



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/25/3370934

Roselea, 11 Joiners Lane, Chalfont St Peter, Buckinghamshire SL9 0AB

- 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 Amit Bhandari against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/0986/FA.
 - The development proposed is part two storey and part single storey Ground floor rear extension. First floor Side extension. Two storey front extension and Loft conversion. Internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area;
 - the living conditions of the occupants of No.9 Joiners Lane, with particular regard to outlook and dominance; and
 - protected species

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located on Joiners Lane which is a residential street consisting of detached dwellings of a variety of different architectural styles within the built up area of Chalfont St Peter. The dwellings, including the appeal property, have a modest and unobtrusive character and appearance due to their setback position from the highway and their intentional height which responds in a positive manner to the stepped topography of Joiners Lane.
5. Notwithstanding the proposed recess and lower height of the side extension, the proposal would add significantly to the width and height of the host property at first floor level and above. Despite the articulation of the façades and separation distances, the proposal would result in an uncharacteristically deep footprint when

viewed amongst the surrounding development. As such, due to its cumulative bulk, the proposal would dominate both the host property and street scene as a whole.

6. In coming to that view, I note that when approaching from longer distances in either direction along Joiners Lane, views of the dwelling would be partially screened by existing boundary treatments and the surrounding dwellings. However, the upper walls and roof would project above these and at closer distances the dwelling would have an unduly dominant and conspicuous appearance. This would be at odds with the low key and unobtrusive character of the surrounding development and would be harmful to the areas character and appearance.
7. Furthermore, the legibility of the existing dwelling would be lost due to the change to a crown roof design together with the increase in massing to all elevations. Whilst the proposal would utilise materials which would be in keeping with other properties in the surrounding area, the proposed extensions would fail to respect the unobtrusive and modest character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider street scene.
8. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal, as a result of the combination of its bulk and massing would have a significant detrimental effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (November 2011) (CS), Policies GC1, H13 and H15 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (September 1997, May 2001, September 2007 & November 2011) (LP) and the Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (September 2013) (SPD) which collectively seek to ensure extensions respect the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling and relate well to the street scene.
9. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and the National Design Guide where they require development to be of a high standard of design which reflects the character of the surrounding area.

Living conditions

10. Despite the stepped topography of the street, the appeal dwelling is currently, largely screened in views from the garden of No.9 due to the sizeable recess on the first floor and the existing vegetation. Notwithstanding the step-back in the proposed side extension and the recess in the proposed rear extension, the alterations would introduce a substantial two storey built form in close proximity to the common boundary. Its length along the shared boundary, coupled with its considerable height, which would be further exacerbated by the properties stepped relationship and blank appearance, would dominate views from the garden of No.9 Joiners Lane. Whilst the existing vegetation would continue to provide some screening, the physical proximity and visual dominance would result in an oppressive structure which would feel overbearing to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupants at No.9.
11. The proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy, nevertheless these are neutral matters that would be expected of any well designed proposal and they do not outweigh the harm identified above.
12. For the reasons set out, the proposed two storey extension would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No.9 Joiners Lane, with

particular regard to outlook and dominance. As such it would fail to comply with Policy H14 of the LP and the SPD which, among other things, aim for development to avoid harm to the amenity of future and existing occupants of nearby residences.

Protected Species

13. The appellant has stated that a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) has been completed by Prohort Limited with a field survey completed however the final report has been delayed and has not been submitted as part of this appeal.
14. I have had regard to Circular 06/2005, which sets out that it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before planning permission is granted. Moreover, as the level of information currently available does not present a full picture of the extent to which bats are present on the site, use of a pre-commencement condition to secure further information would not be an appropriate course of action in this case.
15. The absence of sufficient information means that I cannot rule out significant harm to protected species, namely bats and whilst I note the appellants willingness to incorporate biodiversity enhancement measures this would not alleviate the uncertainty in regard to the presence of protected species onsite. The proposal therefore would fail to accord with Policy CS24 of the CS and the provisions of the Framework which amongst other things seeks to protect and enhance legally protected species.

Other Matters

16. The appellant refers to a similarly designed dwelling that the council has approved in the nearby area and argues that this sets a precedent for the proposal. However, elements of the scheme are significantly different than the appeal proposal, including the topography of the street, setback from the highway, separation distances and surrounding context. As such, it does not alter my conclusions on the main issues as set out above.
17. The proposal would upgrade the insulation and thermal performance of the appeal property and would support adaptable living, extending the life of the building in line with sustainable development objectives. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Allen

INSPECTOR