



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **P Barton BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/W/25/3364509**

**26 Radstock Crescent, Broughton, Milton Keynes MK10 9NE**

- 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 Tafadzwa Manonge of Smile on Faces against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01729/COU.
  - The development proposed is change of use of the existing C3 dwelling house to Class C2, for provision of residential accommodation and care for a maximum of two children aged 11 to 16.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of the existing C3 dwelling house to Class C2, for provision of residential accommodation and care for a maximum of two children aged 11 to 16, at 26 Radstock Crescent, Broughton, Milton Keynes MK10 9NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01729/COU, dated 5 February 2025, 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 drawing number A101 Existing and Proposed Floor Plans.
  - 3) No more than two children shall reside at the property at any one time.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development during the consideration of the application to read "*Change of use of the existing C3 dwelling house to Class C2, for provision of residential accommodation and care for a maximum of two children aged 11 to 16*". As this is a more concise description of the proposal and removes superfluous text from that set out in the application form, I have used it in the banner header above and in my formal decision.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of parking.

### Reasons

4. 26 Radstock Crescent is a 3-storey, 4-bedroom semi-detached house located within a modern development that has unallocated on-street parking bays accommodated within its layout. Whilst my site visit is only a snapshot in time, I

observed capacity for on-street parking within these parking bays on Radstock Crescent as well as on surrounding streets. A local centre was a short distance from the appeal property, with 30-minute time restricted parking, and contained a cycle hire station. Bus stops positioned along Tongwell Street were also nearby. I noticed some on-street parking that did not utilise purpose-built parking bays as well as some limited double parking. However, vehicular movements were light and the parking I observed did not impede upon the free flow of traffic.

5. The proposal would provide a care home for up to 2 children and whilst details of staffing levels are limited, the application form refers to a total of 3 full-time equivalent employees. Whilst the number of staff on the site at any given time would depend on the needs of the individual children, on the basis of the evidence before me it appears unlikely that there would be more than 2 or 3 staff present at any one time.
6. The appeal site falls within Zone 4 of the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Documents (PSSPD), which advises that proposals for care homes are assessed on a case-by-case basis subject to forecast numbers of car owning residents, based on the level of care offered. It adds that institutions marketed to able bodied people are expected to provide 1 parking space per 4 bedrooms, the same rate for visitors and a further space for every resident warden.
7. In light that the 2 children residing at the property would not be of a driving age, the appeal site is in an accessible location, and the capacity for nearby on-street parking bays, I am not persuaded that the level of parking demand generated by the proposal would be significantly different to that of the existing 4-bed house, which has no dedicated off-street parking. Consequently, I conclude that there would not be an unacceptable impact on the availability of on-street parking in the locality.
8. The Council highlights that there is already a high level of on-street parking in the locality. However, there is limited evidence before me to demonstrate the extent of severity of any local parking problems, which would warrant the dismissal of the appeal on highway safety grounds.
9. For the reasons above, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of parking. I find no conflict with Policies CT2 and CT10 of Plan:MK 2016-2031, the PSSPD and Policy GS10 of the emerging MK City Plan 2050. Together they seek development proposals to, amongst other things, meet parking standards unless mitigating circumstances dictate otherwise, offer maximum flexibility in the choice of travel modes, and do not result in inappropriate traffic generation or compromise highway safety.

### **Other Matters**

10. In addition to the main issue, the Parish Council has raised concerns regarding a number of other matters. These include a greater level of waste being generated, a greater strain on local services, and an increase in noise and disturbance. These matters are not raised by the Council, and I have seen little substantive evidence to show that there would be unacceptable harm in these respects arising from the proposed use. Based on the evidence before me, these matters attract a minor degree of weight and so would not lead me to find differently overall.

### **Conditions**

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in light of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Where appropriate, the wording from that proposed by the Council has been amended for clarity.
12. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides clarity.
13. I have also attached a condition to limit the number of children residing at the appeal property to no more than 2 at any one time to ensure that the intensity of the use of the site is managed in the interests of living conditions. The Council has suggested that the property is also restricted to no more than 2 full time members of staff, other than during staff changeover. However, as there would be a close correlation between staffing levels and the number of children, it would not be necessary.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

*P Barton*

INSPECTOR