



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2019

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/19/3232348

2 Quilter Meadow, Old Farm Park, Milton Keynes MK7 8QD

- 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 M O'Reilly against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00805/FUL, dated 26 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'the erection of a new two storey extension adjacent to the existing double garage which will provide an additional garage space and increase the size of the bedroom at first floor. The works also include the removal of the existing western boundary fence and rebuilding a new brick boundary wall approximately 500mm from the site boundary in order to provide pedestrian access to the rear garden amenity'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The houses in Quilter Meadow are generally on fairly spacious plots, and typically set amongst landscaping, which softens their appearance in the streetscene. The layout and siting of the dwellings is fairly varied, such that there is no prevailing building line. However, I observed that most are set well back from the highway, although a few have sections which project much closer to it.
4. The appeal property is a substantial detached house, which is prominently located on a corner plot. It has an existing two storey front extension. The scheme would involve a further two storey front extension, which would bring the house closer to the highway. Whilst its form, materials and appearance would reflect the design of the existing extension, having regard to cumulative impacts, this bulk of development in this location would give the property a very elongated and dominant front projection.
5. Consequently, although the proposal would have a lower height than the main part of the house, considered in combination with previous development, the

scheme would appear rather out of proportion, and not entirely subservient to it.

6. Additionally, the scheme's gable would be located close to the edge of the highway. Whilst a narrow band of landscaping could be provided between it and the pavement, and notwithstanding other trees and hedgerows in the vicinity, the development would appear prominent in the streetscene. That would be particularly the case in the context of the generally greater set back of the dwellings when looking along Quilter Meadow from the west and from the east. It would therefore be at odds with the generally more spacious setting and the less dominant appearance of most other buildings in the area.
7. The garage close to the highway edge at 16 Quilter Meadow is a single storey structure at the end of a cul-de-sac. It is therefore far less dominant compared to this two storey scheme. With regards 18 Quilter Meadow there are similarities between this scheme and that property's two storey gabled extension which is sited close to the highway. However, that development is not typical of the area, and that site is somewhat less prominent than this corner plot.
8. Amongst other things, and in general terms, Policies D1, D2 and D5 of Plan:MK 2016 - 2031 (2019) ('MKP') state that proposals will be permitted if they respond appropriately to the site and the surrounding context, having regard to matters such as layout, massing, scale, and the impact on the streetscene. More specifically, MKP Policy D3 sets out that the scale and design of extensions shall relate well to the existing building and the plot, and shall not detract from their character, and from that of the surrounding area.
9. For the above reasons, the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would not therefore accord with those policies. I note that the Parish Council raised no comments on the scheme. However, having considered it on its merits, I have found that it would conflict with the development plan. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR