

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/16/3162331

61 Western Road, Bletchley, Milton Keynes, MK2 2PR.

- 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 Scott Walker against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01963/FUL dated 14 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side extension. The ground floor of which is proposed as a carport, the first floor is habitable space accessed from the original dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. The second main issue is the effect of the scheme on the living conditions of the occupiers of 59 Western Road (No.59), with particular regard to visual impact, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Appeal site is located within a mixed residential area which is primarily characterised by uniformly designed Victorian terraces and symmetrical semi-detached dwellings, interspersed with detached houses and modern bungalows. Whilst the older semi-detached dwellings typically have gable roofs to the sides, the more modern pairs of semi-detached dwellings have hipped roofs.
 4. The Appeal property comprises one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings that were originally constructed with fully hipped roofs. The Appeal dwelling has a hip to gable extension which has visually unbalanced the roof of the pair of dwellings. Notwithstanding this below roof level the dwellings remain symmetrical and contribute to the sense of uniformity within the street scene.
 5. Together policies D2 and D2A (i) of the Milton Keynes Local Plan (Local Plan) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), seek to ensure that new development adds to the quality of the area. Development should reflect the
-

identity of local surroundings and should be in scale with other buildings in the immediate vicinity in terms of height and massing.

6. To the west of the Appeal site is a narrow plot which is occupied by narrow bungalow which is modest in height and has a fully hipped roof. This bungalow adjoins the boundary with 57 Western Road (No.57) and there is a small gap between the east side of the bungalow and the Appeal property. The gaps between the dwelling at No.59, the Appeal dwelling and their side boundaries help ensure that the bungalow between them does not appear visually cramped within the street scene.
7. The proposed extension would project up to the side boundary of the Appeal site, resulting in a narrow gap between the Appeal dwelling and the adjacent bungalow. At the same time the proposed extension would be materially higher than the bungalow. As a consequence the resultant dwelling would visually overpower the bungalow and the relationship between the two dwellings would appear cramped when viewed from the street scene.
8. The situation would be exacerbated by the design of the roof of the proposed extension which would fail to respect either the gable roof of the host dwelling, or the hipped roof of the attached dwelling. In addition, the design and proportions of the proposed first floor window on the front elevation would fail to respect the existing fenestration. As a result of these factors the proposed extension would appear contrived and awkward and would seriously harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the pair dwellings.
9. This harm would outweigh the benefits for the Appellant and his family which would result from the additional accommodation and is not something that could be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions.
11. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. It would therefore conflict with policies D2 and D2A(i) of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Living conditions

12. With the proposal the side flank wall of the extension would project close up to a large habitable room window in the side elevation of the bungalow at No.59. As a consequence the proposed extension would totally dominate the outlook from the room served by this window, as well as resulting in a material loss of daylight and sunlight.
13. The proposed extension would also project close to other side facing windows at No.59, which would be located a short distance to the rear of the extension. Having regard to the fact that the extension would be located to the southeast it would result in varying degrees of loss of daylight/sunlight within the rooms served by the windows.
14. As a result of these factors the proposed extension would be visually overbearing and would result in a material loss of daylight and sunlight for the occupiers of No.59.
15. Some weight is given to the fact that the occupier of No.59 has not raised any objections to the proposed scheme. However, it is necessary to assess the

proposal on its planning merits and to take into account the impact the proposal would have on existing and future occupiers of No.59. In this instance the harm that would be caused to the living conditions of the current and future occupiers of No.59 would be significant.

16. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.59 due to its overbearing visual impact and loss of daylight/sunlight. It would therefore conflict with policy D1(iii) of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure that new development does not unacceptably harm the living conditions of existing residents.

Conclusion

17. The conclusions on both main issues amount to compelling reasons for dismissing this Appeal.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR