
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/19/3239007

6 Thames Close, Bletchley, Milton Keynes MK3 7BW

- 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 Cooper against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02096/FUL, dated 13 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is brick cavity built porch to include extension to the lounge to the front elevation of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on parking conditions, and consequently highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace dwelling with a parking space provided within the frontage of the site. Parking provision within Thames Close is a mixture of on plot parking, communal parking areas and garages.
4. Thames Close comprises a combination of dwellings and flats and a number of the dwellings benefit from one off road parking space. Within the Close there is a lay-by providing 3 parking spaces and two small parking courts which the appellant advises provides a total of 15 spaces. However, the parking spaces provided within the larger parking court appear to have been reduced as a result of the access to the on-plot parking space at 1 Thames Close.
5. Policy CT10 of the Milton Keynes Council Plan:MK 2016-2031 (2019) (LP) requires development to meet the Council's full parking standards and that on-site parking should not be reduced, if this would result in additional pressure in off-site parking.
6. The appeal site is located within Accessibility Zone 3, where the Milton Keynes Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) requires 2+ bedroom dwellings to have two parking spaces. However, the current dwelling falls below this standard as it currently only has one parking space. This is similar to the other dwellings within Thames Close, with dwellings either

- having a single parking space or relying on the communal parking spaces provided within the Close.
7. The proposed porch would be constructed along the full width of the dwelling and reduce the amount of space available for the parking of a vehicle. The appellant has indicated that if the extension were to be constructed it would still be possible to park a vehicle at an angle without it protruding onto the pathway. However I have not been provided with a plan to demonstrate that this is achievable and I note that the size of the space would be below the required standard.
 8. Whilst the appellant has applied to rent a garage from the block opposite, there is no certainty that one will become available and I am unable to control the retention of this parking provision as it would not be within the appellant's ownership. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on the basis that the porch would result in the loss of off-street parking and therefore the dwelling would be reliant on the parking provision provided within Thames Close.
 9. The parking provision within Thames Close is already significantly below the standards set out within the SPD and therefore I consider that the parking spaces within the communal area would be in demand in order to meet the needs of the occupiers of the Close. Whilst the appellant has indicated that there are often spaces available within the communal areas, I have not been provided with any evidence to demonstrate that this is the case.
 10. The proposed porch extension would result in the loss of the off-road parking space for 6 Thames Close and therefore increase demand for the parking provided within the parking court. Increased parking demand in instances of limited supply may lead to additional congestion as drivers seek parking spaces, or park illegally, which would be detrimental to highway safety. There is no evidence to suggest that such circumstances could be avoided by the appeal proposal.
 11. I have taken into account that there are other similar extensions within Thames Close, which appear to have retained a parking space as part of the development. However, I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. In this case I can not be certain that parking provision would be retained as a result of the extension.
 12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would lead to a detrimental effect on parking conditions, and consequently highway safety, and would conflict with policy CT10 of the LP and the SPD, which sets out the need for developments to meet parking standards. The loss of parking would lead to inappropriate parking within the vicinity of the site harmful to highway safety.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR