



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3366444

44 Hogfair Lane, Burnham, Buckinghamshire SL1 7HQ

- 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 Bradley Harrington against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application ref. is PL/25/0214/FA.
 - The development proposed is the removal of front railings and increase in height of existing wall and piers and construction of garage to front of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a reasonably small detached dwelling with a ground floor and accommodation in the roof space. It is set back from the road on the west side of Hogfair Lane amongst a line of other detached dwellings which are also set back from the road with on-site parking and have a fairly consistent building line.
4. It has double electronic black metal gates between stone and brick pillars and a curved wall extending over the remainder of the width of the plot. The wall has some black iron railings along the top. Behind it there is mature and attractive vegetation which partially screens the dwelling. Parking is available in the front forecourt and there is space to turn vehicles so they emerge in a forward gear. There are garage doors integrated into the dwelling but it is not clear if there is a functioning garage as there are no floorplans of the existing dwelling submitted with the application or appeal.
5. There is room on the short drive for a vehicle to wait in an off-road position for the gates to open. There is vegetation in front of the front boundary wall and a grass verge on

which there is a telegraph pole. The appeal site is close to an egress from a grammar school which is on the east side of Hogfair Lane. There is a partial footpath on the west side of Hogfair Lane and a footpath on the east side. The road is a busy one, particularly at pupil delivery and collection times, when vehicles park/wait to drop off and collect pupils.

6. The proposed development includes the erection of a detached flat-roofed garage in the front area of the plot behind the front wall. It also includes the removal of the vertical metal railings on the front boundary wall and infilling this area with brickwork. The front garden would, for the most part, be hard landscaped.
7. The garage is proposed to measure approximately 5.5m wide, 3.6m deep and be about 2.65m in height. Situated approximately 11m forward of the house with its front orientated to face the dwelling, the garage would contain a garage door and a separate conventional door. Externally it would be finished in render to match the existing dwelling.
8. The front boundary wall is proposed to be raised by about 0.8m taking the front wall to about 1.6m in height with the piers rising to about 1.85m. The resultant wall would not exceed the height of the existing wall with railings above, while the existing gate would be retained.
9. The Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study, Planning and Design Principles indicates that for suburban roads garages should continue to be placed behind the building line and for green suburban roads alternatively placing garages alongside dwellings is also contemplated. Whilst this advice is guidance and should not be applied too rigidly, the context of the appeal site is one where there are almost no ancillary buildings within the front forecourts of plots and there is a fairly uniform treatment of front of plots being used for parking and soft landscaping. This contributes to the character of the immediate area and the streetscene where dwelling frontages can be glimpsed through vegetation and gates, and are not obscured by garages or other ancillary buildings.
10. The loss of the vegetation within the front garden area (which can also be seen through the existing railings on top of the front wall) would result in a changed and less attractive appearance to the streetscene and one that would be inconsistent with the character of nearby front gardens. The replacement of the railings with bricks and the view of the proposed garage above the heightened wall would increase the urban appearance of this part of the Lane to its detriment.
11. In this case, the addition of the proposed outbuilding in close proximity to the front boundary in combination with building up of the wall and the removal of the soft landscaping would result in a development which would appear prominent and incongruous within the streetscene, due to its size and scale and proximity to the front boundary. The proposals would not integrate well with this section of Hogfair Lane or demonstrate an understanding of the existing built form and layout in this immediate area.
12. The appellant points out a dwelling on Hogfair Lane opposite the junction with Lincoln Hatch Lane which has a detached garage within its front forecourt. The surrounding character and siting of this dwelling is very different to the appeal site. It sits well back

from the road as it has a wide verge with a couple of paths in front of it which branch off to Green Lane which lies to its north. It is in significantly more spacious surroundings and is not in a close knit row of dwellings. In any event, I have judged the appeal proposal on its own particular individual characteristics and merits. I have also borne in mind that a lockable garage would help secure its contents against theft but none of these factors override the harm I have identified above.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and be contrary to saved policies EP3 and H13 and Appendix 8 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999, Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011) and policy CP8 of the South Bucks District Core Strategy 2011. The proposed development would also fail to comply with C1 of the National Design Guidance (2019), and the Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Conclusion

14. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector