



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by D J Barnes MBA BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/25/3365626

106 Whalley Drive, Bletchley, Milton Keynes MK3 6HU

- 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 Mr and Mrs Davies against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application Ref is PLN/2025/0506.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single storey and part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living standards for the future occupiers of a bedroom.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling situated within a primarily residential area. Along Whalley Drive there are gaps of varying widths between each detached dwelling dependent upon whether there are garages between the properties. Such a gap exists between the property and 108 Whalley Drive.
4. Within the side elevation of the property at first floor level is a window which serves a bedroom albeit this room also has a larger front window. Accordingly, this side opening is more of a secondary window. Within the flank wall of No. 108 are several openings, including what is identified in the evidence as a primary window serving a bedroom at first floor level. The relationship between these bedroom windows means that there is some intervisibility potentially resulting in some overlooking and associated loss of privacy for the occupiers of each property.
5. The proposed development includes a rear extension which would also remove the existing secondary bedroom window but, because of internal reconfiguration, the erection of another first floor opening within the flank wall. This proposed opening would be the only window serving a bedroom. The appellants have proposed that, to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy for the occupiers of No. 108, this proposed window would be obscurely glazed.
6. Although serving a bedroom which would normally be used at night time, being a habitable room it would be available for use at other times, including during the daytime. There is a reasonable expectation that the occupiers of the bedroom

should be able to have an outlook from the window and be able to open a window sufficiently to enable natural ventilation without compromising the privacy of the occupiers of a neighbouring property. As identified by the council, the absence of a clear glazed window with a satisfactory outlook would also result in a degree of enclosure for the occupiers of the bedroom. For these reasons, the future occupiers of the bedroom would not have satisfactory living standards.

7. An obscurely glazed window could affect levels of sun and daylight reaching the internal space of the bedroom. However, but this matter would not be a reason for the appeal to fail in circumstances where unsatisfactory living standards for the future occupiers of the bedroom have already been identified.
8. Whether rooflights could be erected to serve the bedroom is not a matter for consideration as part of this appeal because such a proposal does not form part of the proposed development. The existing and proposed outlook from other habitable rooms within the property does not obviate the need for a satisfactory outlook from the bedroom.
9. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would fail to provide satisfactory living standards for the future occupiers of a bedroom and, as such, it would conflict with Policy D4 of the Plan:MK 2016-2031. Amongst other matters, this policy refers to all proposals being required to create and protect a good standard of amenity for buildings, in particular ensuring satisfactory outlook and visual amenity from within buildings. There would also be a conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which refers to there being a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
10. Policy D2 of the West Bletchley Neighbourhood Development Plan does not specifically address living standards and, as such, is not of direct relevance to the determination of this appeal but this does not change the judgement which has been reached.

Other Matters

11. There would be a benefit to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 108 associated with the removal of the existing secondary bedroom window and the erection of the proposed obscurely glazed window in the flank wall. However, this would be at the expense of not providing satisfactory living standards for the occupiers of the bedroom. This matter is, therefore, given limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
12. The appellants have identified a family need for the proposed development but the failure to provide satisfactory living standards for the future occupiers of a bedroom significantly and demonstrably outweighs this claimed need. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR