



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2020

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/20/3258790

48 Garwood Crescent, Grange Farm, Milton Keynes, MK8 0PS

- 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 Agboola Ogundeyin against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01464/FUL, dated 18 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above the existing garage conversion and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - whether the accommodation would form an integral part of the existing dwellinghouse.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located within a primarily residential area. The dwelling is positioned at an angle to the road, though it is set back slightly from its frontage. There is a driveway to the side of the dwelling and a converted garage, linked to the main dwelling via a narrow flat roof extension.
4. There are a mix of designs and dwelling sizes in the surrounding area, though there is regularity in the street scene which comes from the consistency in dwelling heights and regular spacing between buildings, with many properties having detached single storey garages to the side or rear.
5. The appeal site is reflective of this, though due to the angled positioning of the dwelling, the gap to the side is larger than average to the frontage but tapers to the rear, leaving limited separation between the existing dwelling, converted garage and neighbouring property. Nevertheless, the site does still retain an overall spacious and open character, which provides relief between the built

- form, particularly at first floor level, and contributes positively to the character of the surrounding area.
6. The appeal scheme comprises a single storey extension to the rear, and first-floor extension above the converted garage and single storey link extension. The eaves height of the first-floor extension would continue through from the existing property, with a pitched roof with gable end to the frontage above the converted garage.
 7. Although gables are characteristic of the surrounding area, that proposed as part of the appeal scheme would be noticeably narrower than others in the vicinity. The roof arrangement to the link section would further add to the incongruity of the proposed extension, and overall due to its size, design and angled relationship to the main dwelling, the first-floor extension would result in an awkward arrangement that would not respond well to the style and design of the host property.
 8. Although set back from the front boundary there would be limited separation to the side boundary, and considering its overall size and design, the first-floor extension would erode the gap and have an undue terracing effect that would harm the current open and spacious character of the site.
 9. The Council have raised no concerns with regards to the single storey rear extension and I see no reason to disagree. However, from the details before me, it is not clear that this element would be severable from the remainder of the proposal, or that in isolation it would maintain an acceptable appearance from the frontage, due to the proposed roof arrangement.
 10. As detailed above, the proposed first floor extension would not relate well to the existing dwelling and visually it would appear as a separate unit. This in turn would emphasise its narrow width and would exacerbate its incongruity within the street scene to such an extent that I consider it would result in unacceptable harm to the host property and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 11. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies D1, D2, and D3 of the Milton Keynes Plan: MK 2016-2031, adopted 2019 (LP) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design, with the proposed scale and design relating well to the existing building and plot and not detracting from the character of the existing building or surrounding area.
 12. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would provide for additional living accommodation for the appellant to meet their needs, and I have attached some weight to this. However, I have no detailed information on this matter or to demonstrate that the appeal scheme is the only way to address this. Therefore, in this case, I do not find that this would outweigh the harm I have identified.

Living accommodation

13. The proposal would include the provision of an additional staircase within the property adjacent to a secondary point of access from the frontage. However, from the details before me the staircase would be accessible from and integral to the existing property, extending slightly into the existing kitchen area.

14. I note the Council's concern that an independent unit of accommodation could be created, though this could be addressed by condition and therefore, with regard to this main issue I do not find any conflict with LP Policy D6 which seeks to ensure that annexes are designed in such a way that they can function as an integrated part of the main dwelling.
15. Whilst I have not found harm in this regard this does not address the harm to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area that I have detailed above.

Other Matter

16. The appellant has stated that there are other similar developments in the area though no further details have been provided. I saw on my site visit that some properties have detached garages though I did not see anything similar to the appeal scheme. This other matter does not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

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

A Denby

INSPECTOR