



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025

by N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/25/3361059

Ruby House, 3 Beechwood Drive, Marlow, Buckinghamshire SL7 2DH

- 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 Dr Nina Fuller-Shavel against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/07415/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is set within a cul-de-sac formed of a score-or-so of detached and semi-detached homes. The homes are well proportioned and sit within commodious plots and feature ample space to the front boundaries. Front gardens are commonly generous and landscaped with a mixture of mature trees and hedges. Aside from this landscaping and paved driveways, these front gardens are largely undeveloped which contributes to the spacious impression of the area. Along the north side of the road, where the appeal property is set, properties are increasingly set-back as one proceeds towards the terminus of the cul-de-sac and the house at the appeal site is respectful of this, being positioned roughly between its two neighbours.
4. The proposed garage would be set in the front garden to the appeal property. It would project forward of the general building line on this side of the road and represent an unwelcome intrusion of built form to an otherwise verdant and open setting. It would disrupt the pattern of buildings and appear as a prominent and alien structure in the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area.
5. I recognise that there are other detached garages to the front of houses in the area. Those at the end of Beechwood Drive are set well back from the road, do not share the same building line and are substantially screened by extensive mature planting. They have an entirely different context and juxtaposition with neighbouring homes due to their position. The detached garages along Marlow Road are also set in a different context and in any case, are not pressed as close to the front boundary as is the case here.

6. As the Wycombe Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (WHPDG) recognises, garages on very large sites may be acceptable in front gardens if they are located in a position which avoids harm to the street scene and the garage does not obscure the property's frontage. This is the case with the cited examples whereas it does not ring true here.
7. I have noted reference to a planning permission for an attached single garage¹ however I do not have details of this scheme before me to form a complete picture. Even so, the description of this as an attached garage, which is only of a size to accommodate one vehicle, leads me to reason that it is of a distinctly different nature to that which is before me. Indeed, even with the established front boundary landscaping, it would not be hidden from view. This having been said, I do not regard the proposal as setting any form of precedent. The acceptability of any proposal is judged on its merits and being mindful of the context as is recognised in the WHPDG.
8. As such, I conclude that the proposed garage, due to its size and scale, position forward of the main house and that of neighbouring homes would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it does not comply with policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 and the guidance in the WHPDG as it does not respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. The proposed garage would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and it therefore conflicts with the provisions of the development plan. The material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan, thus, the appeal is dismissed.

N Bowden

INSPECTOR

¹ Council ref: 23/08022/FUL