



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/23/3315053

Halcyon, 32 Linceslade Grove, Loughton, Milton Keynes MK5 8DT

- 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 and Mrs Sukhnandan against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01445/HOU, dated 30 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension with an open porch canopy to the front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The properties along Linceslade Grove are typically substantial, but fairly varied in terms of their form and style. That said, the host forms part of a small group on this side of the road from No 26 to No 34 which share similar design characteristics. They have principal two storey sections which are set well back from the road, but with subordinate single storey front projections, many of which are shared with the neighbouring property, and which are finished with masonry and pantiles to match the main house. These characteristics give this group a rhythm, and a sense of cohesion and balance, in the streetscene.
4. The proposal would include a long first floor extension above the host's single storey front projection, which would have a similar eaves height, and a very slightly lower ridge line, compared to the principal part of the house. The scheme would thus bring the host's first floor much closer to the road compared to the other houses in this group, including its neighbours either side.
5. Consequently, whilst the scheme would be appropriately finished in matching materials and with sympathetic fenestration, the resultant property's forward projecting bulk and mass would be markedly at odds with the form, layout and proportions of the other houses in this group. It would also cause an awkward juxtaposition with the attached single storey front projection at No 30.

6. I have considered the appellants' analysis of the area's character at Section 2 and Appendix A of their statement of case. In particular, I observed on my visit the nearby properties at 57 Lincslade Grove and at 1 Edy Court, both of which have prominent two storey elements close to the road.
7. However, those properties are on corner plots on the opposite side of this section of Lincslade Grove, and where the two storey parts of the houses are typically closer to the highway than on its eastern side. Additionally, given the varied style of the houses there, those buildings are not seen in the context of a small cohesive group to the same extent as the appeal property.
8. For the above reasons, notwithstanding the tree-lined road and other landscaped screening, the scheme at this height would appear prominent in the streetscene. Viewed in isolation it would not be harmful to the host property, but it would disrupt the harmonious layout and form of this small group. That harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area would be significant.
9. The scheme would therefore fail to comply with Policies D1, D2 and D3 of Plan: MK 2016-2031 (2019). Amongst other things, and in general terms, these state that development will be permitted if it responds appropriately to the site and its context, including buildings in the immediate vicinity, having regard to matters such as layout, height, massing and scale.
10. In its favour, the scheme would provide additional living space for the appellants, broadly in line with the approach in the Milton Keynes New Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which promotes sustainable communities, with buildings which can be extended over time to meet different needs.
11. Whilst I have had regard to the site's planning history, I have considered the scheme before me on its planning merits. Its modest benefit does not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the area. The scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR