



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3373106

8 Lollards Close, Amersham, Buckinghamshire, HP6 5JL

- 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 Lana against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/1563/FA.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey side / rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, and upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at Nos 4-7 (consecutive) Lollards Close, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached property with an enclosed side and rear garden and open plan frontage, set within a late 20th century residential estate development. No 8 sits towards the terminal end of a cul-de-sac and is at one end of a group of four semi-detached properties set in a row (Nos 8-11). To the side of the appeal site is a row of four further semi-detached properties at Nos 4-7. These nestle into a corner of the estate without any conventional road frontage and are aligned perpendicular to Nos 8-11 with their front elevations facing towards the flank wall and side/rear garden of No 8. The intervening space encompasses the open plan front gardens to Nos 4-7 and a footpath access running parallel and adjacent to the side boundary of the appeal site, which is marked by an approximate 1.8m high close-boarded fence and a slightly taller evergreen hedgerow along the length of the rear garden. The proposal is to add a single-storey extension to the side of the appeal property and which would wrap around its rear elevation to a depth of 4m in place of an existing conservatory.
4. The existing dwelling is simple in form and modest in scale, consistent with the building typology of its neighbours. It occupies a verdant setting, where open plan frontages and adjoining green spaces merge to provide planned relief from an otherwise fairly dense pattern of development within the wider estate. Although the

garden area to the side of No 8 has been enclosed with solid timber fencing, the space to the side of the appeal property can still be appreciated when viewed from its surroundings and makes a valuable contribution to the spacious qualities of the immediate area.

5. The extension to the side of the property would be readily seen over the height of the existing boundary enclosure and would be visually prominent within its surroundings. The encroachment of such built form into land that is currently open would undeniably erode the visual gap between No 8 and the adjacent terrace at Nos 4-7. This would be detrimental to the important sense of space and openness within a corner of Lollards Close where I found there to be a delicate balance in the relationships between adjacent buildings.
6. Where the extension would sit to the side of the existing dwelling, it would have a dual pitched roof with a ridge height equivalent to the property's first-floor eaves level. Although it would reflect the style of some properties with attached garages elsewhere along Lollards Close, the extension at No 8 would be wider than those and would lack any degree of recess. As a consequence, when viewed head-on in the approach from Lollards Close, the side extension would appear as an over large and disproportionate addition that would lack an appropriate level of subordination when seen against the modest scale of the original dwelling.
7. In addition, I find the marriage between the pitched roof to the side element and the crown roof to the rear would appear clumsy and disjointed, lacking any cohesion or harmony with the form of the original dwelling. The visual prominence of the crown roof beyond the confines of the appeal site would be further indicative of an overlarge and inharmonious extension.
8. When all of this is considered, by failing to relate well in terms of size, shape, design, and position, I find the extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and to the spacious character and appearance of the wider area. As such, there would be conflict with Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District, adopted in 2011, and with Policies GC1, H13 and H15 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (CDLP), adopted in 1997 (as altered and consolidated), along with the guiding principles of the Council's *Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD), adopted in 2013. Between them these seek to ensure that development, including specifically an extension to a dwelling, displays a high standard of design that reflects and respects local character. For the same reasons, there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Living Conditions

9. Nos 4-7 Lollards Close face towards the side boundary of the appeal property. I observed during my visit that these properties benefit from a front door, kitchen window, and a small obscure glazed window at ground floor, and two first-floor bedroom windows. Outlook from within these dwellings to the front would remain over their open plan frontages. Access along the existing footpath would be unaffected by the proposed extension.
10. The proposal would undeniably project the built form of No 8 closer to these neighbouring properties. According to an undisputed figure given by the Council, there would be a separation distance of around 8m. However, there is no

suggestion, neither do I consider there to be any likelihood of, any loss of direct sunlight or daylight to the living spaces or private amenity areas of any of these nearby properties.

11. I have addressed the visual effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area above. The extension would be obviously seen in the outlook from Nos 4-7 to a greater or lesser degree in each case. However, the new building would be single-storey, domestic in scale and function, and viewed within the two-storey context of the existing. Given this, together with the open space to the front of Nos 4-7 that would remain, I am not persuaded that its presence or proximity would be so visually dominant or overbearing to a degree that would be significant or demonstrably harmful to the neighbours' living conditions. As such, I find no conflict with CDLP Policy H14 or with the SPD as far as they seek to safeguard the amenities of neighbours in relation to extensions.
12. I have noted references to air conditioning units that exist on the side of the existing dwelling and the absence of any such plant shown on the planning drawings. However, I have dealt with the appeal based upon the works for which planning permission was sought. Additional matters raised with reference to any potential obstruction of the footpath during construction are not directly relevant to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

13. Notwithstanding my findings in relation to the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions at Nos 4-7 Lollards Close, I find the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area. I have noted the appellants' needs to cater for their family's requirements, and their commitment to the local community. However, neither of these factors, nor any other matters raised, alter my findings. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR