



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/24/3350105

32 Bates Close, George Green, Wexham, Buckinghamshire SL3 6SB

- 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 Kulbir Kaur against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/24/1323/FA.
 - The development proposed is internal and external alterations, including single storey rear extension, part garage conversion and installing a new garage door, loft conversion installing two rooflights at the front and one rear, new porch, and new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for internal and external alterations, including single storey rear extension, part garage conversion and installing a new garage door, loft conversion installing two rooflights at the front and one rear, new porch, and new vehicular access at 32 Bates Close, George Green, Wexham, Buckinghamshire SL3 6SB. In accordance with the terms of application Ref PL/24/1323/FA, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Elevations (page 4 of 8), Proposed Side View (page 5 of 8), Proposed Side View (page 6 of 8) & Block Plan (page 8 of 8), all dated as received with the planning application dated 15 May 2024, and amended Proposed Internal Plan (page 7 of 8) as submitted with the appeal.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant has submitted additional plans with the appeal documentation. The new plans provide extra annotations, images and measurements to the front area of the appeal property. The supporting evidence indicates that these

plans were submitted to the Council for consideration in advance of the determination of the planning application, and that consultation with technical consultees was undertaken. However, the planning application was nevertheless determined based on the original plans.

4. I have considered the implications of accepting these plans in the light of the 'Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England', and the principles of the 'Wheatcroft' and 'Holborn Studios' judgements. In this latter regard, I am satisfied that the nature of the revised plans presented clarification rather than a substantial difference or fundamental alteration to the proposed development. Furthermore, considering the consultation undertaken by the Council of the technical consultee, no procedural unfairness would arise if the plans were taken into account. The appeal process has not therefore been used to evolve the appeal scheme, but has merely provided additional detail and explanation.
5. On this basis, it would not therefore be prejudicial to any party to determine the appeal based on the additional plans, and I have therefore considered them during the course of my determination of the proposed development.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are;
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant development plan policies; and,
 - the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

7. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The Framework confirms that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The Framework, at paragraphs 154 and 155, sets out the categories of development which may be regarded as not inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to certain conditions. Paragraph 154c) includes the extension or alteration of a building, if it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.
8. Policy GB10 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (1999) (LP) states that "Extensions, which together with all previous extensions, are not of a small scale in relation to the original dwelling will be considered unacceptable in the Green Belt". The Council states that the dwelling had an original floorspace of 101sqm and has not been extended since. The proposal would increase the floorspace by 30.75sqm which represents an uplift of approximately 30.25%.
9. I concur with the Council that this would represent a minor increase in floorspace to the original dwelling, and as such that this would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such the proposal would neither conflict with Policy GB10 of the LP, nor the NPPF.

Effect of proposal on highway safety

10. The appeal property is situated in a residential cul-de-sac and has an existing dropped kerb in front of the garage. I note that the appeal site has one official parking space in front of the garage, however, in assessment against the dimensions contained within the parking standards, the garage is not regarded as of sufficient size to provide a second parking space.
11. Policy TR7 of the LP states that development should comply with certain parking standards set out in Appendix 6. The parking standards set out that dwellings with 4 bedrooms or more should have 3 off-street parking spaces with dimensions of 2.4m x 4.8m. The dimensions of the spaces shown on the additional plans demonstrate that the space at the front of the property and garage would allow for only 2 parking spaces in total.
12. The Council also highlight the Buckinghamshire Countrywide Parking Guidance (BCPG), which identifies that the host dwelling is located within a zone where properties with 5 or 6 habitable rooms should possess 2 off-street parking spaces with dimension of 2.8m x 5.0m. Applying these criteria would allow for only one parking space in total to the front of the property.
13. I am satisfied that the guidance within the BCPG sets out a revised and more up-to-date requirement for the amount and dimensions of parking spaces. However, even if the LP Standards were applied, irrespective of the means of assessment there would be no uplift in the required amount of parking as a consequence of the proposed development, with the number of habitable rooms increasing from 5 to 6 through the conversion of the existing garage.. The status quo would therefore persist.
14. Turning specifically to matters of highway safety, I have no evidence that the area receives a significant footfall of pedestrians or a rapid turnover of vehicles or vehicular movements at high speeds, and the area benefits from street lighting. In addition, the amended plans indicate that the site can continue to accommodate parking in a satisfactory manner to meet the requirement of the BCPG, without obstruction of the public highway for pedestrian or vehicular users.
15. I note that the Council has insisted that the resultant development would only allow a maximum length of 4.5 metres of hardstanding. However, beyond this assertion, no detailed evidence to corroborate the alternative measurement has been provided to counter the measurements shown on the additional plans which the appellant submitted during the planning application. I am also not persuaded that an extended dropped kerb would raise the potential for parking on a wider basis across the frontage of the site, and any more so than that which might occur from the existing dropped kerb arrangement.
16. For the reasons outlined above the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety. The proposal would neither conflict with Policy TR5 of the LP which seeks proposals that comply with the standards of the relevant highway authority, nor conflict with Buckinghamshire Council Highways Development Management Guidance document (2018) which states that developments must provide safe and suitable access for all members of the community.
17. The Council have also mentioned conflict with The Buckinghamshire Council Local Transport Plan 4 (2016). However, I find this document to principally deal with strategic matters in nature, and it has therefore not been decisive in my findings.

Conditions

18. I have imposed the standard time condition, a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty and a condition to ensure that external finishing materials of the extensions match those of the existing dwelling in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions as listed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR