



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3374861

52 Beech Tree Road, Holmer Green, High Wycombe HP15 6UT

- 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 & Mrs A Smith against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application ref. is PL/25/2009/FA
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage.
-

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 detached two storey chalet style dwelling on the north side of Beech Tree Road in Holmer Green. Beech Tree Road is a reasonably long and straight road which is predominantly residential. It is made up of mainly of detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows.
4. The appeal dwelling sits back from the road and has space to park vehicles off road in the front forecourt area. It has a narrow and long rear garden. There is a mature hedge on the front boundary and a wide gap in the frontage to allow vehicles to drive into and off the site.
5. The proposal is for a detached single garage to be constructed in the front south east corner of the site, adjacent to the existing hedge. The garage would be constructed with a brick plinth and would be finished in timber weatherboarding, with a hipped roof, finished with tiles.
6. No.50 is a single storey dwelling to the east of the appeal site and no.54 is a two storey dwelling to the west. There is a single storey clubhouse building (Holmer Green British Legion) to the east of no.50. This extends fairly close to the road (oblique flank towards the road) but there are some parking spaces between the main building flank and the road. There is no front boundary treatment. In terms of a pattern of development in the area, the clubhouse and its parking are inconsistent.

7. The dwellings on the south side of Beech Tree Road in the vicinity of the appeal site are generally located stepped back from the road with on-site parking in front of them. This is also generally the case with dwellings on the north side of the road in the vicinity of the appeal site. This to my mind is a strong characteristic of the area and creates a pattern of dwellings which can be seen above their front boundary treatments where those exist and viewed over their front forecourts.
8. The 'Residential Extension and Householder development Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (Chiltern District Council) at paragraph 38(ii) states that care needs to be taken in the siting of garages, particularly in areas characterised by open frontages which are clear of built form. In these areas it is unlikely to be acceptable to site a garage forward of a dwelling as this would disrupt the existing pattern of development.
9. Whilst each case needs to be considered on its own merits, the proposed garage in this appeal would be located in front of no.52 which is an open area mainly used for vehicle parking and free of built form. On my site visit, I noted that this was the prevailing pattern of development in the vicinity of the site. There were few, if any, lawful ancillary buildings/structures between the dwelling building lines and the front of residential plots. The proposed development would not be in keeping with this grain of development. Views of the front elevations of dwellings unencumbered by ancillary buildings in front areas is typical of the streetscene. In some plots, soft landscaping partially screens the ground floor accommodation. However, as is the case with this appeal, soft landscaping such as a hedge is often not protected by legislation and can be cut back or can become diseased or aged and die. It cannot be relied on in the medium or long term to screen or partially screen buildings such as garages built in the front forecourts of dwellinghouses.
10. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (adopted 2011) and policies GC1 and H20 of the Chiltern Local Plan (adopted 1997 including alterations adopted 2001, consolidated in 2007 & 2011).

Conclusion

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

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector