



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/23/3314278

43 Far Holme, Middleton, Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire MK10 9RS

- 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 Trevor Maguire against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01898/HOU, dated 26 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey rear/side extension including two dormer windows, rear dormer window and a new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For reasons of clarity, the description of development has been adopted from the Decision Notice and Appeal Form.

Main Issues

3. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 41 Far Holme.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey dwelling, with the second storey accommodation contained within the roofspace. It has external materials of black weatherboarded walls and a slate roof. The property is located within a triangular shaped plot on the periphery of a housing area which contains a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying designs and external materials, a traditionally constructed 2-storey farmhouse and a complex of farm buildings converted to domestic use. To the west of the property is an area of parkland and there are footways adjacent to the eastern and northern boundaries of the property.
5. From what was observed, the dwellings within the surrounding area have mainly rectangular footprints albeit some have been altered by additions. The proposed development includes the erection of an extension with the same eaves and ridge height as the host property. Further, the external material would match those of the existing property.

6. By reason of the shape of the plot, the proposed extension would have an orientation whereby a flank wall would be sited parallel to 41 Far Holme rather than project either at right angles from the property's rear wall (similar to the existing single storey element) or continuing the rectangular form sideways from the main part of the dwelling. However, the siting of the flank wall would retain a gap between the proposed extension and the shared boundary with No. 41 which would be similar in size to other gaps within the surrounding residential development.
7. When viewed from the road and the adjacent footways the property sits very much in its own plot. Although the form of the proposed extension would be unusual, the resulting property would not materially detract from the character and appearance of either the surrounding residential area or the adjacent parkland. No concerns associated with the setting of the near-by Conservation Area have been raised by the Council and there are no reasons to disagree with this assessment. There would not be a conflict with Policy D1 of Plan:MK because the appeal scheme would not have a materially harmful impact on the locality.
8. However, rather than being a subservient addition, the scale of the proposed extension would be significant and would physically and visually dominate the host property despite the resulting footprint covering only 31% of the plot. The proposed extension would not be set down below the ridge height of the host property to create a visual and physical sense of subservience. Further, the design of the hipped roof of the proposed extension and the dormer windows at eaves level would not respect the existing character and appearance of the host property. This unacceptable harm would not be mitigated by the use of matching external materials.
9. Although the form of the appeal scheme would be acceptable and there would not be material harm caused to the surrounding area, these matters are demonstrably outweighed by the scale and design of the proposed extension and its adverse impact upon the character and appearance host property. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with Policy D2 of Plan:MK. Amongst other matters, this policy requires that the scale of proposed extension to existing buildings does not detract from the character of the original building. Policy D3 of Plan:MK does not appear to be of relevance to the proposed development because it concerns canal side development.

Living Conditions

10. As noted, a flank wall of the proposed extension would be sited adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 41. At the rear of this property is a single storey ground floor addition where the elevation is predominantly glazed with an outlook towards the garden. Adjacent to the rear of No. 41 is a large area of decking. According to the Council, the proposed extension's flank wall would project about 6 metres beyond the rear elevation of No. 41.
11. By reason of the appeal property being located to the north of No. 41, it is unlikely that there would be material reductions in levels of daylight and sunlight reaching the rear windows and decking area of this neighbouring dwelling. However, the siting and height of the proposed extension would represent a visually dominant and overbearing form of built development within

the outlook of the occupiers of No. 41, whether from the ground floor windows or the area of decking. The visual dominance of the extension would be accentuated by the dark external materials proposed which would match those of the property.

12. On this matter it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 41 Far Holme because of their outlook and, as such, it would conflict with Policy D1 of Plan:MK which requires development not to have an unacceptable visual intrusion. Policy D5 of Plan:MK refers to renewable energy and is not of direct relevance to this main issue.
13. Accordingly, and for the reasons given, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR