



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2022

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/21/3286297

23 Fremantle Road, High Wycombe, HP13 7PQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simon Guiver against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06967/FUL, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Building of a detached garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house in a residential area. Houses within the street are also detached with front gardens behind the pavement. Generally, gardens comprise a lawn next to a driveway with no, or low, boundary walls. Most properties have garages attached to the side, as is the case with the appeal property, or incorporated into the house design with first floor rooms above. Generally, garages share the house building line or are set back behind it. As a result, the street has an open character with views across most front gardens.
4. The appeal property is on a corner where the road swings round and forms a small cul de sac of five houses. These properties differ from most in the road in that they have mature hedge boundaries between the houses, some of which extend around the front of the gardens to the pavement edge, as is the case with the appeal property. Consequently, the frontages of these properties are less open to views from the street as elsewhere within Fremantle Road. Nonetheless, it is obvious that none of these properties, or others within the street, have substantial buildings in their front gardens. Also, within the cul de sac the appeal site front garden is visible, as is the driveway which at the time of my visit had 2 cars parked and potentially room for a third.
5. The proposal is for a relatively large garage with an approximately 6m high half hipped roof. It would be located in the front garden behind the existing hedge, forward, and to the side, of the house. The roof would be seen above the hedge

and the close board fence which extend along the side boundary adjacent to the pavement. It would also be clearly visible from within the cul de sac and seen as separate from the main house. As such it would appear as an incongruous addition to the front garden of the property and at odds with the prevailing character of the area, which is free of large buildings within front gardens. The proposal would therefore conflict with sections 12.1 and 12.4 of the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2020) which require garages to be set behind the front building line of dwellings to avoid harm to the street scene, and Policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) which require development to respect and improve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

6. I have considered all other matters raised in support of the appeal, including the processing of the planning application and the absence of public representations. However, for the reasons above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR