executed Unilateral Undertaking (UU) pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Although the undertaking would only take effect if planning permission were granted, the Council registered it as a local land charge. Following correspondence between the main parties during the appeal, the appellant executed and submitted a revised UU. The earlier registration does not preclude consideration of the later undertaking in the determination of this appeal, and I am satisfied that the circumstances surrounding the registration do not affect my ability to determine the appeal.

5. The updated UU would secure, amongst other matters, nine of the proposed dwellings as affordable housing and a contribution towards the creation of additional clinical capacity in the local area. The Council therefore no longer pursues its third reason for refusal and, on the evidence before me, I have no robust reasons to reach a different conclusion.

6. A new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 17 August 2026. The main parties have been provided with an appropriate opportunity to comment on its implications and where received I have taken the comments into account.

7. A ministerial letter was issued on 6 October 2026 providing commentary on the operation of the revised Framework. To the extent relevant, I have had regard to it. However, my conclusions are based principally on the policies of the development plan and the Framework itself.

8. Since the close of the hearing, the Regulation 19 stage of the emerging Buckinghamshire Local Plan has been completed. Whilst the emerging plan is a material consideration, it has yet to be examined or found sound. Given its early stage in the statutory process and the potential for further modification, I attach only limited weight to its draft policies, and it has not been determinative in my decision.

9. Although the effect of the proposal on heritage assets did not form part of the Council's reasons for refusal, I have a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings. In light of the evidence before me and the discussions at the hearing, the effect of the proposal on heritage therefore forms a main issue in this appeal.

Main Issues

10. The main issues are:

- Whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies;
- The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to its location within the Chilterns National Landscape;
- The effect of the proposal on the setting of heritage assets; and
- Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Development Plan Policies and the Framework

11. The development plan includes saved policies of the Chiltern District Local Plan (adopted 1997 including alterations 2011 and Consolidated 2007 & 2011) (the Local Plan) and policies of the Chiltern Core Strategy (adopted 2011) (the Core Strategy). The Framework is a material consideration of critical importance. Annex A of the Framework provides that development plan policies, or parts of policies, which are materially inconsistent with the Framework's national decision-making policies should be given very limited weight. Development plan policies should not, however, be given reduced weight merely because they pre-date the Framework.

12. Policy GB2 of the Local Plan establishes a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, subject to specified exceptions. Its general objective of resisting inappropriate development in the Green Belt is consistent with Framework Policy GB6. However, its stated exceptions do not reflect the materially different provisions of Framework Policies GB7 and GB8. I therefore give very limited weight to Local Plan Policy GB2 insofar as it defines the

categories of development that are not inappropriate. I nevertheless give significant weight to its consistent objective of resisting development found to be inappropriate under the Framework. I have assessed whether the proposal would be inappropriate development principally against Framework Policies GB6, GB7 and GB8.

13. Policy GC1 of the Local Plan and Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy require development to achieve a high standard of design that responds appropriately to its surroundings and respects local character and distinctiveness. These requirements are consistent with the contextual and design principles in Policy DP3 of the Framework. Although the policies and some of the guidance to which they refer pre-date the current Framework, I find no material inconsistency and attach those policies full weight.

14. Policy LB2 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the setting of listed buildings from adverse effects. That objective is consistent with the importance placed on conserving designated heritage assets and their settings by Policies HE4 and HE6 of the Framework. However, Local Plan Policy LB2 does not provide for the balancing exercise required by Framework Policy HE6 where harm arises. I therefore give very limited weight to that unqualified element of the policy. Its underlying objective of protecting the significance and settings of listed buildings is consistent with the Framework and remains relevant to my assessment of development-plan conflict.

15. Policies LSQ1 of the Local Plan and CS22 of the Core Strategy seek to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, landscape character and distinctiveness of the Chilterns National Landscape. These objectives are consistent with Framework Policy N4 and attract significant weight. However, I give very limited weight to Policy LSQ1's more restrictive approach to major development and Policy CS22's requirements for enhancement in all cases and strict compliance with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide, as these do not reflect the Framework. I consider later whether the proposal constitutes major development under Policy N4 and have otherwise assessed it against that policy alongside the consistent conservation and landscape criteria of Policies LSQ1 and CS22.

Whether Inappropriate Development

16. Since the hearing, the definition of 'Grey Belt' has been updated within the Framework. The main parties no longer dispute that the appeal site falls within that definition. It was also clear from the discussions at the hearing that the site does not strongly contribute to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, preventing neighbouring towns from merging or preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. I therefore find that the appeal site is Grey Belt.

17. Under Framework Policy GB7(1)(g), development on Grey Belt land is not inappropriate development only where all the specified criteria are met. Given the limited extent of the site, its relationship with existing development and its contained location, I am satisfied that the proposal would not fundamentally undermine the purposes, taken together, of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. In this instance, there is a demonstrable unmet need for housing, and the site is sufficiently accessible. However, this major residential proposal must also satisfy the 'Golden Rules' set out in Framework Policy GB8 to satisfy the exception at GB7(1)(g).

18. The submitted planning obligation would secure 50% affordable housing, thereby satisfying the affordable-housing element of the Golden Rules. It would also secure necessary improvements to local infrastructure, notably off-site highway improvements and the creation of additional clinical capacity in the local area. The affordable-housing and infrastructure requirements would therefore be met.

19. Neither the indicative scheme nor the planning obligation identifies the provision of new publicly accessible green space or improvements to existing publicly accessible green space.

20. Outline permission is sought for 18 dwellings. I have not treated the illustrative layout as fixing the form of development at reserved matters stage. Nevertheless, the submitted material should demonstrate that a scheme for the amount of development proposed could satisfy the Golden Rules. The indicative layout identifies no meaningful publicly accessible green space within the site. Moreover, no capacity assessment, parameter plan or alternative indicative arrangement demonstrates that 18 dwellings could be accommodated together with publicly accessible green space, access, parking, private amenity space and an appropriate response to the surrounding pattern of development. Having regard to the site's constrained and elongated form, the evidence does not demonstrate that the amount of development proposed could incorporate the green-space contribution established by Framework Policy GB8.

21. The proposed off-site highway works would improve infrastructure, access and pedestrian connectivity, including potentially to areas of existing green space. Nonetheless, they would neither create publicly accessible green space nor improve the quality, capacity or function of an existing space. Better access is not equivalent to its provision or improvement. The works therefore would not provide the contribution towards publicly accessible green space envisaged by Framework Policy GB8(1)(c).

22. The appellant also suggests that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts could fund improvements to existing green space. However, no specific improvement, delivery programme or commitment to allocate CIL receipts for that purpose has been identified. Nor is there sufficient certainty that any resulting works would be delivered or directly related to the appeal development. The potential use of CIL receipts therefore does not amount to an identified, deliverable contribution towards the provision or improvement of publicly accessible green space and does not demonstrate compliance with Framework Policy GB8(1)(c).

23. At the hearing, the appellant also suggested that publicly accessible green space could be provided on land within its control outside the appeal site. However, that suggestion was advanced only in general terms. No obligation, heads of terms, parameter plan or other mechanism was put forward that would secure the provision, public accessibility, delivery or long-term management of such land. The outline nature of the proposal does not require the detailed design of that provision to be fixed at this stage. It does, however, require sufficient certainty that the Golden Rules could and would be satisfied. In the absence of an obligation, heads of terms, parameter plan or other mechanism securing delivery, public access and long-term management, the suggested off-site provision does not demonstrate compliance with Framework Policy GB8(1)(c).

24. During the hearing, the appellant emphasised that Framework Policy GB8 states that the Golden Rules contributions "should", rather than "must", be made. While that reflects the policy's wording, the use of "should" does not remove the need for clear justification where a contribution is neither proposed nor secured. Policy GB8 affords substantial weight to compliance with the Golden Rules and identifies circumstances in which viability evidence may demonstrate that compliance is not possible. No such evidence, or other robust justification for omitting the green-space contribution, has been provided.

25. Nor does the absence of an identified deficiency in existing green-space provision justify its omission. Policy GB8 expects major residential development on Green Belt land to contribute through the provision of new, or improvements to existing, publicly accessible green space. That expectation is not confined to areas where a quantitative or qualitative shortfall has been demonstrated. Similarly, the Council's failure to request such provision at application stage does not relieve the proposal of the need to address national policy. The appellant has demonstrated neither that the contribution would be provided nor a robust justification for its omission.

26. Framework Policy GB8(2) requires substantial weight to be given to the importance of complying with the Golden Rules. Neither the outline nature of the proposal nor the suggested use of land outside the appeal site overcomes the absence of a clear, deliverable and enforceable commitment to provide new, or improve existing, publicly accessible green space. In these circumstances, the proposal has not been shown to satisfy Framework Policy GB8 and therefore cannot benefit from the exception in Policy GB7(1)(g).

27. Consequently, notwithstanding the site's Grey Belt status, it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt under Framework Policy GB6. It would also conflict with the consistent objective of Local Plan Policy GB2 insofar as that policy resists inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Openness

28. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Openness and permanence are its essential features.

29. Although the site is previously developed land and the equestrian use could intensify, it remains largely open and free of built form, comprising predominantly open paddocks. Mature frontage vegetation would filter views and reduce the development's prominence in some views. Nevertheless, it would remain apparent from the new access and partially visible from the adjacent public footpath and parts of the woodland beyond, with the extent of those views varying seasonally. More fundamentally, Green Belt openness has both spatial and visual dimensions. The introduction of 18 dwellings, together with associated infrastructure and domestic paraphernalia, would substantially erode both dimensions of the site's openness and cause significant harm to the Green Belt.

National Landscape

30. The appeal site lies within the Chilterns National Landscape, which is protected for its nationally important natural beauty. The Chilterns National Landscape Management Plan 2025 – 2030 (the Management Plan) identifies a range of special qualities, including its chalk landscapes, extensive woodlands, ancient hedgerows and field trees, distinctive pattern of villages and rural lanes, rich

historic environment and varied mosaic of open and enclosed landscapes. In the context of this appeal, the special qualities most clearly represented are the wooded character of the area, including the adjacent ancient woodland, and the network of paddocks, trees and established boundary vegetation that contribute to the characteristic mosaic of enclosure and openness found across parts of the Chilterns. Together, these features contribute to the natural beauty and distinctive character of the National Landscape.

31. The extent to which those qualities are expressed at the site is best understood through its local landscape character. The site lies within the Great Kingshill Settled Plateau Landscape Character Area[1], which is characterised by a gently undulating plateau of arable fields, rough grazing and paddocks, defined by hedgerows and interspersed with trees and small woodland blocks. The site's open paddocks, established boundaries and relationship with adjacent ancient woodland reflect the characteristic pattern of grazed land, vegetation, openness and enclosure. It therefore makes a limited but positive contribution to the local character and natural beauty of this part of the National Landscape.

32. The site is enclosed and has a limited visual envelope, with no significant long-distance views. It is also influenced by nearby residential development. Many of the more distinctive special qualities identified in the Management Plan are not evident within the site, while those that are present occur widely across the designation. The site is therefore neither defining nor essential to the character of the National Landscape as a whole.

33. The Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (2010) identifies Prestwood as a plateau village where small-scale landscapes enclosed by woodland and glimpsed views are characteristic. In this context, the site provides an undeveloped transition between the housing along Greenlands Lane and the woodland beyond, contributing to a soft relationship between the village and the surrounding countryside. The presence of other enclosed landscapes nearby, including areas that may be more tranquil, accessible or sensitive, does not diminish that site-specific contribution. Nor is there substantive comparative landscape evidence before me that indicates otherwise.

34. Although different parts of a National Landscape may exhibit different characteristics and sensitivities, the designation and statutory duty apply throughout it. The site cannot therefore be treated as expendable merely because other areas may be more distinctive or sensitive. The relevant consideration is the effect of the proposal on the site within its particular landscape context.

35. The development of 18 dwellings, together with roads, parking, hard surfacing, gardens and associated domestic activity, would occupy a substantial proportion of the site. Whatever detailed layout were pursued, development of that scale would replace its predominantly open paddock character with a distinctly suburban form. This would diminish the site's openness and relationship with the adjoining woodland, weakening the undeveloped transition between Prestwood and the surrounding countryside.

36. The effects would be experienced principally within the site and its immediate surroundings, including from the public footpath, the site accesses and filtered views from Greenlands Lane. Established vegetation, adjoining development and

[1] As defined in the Chiltern District Landscape Character Assessment (2011)

woodland would contain their geographical extent. Nevertheless, the permanent loss of the paddocks and weakening of the soft settlement edge would erode the local pattern of openness, enclosure and vegetation characteristic of this part of the Great Kingshill Settled Plateau. Although the wider character area and National Landscape would remain largely unchanged, the proposal would cause a material and lasting erosion of local landscape character.

37. The proposal would therefore cause moderate and localised harm to the character and appearance of this part of the National Landscape. It would conflict with Policies Local Plan Policy GC1 and Core Strategy Policy CS20, the consistent conservation and landscape-protection elements of Local Plan Policy LSQ1 and Core Strategy Policy CS22, and Framework Policy N4. Giving great weight to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Landscape, and having regard to the statutory duty to seek to further its purposes, I attach substantial weight to the identified harm.

38. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposal, the site's settlement-edge setting and the contained extent of its effects, the development would not have significant adverse effects on the statutory purposes of the National Landscape. It would not therefore constitute major development for the purposes of Policy N4, and the exceptional-circumstances test would not apply.

Heritage Assets

39. The appeal site lies close to the Grade II listed Hampden Farm and the attached Hampden Farm Barn, which together form a historic farmstead. Hampden Farm derives its significance principally from its seventeenth-century origins, eighteenth-century re-fronting, surviving traditional form and fabric, and its historic agricultural function as part of a farmstead. The nineteenth-century barn, although converted and partly rebuilt, remains legible as a former agricultural building historically and functionally associated with the farmhouse and is listed by virtue of its attachment to it.

40. The appeal site also lies close to Woodlands, formerly Greenlands Farm, a Grade II listed building whose significance derives principally from its seventeenth-century origins and surviving timber-framed construction, notwithstanding later alterations and additions.

41. Hampden Farm and Hampden Farm Barn are experienced within a predominantly rural setting comprising gardens, woodland, former agricultural buildings and surrounding open land. Although twentieth-century development along Greenlands Lane, the conversion of former agricultural buildings and the construction of modern stables have altered that setting, the appeal site remains as open paddocks associated with the historic farmstead. Its openness and undeveloped character provide evidence of the agricultural landscape within which the farmhouse and barn developed and operated. The site therefore contributes positively to their significance by allowing their historic agricultural function and relationship with the surrounding land to be understood and appreciated.

42. The proposal would retain the principal rural setting of the farmstead and its immediate relationship with the surviving buildings. Existing vegetation, intervening built form and separation would also limit the extent of the change experienced from the listed buildings. Nevertheless, replacing the open paddocks with 18 dwellings and associated infrastructure would introduce a suburban form of

development into land that currently contributes to an understanding of the farmstead's agricultural origins. The loss of that openness would weaken the legibility of the farmhouse, barn and surrounding land, thereby reducing the contribution that this part of their setting makes to their significance. The proposal would therefore cause minor harm to the significance of Hampden Farm and Hampden Farm Barn.

43. Woodlands is separated from the appeal site by intervening development and a tall established hedge and is not visible from the site. Its setting has also been altered by extensions, a large garage and other development. Although the proposal would change part of its wider surroundings, it would not affect the verdant and partly secluded setting in which the building is experienced, nor its separation from the developed edge of Prestwood. Those aspects of its setting would continue to allow its historic character to be appreciated. The proposal would therefore preserve the significance of Woodlands.

44. Framework Policy HE6 requires harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I attach considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving Hampden Farm, Hampden Farm Barn and their settings. The scheme would deliver 18 dwellings in an area of acute housing need, including nine affordable homes secured through the planning obligation. I find that these significant public benefits would outweigh the minor harm to the significance of Hampden Farm and Hampden Farm Barn.

45. The proposal therefore satisfies the balance required by Framework Policy HE6, notwithstanding its conflict with Local Plan Policy LB2 in respect of Hampden Farm and Hampden Farm Barn. It would preserve the significance of Woodlands and would not conflict with that policy in respect of that asset.

Other Considerations

46. The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Its March 2026 position statement[2] identifies a supply of only 0.86 years for the East Planning Area. This represents an acute deficit, while the evidence before me indicates that the housing land supply shortfall has been longstanding and that the Council is unlikely to have a sufficient supply of homes in the foreseeable future. The proposal would deliver 18 dwellings and would therefore make a meaningful contribution towards addressing that deficit. I attach substantial weight to the provision of additional housing.

47. Nine of the proposed dwellings would be affordable, representing 50% of the scheme, and their delivery would be secured through the executed planning obligation. In view of the identified housing need, the provision of nine affordable homes would be a significant social benefit. I attach substantial weight to this consideration, in addition to the weight afforded to the market housing.

48. The proposal would also reuse previously developed land. However, the site remains predominantly open and free of built form and its redevelopment would not remediate derelict, degraded or substantially developed land. In those circumstances, I attach moderate weight to its previously developed status.

[2] East Planning Area Five-Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement (March 2026)

49. The proposed off-site highway works would improve pedestrian connectivity between the site and existing services and facilities. Insofar as those works would also benefit existing residents, I attach moderate weight to them.

50. The planning obligation would also secure a contribution towards the creation of additional clinical capacity in the local area. That contribution is necessary to address the additional demand arising from the development. It is therefore a mitigating measure rather than a separate benefit weighing in favour of the proposal.

51. The proposal would also deliver biodiversity net gain. Although this is expected of new development and would be secured through the planning process, it would provide an environmental benefit. Given its nature and scale, I attach modest weight to this consideration.

52. The site's accessibility would enable future occupiers to reach services and facilities by a choice of transport modes. As this is principally a locational attribute rather than a benefit generated by the proposal, I attach it modest weight.

53. The development would also generate socio-economic benefits associated with the construction and subsequent occupation of the proposed dwellings, including additional support for local facilities and services. Given the scale of the proposals, such benefits would be modest in nature. Accordingly, I attach modest weight to them.

54. Compliance with other development plan policies, including those concerning highway safety and flood risk, is a neutral matter.

Other Matters

55. Previous appeal decisions relating to residential development of the site are material considerations. However, they were determined under a materially different policy context, including a version of the Framework that did not contain provisions relating to Grey Belt land. There are also notable differences between those proposals and the current appeal; these include the precise site area, the detailed evidence submitted including in respect of landscaping matters, as well as the potential benefits of the scheme. Accordingly, whilst I have had regard to the previous decisions, they have not been determinative, and I have assessed the appeal on its own merits.

56. I have been referred to the Sonning Common appeal decision[3], where the Inspector recognised that different parts of a National Landscape may possess different characteristics and sensitivities. I have applied the same site-specific approach. However, the Sonning Common decision concerned a materially different context: the site there was influenced by an institutional complex, extensive parking and a more urbanised settlement transition, and the Inspector found that many special qualities were absent or only weakly represented. The present site retains an open paddock character and performs a clearer transitional role between Prestwood and the adjacent ancient woodland. Those differences substantially limit the assistance provided by that decision, and I attach it limited weight.

[3] Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/20/3265861 - Little Sparrows, Sonning Common, Oxfordshire RG4 9NY

57. The appellant contends that the Council treated the National Landscape designation as an absolute constraint. Regardless of the Council's approach, I have undertaken my own site-specific assessment and attached weight to the identified effects in accordance with the Framework.

58. Even if the development is not located within a reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (as defined in the Framework), it remains that I consider the appeal site to occupy a broadly sustainable location with regard to access to facilities and services by sustainable means of travel. I have taken that accessibility into account in applying the relevant provisions of Framework Policies GB7 and TR3.

59. The submitted Unilateral Undertaking would secure nine affordable dwellings, the off-site highway improvement works and a financial contribution towards additional clinical capacity in the local area. On the evidence before me, these obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. They therefore satisfy the tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). The undertaking would also secure biodiversity net gain, which I have taken into account in determining the appeal.

Green Belt Balance

60. Although the appeal site falls within the Framework's definition of Grey Belt, the proposal would not comply with Policy GB8 and therefore cannot benefit from the exception in Policy GB7(1)(g). The proposal would consequently be inappropriate development and harmful to the Green Belt by definition. It would also substantially erode the site's openness. Policy GB6 requires substantial weight to be given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to openness.

61. The delivery of 18 dwellings would make a meaningful contribution towards addressing the Council's acute housing shortfall and attracts substantial weight. The provision of nine affordable dwellings would provide an additional significant social benefit, to which I also attach substantial weight. The reuse of previously developed land and improvements to pedestrian connectivity attract moderate weight, while biodiversity net gain, the site's accessibility and the socio-economic benefits each attract modest weight. Taken together, these considerations weigh substantially in favour of the proposal.

62. However, the proposal would also cause moderate and localised harm to the character and appearance of the Chilterns National Landscape, to which I attach substantial weight.

63. The proposal would also cause minor harm to the significance of Hampden Farm and Hampden Farm Barn through changes to the shared wider setting of the historic farmstead. It would therefore conflict with Policy LB2 of the Local Plan. Although the public benefits outweigh that harm for the purposes of Framework Policy HE6, the harm remains an adverse effect in the balance under Framework Policy GB6. The proposal would preserve the significance of Woodlands. The housing and other public benefits have been included only once on the positive side of the balance.

64. Drawing these matters together, the proposal would cause harm by reason of inappropriateness, substantial erosion of Green Belt openness, moderate and

localised harm to the Chilterns National Landscape, and minor harm to the significance of Hampden Farm and Hampden Farm Barn through changes to the shared wider setting of the historic farmstead. The benefits, taken together, weigh substantially in favour of the proposal. However, they do not clearly outweigh the Green Belt and other harm identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances required by Framework Policy GB6 do not exist.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

65. The proposal would conflict with the consistent objective of Local Plan Policy GB2 because it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would also conflict with Local Plan Policy GC1 and Core Strategy Policy CS20 and with the consistent conservation and landscape-protection elements of Local Plan Policy LSQ1 and Core Strategy CS22 because of the identified harm to the Chilterns National Landscape. The harm to the significance of Hampden Farm and Hampden Farm Barn through changes to the shared wider setting of the historic farmstead would conflict with the heritage-protection objective of Local Plan Policy LB2, notwithstanding the favourable balance under Framework Policy HE6. The proposal would preserve the significance of Woodlands and would not conflict with Policy LB2 in respect of that asset. Compliance with development plan policies concerning highway safety, flood risk and other technical matters is neutral.

66. The conflict with the Green Belt strategy and the policies protecting the National Landscape goes to important spatial and environmental objectives of the development plan. Although I give very limited weight to the identified elements of Policies GB2, LSQ1, CS22 and LB2 that are materially inconsistent with the Framework, the proposal also conflicts with the consistent elements of those policies and with Policies GC1 and CS20, to which I attach full weight. In combination, those conflicts are sufficient for the proposal to conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.

67. The Framework is a material consideration of critical importance. Among other matters, its policies support the delivery of market and affordable housing and recognise the contribution of previously developed land, improved connectivity, biodiversity net gain and socio-economic activity. However, for the reasons given above, the proposal would not accord with the Framework's policies for development in the Green Belt. The support provided by its other policies does not alter my conclusion under Framework Policies GB6 to GB8.

68. The site lies adjacent to but outside the settlement of Prestwood and Framework Policy S4 is not applicable. Policy S5(5) of the Framework provides that development in the Green Belt is to be determined under Policies GB6, GB7 and GB8. The proposal would be inappropriate development, and the other considerations do not clearly outweigh the Green Belt and other harm. The very special circumstances required by Policy GB6 have therefore not been demonstrated. Nor does Policy S3(1)(c) support the proposal because it does not accord with the national decision-making policies in the Framework. Accordingly, the proposal does not benefit from the expectation of approval under Framework Policy S3.

69. In conclusion, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the approach of the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. The

appeal is therefore dismissed.

Lewis Condé
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

S. Randle, Counsel – 4-5 Grays Inn Square, London

J. Emmett, Assoc RICS – JCE Planning & Architectural Consultancy

D. Lomas, BSc MSc, PG Dip, Dip Hons MRTPI, MTPA – MSC Planning Associates

S. Wilson, Ba Hons DipLA – Portus and Whitton Landscape Architects

Dr. C. Fry – Architectural History & Conservation Consultants

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

E. Showan – Principal Planner

R. Timlin – Senior Planning Officer

D. Simmons – Planning Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Dr. M. Stubbs – Planning Adviser to the Chilterns Conservation Board

C. Bunting – Great Missenden Parish Council

R. Gibson - Treasurer Prestwood Community Association (PCA)

Dr. K. P. Ray – Local Resident

W. Ramsey – Local Resident

T. Ramsey – Local Resident

DOCUMENTS

Copy of Unilateral Undertaking Pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990: Land adjacent to Hampden Farm Barn, Greenlands Lane, Prestwood, HP16 9Qx (Dated 20 July 2026)

Copy of R (Faversham Town Council) v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2026] EWHC 1651 (Admin)