

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/17/3168656

26 Crossways, Beaconsfield HP9 2HX

- 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 & Mrs Cook against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01749/FUL, dated 20 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is for roof alterations and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed dormer window upon the character and appearance of the dwelling, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Old Town Conservation Area; and whether the proposal would provide adequate off-street parking facilities.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is situated within a relatively modern development, comprising a mix of two storey staggered terraced houses and two and a half storey blocks of flats. The rear roof slope of the subject dwelling is not visible from Park Lane or any other public vantage point within the Conservation Area, it is stepped forward from that of no27, adjoining, and the dormer extension would not project beyond its roof plane. The rear elevation of no26 is also stepped forward from that of no25, but the difference is less than to the other side.
4. The dormer would be set in from the eaves and down from the ridge such that it would not appear overly dominant within its roof. Consequently, the impact of the dormer window extension impact upon the visual amenities of the area would be very localised.
5. I acknowledge that the dwelling as it exists has 2no dormer windows serving the first floor which break through the rear eaves and, combined with the proposed dormer, would give it a slightly jumbled appearance. However, due to its location, concealed from public view, the overall harm to the character and

appearance of the host dwelling would be minimal and I find that the proposal would at the very least preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

6. The proposal complies with Policies C1 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (1990) (LP) and Policy CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy (2011) which where concerning proposals to alter and extend existing residential dwellings require the extension to harmonise with the existing building in terms of scale, height, form and design and require proposals to preserve or enhance important features which contribute to the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. I also find that the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework which highlights within paragraph 132 of Section 12 that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Parking Provision

7. LP Policy TR7 states that development will only be permitted where it complies with the parking standards, amongst other things. The Council's standards as set out within LP Appendix 6 highlight that where planning applications are made for new development, including extensions to existing development, conversions or change of use, the adequacy of the proposed parking facilities should be assessed against them. Where concerning dwellings of four bedrooms or more, there is a requirement for three spaces per dwelling to be provided (where a dwelling has two or three bedrooms, two spaces is the required standard).
8. The appeal site currently has provision for 1no off-street parking space within a garage block located due west of the appeal site. The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from two to four and whilst I acknowledge that bedroom no4 could be used as a study, nonetheless the drawings before me show space for a single bed within that room and I can only determine the proposals based upon the plans before me. Furthermore, I acknowledge the planning history cited on other dwellings within the road, however, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
9. I found on my site visit that the dwelling is located within an area of high parking stress with cars parked half on the kerb outside the site. Taking into account the fact that there is only 1no garage space serving the dwelling in question, parking provision is already substandard and I consider that the proposal would further accentuate this. I acknowledge the appellants interpretation of LP Policy TR7 and Appendix 6, but the increase in internal living accommodation would have to be facilitated by operational development in the form of the construction of the rear dormer, and which I consider to be an extension. This is notwithstanding the fact that I fully sympathise that the proposal would improve their quality of living.
10. However, as the proposal makes inadequate provision for off-street parking, I find it conflicts with LP Policy TR7 as summarised above.

Other Matters

11. The Council highlights that if permitted the proposal would have acted as a precursor for further applications for similar types of development within the part of the Conservation Area that the appeal site finds itself situated. As each case must be assessed on its own merits I give limited weight to this argument. However, notwithstanding the fact that I have found that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, I find that inadequate parking provision in an area of parking stress weighs against the proposal.

Conclusion

12. Therefore, having regard to the above and to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR