



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by **Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/W/24/3356572

60 Wendover Street, High Wycombe HP11 2JF

- 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 Hamzah Hussain against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - West Area (Wycombe).
 - The application Ref is 24/05114/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part single/part two storey rear extension & single storey front extension on connection with creation of four self-contained bedsit flats, creation of bin/cycle stores and new fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant details that the appeal scheme is a resubmission of a previously approved application for a similar scheme¹. I do not have all of the details of this application or the circumstances and planning policies that were relevant at the time that planning permission was granted. Moreover, I do not have any substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the planning permission was implemented and remains extant such that the planning permission could still be implemented and thereby be given weight as a valid fall-back position or, given that it was granted consent over 4 years ago, has now lapsed. As such while I have had reference to the existence of this planning permission, I afforded it very limited weight and I have determined the appeal scheme on its own merits.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the appeal scheme on highway safety and whether or not the appeal scheme would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers.

Reasons

Highway safety

¹ 20/07744/FUL granted on the 12th January 2021 for the erection of part single/part two storey rear extension & single storey front extension on connection with creation of four self-contained bedsit flats, creation of bin/cycle stores and new fencing.

4. The road adjacent the appeal site includes parking restrictions, and I saw at the site visit that there was a high level of use of this on street carparking. The council assess that the appeal scheme would generate a need for four parking bays, none are proposed on site and none are currently provided on site. Therefore, as detailed in the Officer's report it was reasoned that there would be demand for two additional on-street carparking spaces.
5. I saw at the site visit that the area is subject of some parking demand pressure and that there are parking restrictions in place on streets near to the appeal property. That said, I note the results of the Parking Survey dated November 2020 and the range of services that future residents would have access to within walking distance of the appeal site and public transport options available locally.
6. Even if there were an increase in on-street parking, I have no evidence before me to show that it would result in indiscriminate on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety and moreover, I have no substantive evidence to show that there is no capacity to absorb the very limited potential increase in demand for on street carparking resulting from the proposed development and some evidence to demonstrate that there is capacity.
7. I accept that one consequence of placing reliance upon on-street carparking is that existing and future residents of the area would to some extent be inconvenienced by an increased competition for the available spaces. This would manifest itself in terms of taking longer to find a parking space, or residents having to park further away from their homes. Whilst I acknowledge that this would be an inconvenience to local residents, I do not find that this would amount to an unacceptable impact on their living conditions.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would potentially lead to a very limited increase in demand for on street carparking but that this would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the living conditions of local residents. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policy DM33 of the Wycombe District Local Plan that seeks amongst other matters to ensure that new development provide for parking sufficient to meet the needs of future occupants and to ensure there is no significant adverse impact from any overspill parking demand.

Living conditions

9. Policy DM40 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (the LP) requires that all new dwellings meet the nationally described technical housing standards for minimum internal space requirements.
10. The appellant does not dispute the council's statement, that the size of proposed units 3 and 4, being some 30.5m² and 28.9m² respectively, are considerably below the national internal space requirement of 37m².

Moreover, the submitted plans show a somewhat contrived living arrangements with seating in alcoves and televisions above sinks.

11. The appellant provides no persuasive evidence to justify such a deficiency against the national standard. The appellant does make reference to the previous approval of a similar scheme by the council and that the requirements have not changed since that time.
12. However, for the reasons detailed earlier I afford this earlier permission very limited weight, and it does not outweigh the clear inadequacy of the internal space provided by the appeal scheme and the clearly inadequate living conditions that the appeal scheme would consequently provide for future occupants.
13. On this basis I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would provide inadequate living conditions for future occupiers contrary to policy DM40 of the LP.

Other Matters

14. I note that Buckinghamshire Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and has submitted an assessment which identifies that the 'West Planning Area', that includes the appeal site, has a 1.96-year supply of housing sites for the five-year period 2024-2029.
15. This is a material consideration that carries significant weight in favour of the appeal scheme. However, I do not consider that it outweighs the inadequate size of the proposed units 3 and 4 and the consequential harm to the living conditions of the future occupiers.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR