



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3375601

Lynfield, Wexham Street, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire SL3 6PA

- 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 Habib Khan against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/2920/FA.
 - The development proposed is the demolishing of existing single garage, erection of new detached double garage flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that there are no trees or hedges on the application site, and that no trees or hedges would need to be removed or pruned in order to carry out the proposal. No trees or hedges are identified on the submitted drawings. However, at my visit I observed both a substantial tree, together with a smaller tree within the appeal property's garden, which would both require either significant limbing, or complete removal to carry out the proposal. I have therefore taken this into account in my determination.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large 2-storey detached residential dwelling constructed in the latter half of the last century. It is constructed from facing brickwork to its walls under a pitched and gabled, tiled roof, and has a detached flat-roofed single storey garage within its side garden which forms part of the property's boundary with the public footpath. The property remains broadly as it was built, other than window and cladding replacement.
5. The property occupies a corner plot on the north side of the junction between Wexham Street and Home Farm Way. The plot is generally rectangular in shape, though its southern boundary forms a segmented half hexagon shape. This southern boundary has a low brick wall to two of its sides with shrub hedges behind, whilst the third is substantially formed from the side wall of the existing detached garage block. The appeal property's end gable wall, garage, side garden and the trees and hedges within it, which soften the visual appearance of

development on the appeal site, are prominent in street views, owing to the property's position at the junction of the two roads.

6. The area surrounding the appeal property consists of a small estate of similar detached properties on Home Farm Way, whilst properties which front onto Wexham Street are of varied ages and architectural styles, though most date from the early part of the 20th century, set within good sized plots and with substantial gardens to their frontages. These are predominantly enclosed behind mature hedges, or low brick walls, and have mature trees within their front gardens. The character of the area is therefore one of an established leafy residential neighbourhood.
7. The proposal would remove the existing garage and replace it with a larger flat roofed garage, which would be both substantially taller and longer than the existing. It would be located with its front elevation onto Wexham Street, well forward of the line of the principal elevation of the main dwelling, whilst its rear elevation would be almost in line with the rear elevation of the main dwelling. Owing to the size of its footprint, and the shape of the side garden, the corners of the proposed garage would be close to the faceted southern boundary walls and would necessitate the substantial pruning or complete removal of the trees and much of the shrubbery within the garden to accommodate it.
8. The appeal property currently has a double width driveway and parking for up to four cars on its frontage with Wexham Street. The appeal proposal would result in the loss of most of the remaining garden areas for the property, leaving only a very small and oddly shaped area of external garden space, for the amenity of the occupiers of the appeal property.
9. The appeal proposal would introduce a large mass of development, which would not appear subservient to the main dwelling, close to the boundary with the public footpath, and would result in the loss or substantial loss of tree and shrub planting which might screen it. I find this would be both prominent and incongruous in the street scene, which would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with policies EP3 and H13 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999, Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011) (the Local Plan) and with policy CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy (adopted February 2011). These require, among other things, that development is designed so that its scale, layout, siting, height and design are compatible with the site itself, and the locality in general. Development should remain subordinate to the scale of the existing dwelling, should not decrease the proportion of the site remaining free from development significantly, and should retain adequate garden space to serve the existing dwelling.

Other Matters

11. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt (GB). Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the construction of new buildings in the GB is inappropriate. Paragraph 152 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the GB and should only be approved in very special circumstances. However, paragraph 154 of the Framework also provides a list of exceptions to inappropriate development in the GB.

12. The Council consider that the proposal would meet the exceptions of paragraph 154(c) and 154(d) of the Framework, and that with reference to the GB policies of the Local Plan, policies GB1 and GB10, the appeal proposal would not be inappropriate development in the GB. Having examined the evidence before me, I find no reason to find otherwise.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would be contrary to the development plan, read as a whole, and that the material considerations I outline above, would not outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR