



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/25/3374551

2 Carteret Close, Willen, Milton Keynes, MK15 9LD

- 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 Mac Macaulay against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application reference is PLN/2025/1013.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing rear conservatory and the erection of a single storey rear and side extension with roof lights. First floor side and rear extension above existing garage with rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal as I find it describes the proposal more concisely.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the first-floor side extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and the visual amenity of the street scene and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling with an attached garage which is located within a residential area. The dwellings along Carteret Close are characterised as two storey with a clipped gable roof design with the appeal site being representative of, and in-keeping with, the dwellings found within the immediate locality and within which the proposals would be generally viewed. The dwellings share architectural and general design features which, overall, results in visual continuity and a consistent character and appearance. The attached single storey garage is also a notable feature of dwellings on Carteret Close.
5. The proposed roof of the first-floor side extension, above the existing garage, would have a lean-to appearance which would result in the overall height of the extension being below the eave of the host dwelling. This, alone, would not result in the proposal being sufficiently subservient (or appropriate) as the overall design would be completely at odds and out of keeping with the character of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal would result in a proposed first floor side extension which would be entirely uncharacteristic for the host dwelling and the visual amenity of the street scene and surrounding area as a result of a bulky and unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling.

6. The additional storey above the existing garage would be out of character with the style of garaging which is characteristic within Carteret Close and would result in competing and unsuitable design aspects which would look visually awkward as a result of the lean-to style/design and, in particular the proposal's interaction with the first-floor window and roof. Furthermore, the lack of fenestration, at ground floor level, would lead to a large brick wall in the context of the street scene at ground floor level in the front elevation which I find would exacerbate the inappropriate visual bulk, scale and massing of the proposal to the side of the host dwelling in views along Carteret Close.
7. I note that the appellant outlines that the proposal has been designed to mirror the main house as a result of the lean-to design, however, whilst the proposal may be subservient insofar as the height does not exceed the eaves of the host dwelling I do not find that the proposal would be visually subservient due to the bulk scale and massing and design combined with the design features discussed above. In particular the interaction of the roof and the first-floor window, and lack of fenestration at ground floor, I find contributes to bulk, scale and massing visually which would be inappropriate for the host dwelling. The proposal would be set back, at first floor level, from the principal elevation of the dwelling, however, I do not find that this is sufficient to support the proposal in design terms with the awkward and contrived nature of the proposed side extension being further exacerbated by the interaction with the proposed rear extension.
8. The proposal would utilise matching materials and whilst reference has been made to other two storey side extensions granted, each application should be considered on its own merits. The appellant's planning statement, submitted within the original application, references a project at 4 Oakwood Drive (21/015687/HOU), however, no details of this site have been submitted before me as part of the appeal submission. I have no details, therefore, of the proposal which is stated to have been approved other than the commentary by the Council that it allowed varied roof forms as being acceptable.
9. Overall, I find that the proposal would result in visual intrusion which would be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area where the street scene is characterised by appropriate additions, and consistent design to the side of properties, in terms of the general roof scape. The first-floor side extension, above the existing garage, would also be combined with a large single storey rear extension which, cumulatively, would result in an overbearing and unsympathetic addition to the appeal site and the host dwelling by the appellant.
10. The proposal would be contrary to Plan:MK 2016 to 2031 Policy D1 which requires proposals as a whole respond appropriately to the site and the surrounding context and Policy D2 which requires the massing/scale of a development and appearance of buildings to exhibit a positive character or sense of place for a development and that the design allows for visual interest through the careful use of detailing, where this is appropriate to the character of the area.
11. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy D3 which requires that the proposed scale and design of extensions to existing buildings relate well to the existing building and plot and do not detract from the character of the existing building and the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to Campbell Park Neighbourhood Development Plan Design Policy 1 which requires proposals to

integrate into surroundings in terms of scale, density and design and to respect the character of the area.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has submitted a daylight and sunlight impact assessment, however, impact upon neighbouring residential amenity with regard to such matters does not form a refusal reason from the Council. I note from the Council's delegated report that they consider the proposed first floor side extension would have some negative impact on the outlook afforded from the rear windows of 1 Carteret Close and its private rear amenity space, however, on balance the Council do not consider the proposal would cause unacceptable overbearing impact to the neighbouring garden.
13. I have no reason to conclude differently in relation to such matters and whilst I acknowledge the assessment submitted by the appellant the acceptability of the proposal in the context of residential amenity does not overcome the issues which I have found with the proposal in the context of design, siting and visibility in terms of character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene itself.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR