



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2025

by **Julian Shirley DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/25/3361280

22 Christian Court, Willen, Milton Keynes MK15 9HX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ricky Tester against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01710/HOU
 - The development proposed is described as “the demolition of existing garage to side, erection of new two storey side extension and alterations to front and rear elevations.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form does not include reference to the raised ridge height and alterations to the roof of the dwelling. The Council revised the description of development to include these elements. The raised ridge height and roof alterations are clearly shown on the plans before me. Therefore, I consider the development to be as described in the decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached dwelling with a front and rear garden and an adjoining side garage. The property appears to have previously been extended. A pedestrian footpath with established planting runs adjacent to the site boundary between the garage and a detached dwelling at 23 Christian Court.
5. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey houses of a similar age and similar styles in Christian Court. Many properties, with the exception of the appeal property, generally appear to be in their original planned form, with limited alterations visible.
6. Properties in the surrounding area with adjoining garages break up the street scene between dwellings which contributes positively to its reasonably spacious residential character. Although the appeal property is located towards the corner of the cul-de-sac and is separated by its neighbouring dwellings, the adjoining garage

continues the rhythm of the spaces and built form between the dwellings elsewhere in Christian Court.

7. The proposed development would substantially extend the existing dwelling, demolishing the existing garage and replacing it with a two-storey side extension, together with front and rear alterations and an increase in height of the gable roof.
8. The two-storey extension would increase the height of the side extension of the property adjacent to the site boundary. Notwithstanding the adjacent existing planting, the extension would be very readily apparent from the public domain such that it would have a significant influence on the street scene.
9. Furthermore, as a result of the over dominance of the extension to the original building, it would have an adverse effect on the visual relationship with the adjacent dwelling at 23 Christian Court. It would significantly unbalance and narrow the visual gap between the two dwellings and result in an overbearing feature adjacent to the public footpath.
10. The proposal would form a continuous hard boundary of approximately 9m in length and 6m in height close to the footpath. Whilst the existing planting alongside the footpath would provide some visual relief against this elevation, the planting is outside of the site boundary. Therefore, the planting is outside of the ownership of the appellant and so the degree of screening this would provide to the side elevation is uncertain.
11. Notwithstanding the proposed materials would closely match those of the host building, the mass, scale and height of the extension would not be sufficiently subservient to the host building. It would appear as a somewhat dominant and harmful addition that would fail to be subordinate to the host dwelling.
12. I therefore find the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Policies D1-D3 and D5 of Plan:MK, Policy 1 of the Campbell Park Neighbourhood Development Plan and the New Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. These require, amongst other matters, that proposals respond appropriately to the site and surrounding context; the massing/scale and appearance of buildings exhibit a positive character, that extensions relate well to the existing building and do not detract from the character of the building and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

13. The appeal property was extended in 2015 and as such it does not mirror the neighbouring dwelling at 23 Christian Court. Whilst it is noted that the appeal property appears to have been extended previously, the appeal proposal has been determined on the basis of its effect on the existing host property and the surrounding area.
14. The appellant refers to developments within Willen and nearby dwellings where it is claimed much larger extensions have taken place. However, no directly specific comparable sites to which this might apply have been put forward and I have not been provided with the details of these cases. In the case of the property at 42 Portland Drive, based on my site visit, it is not clear what was altered or what factors were taken into account by the decision maker in that particular case. As

such, I am unable to draw any direct comparisons with the appeal scheme before me.

15. The appellant also draws attention to other larger houses in the vicinity of the appeal site at 11-16 Christian Court. However, the appeal proposal has been determined on its individual merits and site-specific circumstances, with regard to the evidence before me.
16. I note the appellant's desire to secure additional living space for the appellant's family. However, it has not been demonstrated that this could not be achieved in a more sympathetic manner, or that other alternative solutions are not available to meet the appellant's accommodation requirements. Therefore, I do not consider that there is sufficient justification to outweigh the harm I have identified from the proposal.
17. The Council concluded that the proposal would not result in harmful living conditions to neighbouring occupiers and based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree. In addition, it is noted that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of car parking provision. However, compliance with such policies would be a neutral matter in the balance and does not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Julian Shirley

INSPECTOR