
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2021

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/21/3276410

12 Shepperton Close, Castlethorpe MK19 7HR

- 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 Miss Rose Kelly against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00016/FUL, dated 5 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is 3m single storey rear extensions and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 3m single storey rear extensions and garage conversion at 12 Shepperton Close, Castlethorpe MK19 7HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00016/FUL, dated 5 January 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 04 Rev D Proposed Plans & Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal form and Council's decision notice, save the omission of reference to resubmission of an earlier planning application (20/02875/FUL). This differs from the description contained in planning application form, but I consider that the Council's description more accurately reflects the proposal before me.
3. The Council's reason for refusal relates only to the proposed rear extension to the garage. The rear extension to the dwellinghouse and the garage conversion are not a point of contention between the parties, and I have no reason to disagree. These proposals have not therefore been determinative in considering this appeal
4. Since the appeal was submitted, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on in July 2021. In my opinion, the revised document does not materially alter the policy context in

relation to the main issue and, in reaching my decision, it was not necessary to seek comments from the main parties.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed flat roof rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwellinghouse and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. No.12 Shepperton Close (No.12) is a two-storey linked detached dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Shepperton Close. Shepperton Close is within Character Area 2 of the made Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (September 2017) (CNP). The CNP observes that Shepperton Close has a consistency of design and materials and I saw this on my site visit. The cul-de-sac is typically characterised by attractive detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellinghouses finished in redbrick with traditional pitched roofs, short chimney stacks, ground floor front bays and white windows and porch details.
7. The original application plans showed the garage door of No.12 to be replaced with a separate door and window and the centrally located chimney stack removed. The amended plans, however, retain these original features and consequently the proposals would not result in any discernible change to the appearance of the host dwellinghouse when viewed from Shepperton Close. The consistency in design and materials that is a defining and important characteristic of Shepperton Close will therefore remain.
8. To the rear, it is proposed to extend at ground floor by 3m from the original rear elevation and its attached garage. The extension to the garage would be offset from the party boundary with its linked attached neighbour at No.14 Shepperton Close (No.14) and would have a flat parapet roof with stone coping. Its total height would be around 3m with the flat roof set above the eaves of the existing pitched roof of the garage.
9. Policy 3 of the CNP requires roof pitches within Character Area 2 to range between 35 to 45 degrees. The proposed flat roofed extension to the garage would clearly conflict with this part of the policy. However, the proposed extension is to the rear of the dwellinghouse which is less sensitive to change and would not be visible at all from the public realm of Shepperton Close. It would also not be visible from the single-track that runs to the rear of the dwelling because of a change in levels and the existing concrete and timber boarded boundary fencing. The scale of the flat roof is modest and although the parapet would be above the height of the eaves of the existing roof, the pitched form of the original garage would still be legible.
10. Further, whilst pitched roofs are a defining characteristic of the dwellinghouses on Shepperton Close, there are examples of garages with flat roofs as you enter Shepperton Close that are set back within rear gardens but are nonetheless visible from the public realm.
11. The garage extension is described in Section 5 of the planning application form as being of a brick finish with white UPVc windows. These materials would be similar in colour and texture to the existing and although the materials for the proposed double doors are not described, the detail of these can be controlled through a planning condition.

12. Consequently, I do not find that the proposed extension to the garage would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwellinghouse or wider surrounding area. It would accord with CNP Policy 3 because the scale, design, height and materials reflect the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding buildings. It further accords with the design guidance in the Framework and Policy D3 of the Plan:MK 2016-2030 (March 2019) in so far as it requires the scale and design of extensions to relate well to the existing building and to not detract from the character of the area.

Other Matters

13. I note that there have been a number of objections from third parties in respect of both the design of the proposed extension and its use. I have dealt with design under the Main Issue above. The appeal before me is only a householder extension and not for the use of the garage as a separate dwellinghouse or commercial gym. The concerns associated with these uses, including noise and disturbance, traffic generation and parking, therefore fall outside the scope of my consideration here.
14. The appeal property is set forward of its neighbour at No.10 Shepperton Close (No.10) and therefore the proposed rear extension would not extend much beyond the rear building line of the garage of No.10 which is set on the party boundary. The garage would be extended to the rear by around 3m beyond the attached garage of No.14, offset only slightly from the boundary. The depth and height of the extension (both around 3m) are however modest and the attached garage of No.14 sits between the extension and the main part of the dwellinghouse. I am therefore satisfied that the extension would not cause material harm to the living conditions of No.10 or No.14 Shepperton Close through either loss of daylight/sunlight or loss of outlook.

Conditions and conclusion

15. The standard time limit and a condition specifying the approved plans are required to provide certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also necessary requiring external materials of the proposed extensions, including the windows and doors, to match the existing dwellinghouse.
16. For the reasons give above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions above.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR