



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2025

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/J0405/D/25/3369987

16 Henry Road, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP20 1NW

- 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. and Mrs. K. and N. Tukhoo against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00716/APP.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as follows: *"Loft conversion with rear dormer. Front two storey extension that does not extend beyond front and side elevation. Addition of porch to the front. Relocation of front door. Rear partial double storey extension."*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area in the western part of Aylesbury, where Henry Road is part of a roughly regular street pattern that is laid out to the north of the main A41 road which enters Aylesbury from the east. Henry Road is characterised by two-storey houses along the street frontages, in semi-detached pairs and short terraces, and the houses are generally traditional in form with hipped or gabled roofs.
4. Number 16 Henry Road is a semi-detached house (paired with number 14), in a conventional form, constructed of brickwork under a hipped, tiled roof. Like others in the street, the house has undergone some modifications over the years, but its basic architectural form has been retained. It stands back from the road, behind a small front garden that also includes parking provision. A narrow, shared drive at the side of the house gives access to a garage at the rear and to a long back garden.
5. It is now proposed to carry out a scheme of extensions and alterations to the property. The project would include a loft conversion with a rear dormer and alterations to the roof to create a half-hipped form, together with a two-storey extension to part of the front elevation. A new porch would also be added at the

front and the front door would be relocated. In addition, a new extension would be added at the rear, partially two-storey.

6. The 'National Planning Policy Framework' emphasises the aim of "achieving well designed places" in the broadest sense (notably at Section 12), while making effective use of land and encouraging economic activity. It is aimed at achieving good design standards generally, by adding to the overall quality of the area and being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, although it is also recognised that appropriate change may include increased densities. The achievement of good design includes protecting existing residential amenities and providing good standards of accommodation in new development.
7. An emphasis on the importance of encouraging good design more generally is also to be found in the Development Plan and attention has been drawn to the 'Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (Adopted Plan) 2013-2033' (which was adopted in September 2021). Specifically, Policy BE2 of the Local Plan is concerned with the "Design of new development" and, among other things, this Policy requires new development to respect and complement "the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings".
8. The Council's 'Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Design Supplementary Planning Document' (which was adopted in 2023) is also relevant but it does not have the force of the statutory Development Plan. Section 8 addresses the design of "household extensions".
9. The proposed alterations to the roof structure would create a new half-hipped construction, combined with a box dormer, in order to increase the accommodation to be provided at second floor level. It is noted that other buildings in the vicinity include both hipped and gabled roofs but, in this case, the proposed form would be awkward and out of keeping because of the contrived and uncharacteristic nature of the design. Although symmetry in semi-detached houses is not necessarily an essential design feature, the finished composition in this case would be ungainly and unsympathetic to both the host building and the surroundings more generally. Thus, it would amount to an awkward intrusion in the streetscene.
10. By contrast, the proposed rear two-storey and single-storey extension would be in harmony with the original design. It would be proportionate in scale and sympathetic in building materials, with a flat roof at ground floor and a similar pitched roof (albeit with a gable) over the two-storey part of the extension.
11. Moreover, the impact of the finished project on the residential amenities of neighbours would be very limited. Their outlook, light and privacy would not be materially affected, provided, of course, that the proposed flat roofed areas were not to be used as balconies or terraces. In relation to that potential concern, I have noted the inclusion of "Juliet Doors" on the proposed rear elevation but I am confident that the use of the flat roofs could have been controlled by the imposition of conditions, if the proposals had been otherwise acceptable.
12. Evidently, the appeal site lies within an established urban area, which is "sustainable" in planning terms, and the proposed development would make useful additions to the existing house. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the harm that would be done to the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings outweighs the benefits of the project.

13. Hence, I have concluded that the scheme before me would conflict with both national and local planning policies (including the Development Plan) and that it ought not to be allowed. Although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations (including references to other house extensions in the vicinity), I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.
14. In reaching these conclusions I have considered whether the appeal could be allowed but subject to conditions that might overcome the visual concerns that I have identified. In view of all the uncertainties involved, however, I have formed the opinion that it would not be possible to frame precise conditions to deal with the objection that I have identified and that therefore the appeal must be dismissed.

Roger C. Shrimplin

INSPECTOR