
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/19/3238945

35 Chipping Vale, Emerson Valley, Milton Keynes MK4 2JW

- 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 Ogunneye against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01848/FUL, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is garage extension and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on parking conditions, and consequently highway safety and on the character and appearance of the area

Reasons

Highway Safety

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached dwelling with an integral garage. The dwelling is located on a corner plot with two parking spaces, each accessed from separate driveways to the east and west of the site.
4. 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.
5. 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. The SPD states that garages are not considered as parking spaces for the purposes of the standards required and therefore the site currently benefits from 2 parking spaces.
6. The proposal includes the conversion of the existing garage to living accommodation and the erection of a single storey side extension to provide a garage. As the existing garage is not considered by the SPD to contribute to the existing parking provision its loss has a neutral impact.
7. The proposed garage would be constructed to the side 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 to the side of the dwelling. However, I have not been provided with a plan to demonstrate that this is achievable, and I am therefore not convinced it would be possible to provide a space which would meet the required parking space standards. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on the basis that the proposed development would benefit from one off road parking space.

8. The proposed extension would result in the loss of an off-road parking space for 35 Chipping Vale and therefore increase demand for parking on the street. Due to the number of dropped kerbs within Chipping Vale, opportunities for off-street parking are limited.
9. Whilst it has been put to me that the area is only lightly trafficked, with low traffic speeds, there is insufficient evidence before me to demonstrate that this is the case. However, even if I were to accept this was the case it would not overcome my concerns that a lack of appropriate parking would be detrimental to highway safety. 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.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a potentially harmful impact on highway safety, and would conflict with policy CT10 of the LP and the SPD, which set out the need for developments to meet parking standards. The lack of appropriate parking would lead to inappropriate parking within the vicinity of the site harmful to highway safety.

Character and appearance

11. 35 Chipping Vale is a two storey detached dwelling with an attached garage. The estate is characterised by detached two storey dwellings of differing designs and styles, which results in an organic form of development with each dwelling being sited in a slightly different position to the road. As such, the group of dwellings are not uniform or symmetrical, and this contributes to the overall variety of the street scene.
12. The proposed extension would be located to the side of the dwelling, in line with the front wall of the host dwelling, but would have a lower roofline. In these ways the proposal would be subservient to the host property. Furthermore, the proposed roof form and use of matching materials, which could be secured by condition, would be in keeping with the host dwelling. Overall, I find that the development would be a sympathetic and proportionate addition that would not detract from the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling.
13. The proposed extension would extend approximately 4.5m towards the side boundary. It would be visible in views along Chipping Vale, particularly as the side wall of the house is exposed and visible from within the street scene. Whilst there is a varied street scene within Chipping Vale, the existing garages are generally set back from the front elevation by some distance.
14. The siting of the proposed garage in line with the front elevation of the main dwelling would be an incongruous feature and would result in a loss of openness between 35 and 37 Chipping Vale. Although the massing of the

garage would be mitigated in part by the tapered design of the extension this would not lessen its prominence.

15. The built form of the garage, due to its position in line with the existing dwelling in combination with the exposed side elevation, as a result of the configuration of the dwellings within the street scene would introduce an incongruous and dominant form of development which would be detrimental to the overall character and appearance of the area.
16. In conclusion the proposal would cause an unacceptable degree of harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with policies D2 and D3 of the LP which seek to ensure development is high quality and does not detract from the character of an area.

Conclusion

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

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR