



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/19/3240238

33 Poppy Avenue, Broughton, Milton Keynes MK10 7AT

- 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 Vadodaria against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02020/FUL, dated 7 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with particular regard to outlook, and parking.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms a detached dwelling that is located within a residential estate. The property shares part of a double garage which is set back so that parking areas for the host property, and its neighbour at 35 Poppy Avenue, are provided between and to the side of the dwellings. The area is generally suburban in character with dwellings arranged in a linear manner along the estate roads. Although the area contains a variety in style and size of dwellings, the use of complementary materials gives the area a pleasant open and spacious character which is reinforced by the layout of dwellings in the area.
4. The proposal seeks to erect a two storey extension to the side of the property, providing a carport at ground floor level with a bedroom over at first floor level. The development would extend to the boundary with the neighbour at No. 35, and although a carport would be provided at ground floor level, the extension proposes a solid wall over the two floors along its shared boundary.
5. The appeal site occupies a prominent position within the estate, being on a corner plot and opposite an area of open space. Although it is proposed to set the extension back from the main elevation, the eaves and ridgeline would follow the existing building and, coupled with its overall width, would result in a very large mass of development on the plot. While parking spaces would still be provided, the scale of the development would also result in a loss of openness between the host property and No. 35, which in this prominent

location, would give the building a somewhat cramped appearance when compared to other properties in the vicinity, including that at No. 35. This would give the development a contrived and incongruous appearance that would erode the open and spacious character of the area.

6. In addition, the Milton Keynes Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (the Parking SPD) requires that carport spaces are required to be open on two faces and have minimum internal dimensions of 3.0m x 5.0m per space. While I acknowledge that the overall length of the parking area provided does not change as a result of the development, this would include an area of the drive to the front of the carport and part of the internal circulation area to its rear.
7. While the internal area of the carport would exceed 3.0m, the entrance and rear element would have a width of some 2.5m. This would be below the 3.0m as envisaged by the Parking SPD and although two cars may be able to park on the site, the restricted width of the carport could result in vehicles overhanging its entrance which in turn could impact on the ability of vehicles to open doors, or make it impractical or undesirable to use the parking area provided. In the absence of a parking plan to demonstrate how vehicles would park on the site with the restricted width, I find the carport to be unacceptable which could result in vehicles parking on the street.
8. Thus, the development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area and fail to provide adequate on-site parking. It would be in conflict with Policies D1, D2 and D3 of the Milton Keynes Council Plan:MK 2016-2031 (the Plan), the Milton Keynes Council New Residential Development Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the Parking SPD which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that buildings are of an appropriate scale, exhibit a positive character that responds appropriately to the site and surrounding context and provide appropriate parking areas.
9. Turning to the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the adjoining occupier, there are examples throughout the estate where properties, which although they do not occupy such a prominent position as the appeal site, nonetheless have a single drive between them. Therefore, while I have found that the overall scale of the development would harm the character and appearance of the area, the impact of a development on living conditions is quite a different issue and I am not persuaded that the extension would lead to an overbearing development that would erode the outlook from the side windows of No. 35. Thus, the development would not be in conflict with Policy D5 of the Plan which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that a development is not overbearing upon existing buildings.

Conclusion

10. While I have found that the development would not result in material harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, I have found that it would harm the character and appearance of the area and fail to provide adequate parking spaces. Thus, for the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR