



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3368736

14 London End, Newton Longville, Buckinghamshire MK17 0AX

- 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 & Mrs Phillips against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00620/APP.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing side garage, side outbuildings and rear conservatory. Proposed replacement single storey side and rear extension and two storey side extension. Fenestration amendments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing side garage, side outbuildings and rear conservatory. Proposed replacement single storey side and rear extension and two storey side extension. Fenestration amendments. at 14 London End, Newton Longville, Buckinghamshire MK17 0AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00620/APP, , subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01, PL04 and PL05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached two storey house with a pitched roof with gable ends, located in a cul-de sac of detached properties that are of a wide variety of ages and architectural expression. The appeal dwelling is set well back from the road, with a generous drive and front garden. To the rear is a similarly generous rear garden. The appeal dwelling sits within the centre of its plot and is neighboured by a similarly scaled dwelling and plot on one side, with open fields to the other.

4. The appeal dwelling appears to be mid to late 20th century in date, plainly designed with little architectural embellishment or significant architectural merit. There is an existing flat roofed front porch that connects to a side garage, which produces a wraparound effect to the main house. To the rear of the garage there is a later pitched roof conservatory. To the other side of the house is an original single storey outbuilding connected to the main house by an integrated and gated through passage. The proposed extension of the appeal dwelling involves the demolition of the existing conservatory and outbuilding with integrated passage.
5. The existing garage would be converted to living space as part of the proposed single storey side and rear extension. The rear part of the side and rear extension would be as wide as the existing house and garage, with a flat roof with lantern. The garage and proposed side extension would have a pitched roof with gable end, mirroring that of the existing dwelling, that would also integrate with the existing front porch, replacing its existing flat roof form.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would be to that side of the appeal dwelling that is adjacent to open fields. Its front wall would be slightly set back from the main front elevation of the existing house. To the rear it would project as far rearward and integrate with the single storey rear extension, with a pitched gable to its rear elevation. The roof of the two storey side extension would be set down from the roof ridge of the existing roof of the appeal dwelling, to which it would connect in a hipped form, extending the existing rear roof slope.
7. The proposal would significantly increase the size of the appeal dwelling, with the main additional volume being evident in the proposed parts of the proposed extensions on either side of the existing dwelling. Whilst the proposed extensions wrap around the house, the proposal would leave the existing dwelling as the main single volume of the final composition, with both proposed side extensions appearing as secondary in terms of volume and scale to the existing house. The single storey nature of the proposed single storey side and rear extension and the setting in and down of the proposed two storey side extension would result in the proposal appearing as subordinate to the appeal dwelling rather than appearing to dominate it.
8. Whilst the proposal would, in form, wrap around the existing house, this would only be evident from the rear. However, given the plain design of the appeal dwelling and the combination of hipped and flat roofs of the proposal, in rear views of the appeal dwelling, the bulk of the proposal would appear to be broken down into three separate parts rather than a single wrapping feature. As such, the proposal would not appear as a single wraparound feature and would result in no detrimental effect on its existing architectural expression and would be of little significance in terms of the limited design qualities of the existing building.
9. To the front, the proposal would appear as two side extensions to the existing building, which would enlarge the existing house but would appear as recessive and complementary to its existing scale, character and general appearance. Consequently, the proposal would not appear to dominate the appeal dwelling in views from the front or from the street. Rather, in these views the additional bulk of the proposal would appear to be recessively massed, without overwhelming the existing dwelling. As such, the proposal would be in keeping with the scale of the existing dwelling and its plot. For these reasons, the proposal would accord with the design advice set out in section 8 of the Vale of Aylesbury Design Supplementary

Planning Document (2023) and sections C1, I1 and I2 of the National design Guide (2021).

10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and would not therefore conflict with Policies NL2 of the Newton Longville Neighbourhood Plan (2025), Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). Collectively these seek development, including by extension that is of good quality design that respects and complements the scale, height, massing order, proportions, form, materials and context of the site and setting, including its local distinctiveness.

Conditions

11. I have attached the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation and, in the interests of design quality, I have attached conditions requiring adherence to approved drawings and matching materials.

Conclusion

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

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR