

**Application Number:** [23/02748/FUL](#)

**Estimated reading time:** 13 minutes

**Proposal:** Erection of a single storey side extension, internal reworkings and external alterations to car park and building **at** Hanslope Surgery, 1 Western Drive, Hanslope, Milton Keynes, MK19 7LA

**Applicant:** Mr Naeem Younus

**Application type:** Full planning application

**Ward:** Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope      **Parish:** Hanslope Parish Council

**Statutory Target:** 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024      **Extension of Time:** Yes – 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2024

**Case Officer:** Lauren Bradwell  
Planning Officer  
[lauren.bradwell@milton-keynes.gov.uk](mailto:lauren.bradwell@milton-keynes.gov.uk)

**Team Manager:** Chris Nash  
Development Management Manager  
[chris.nash@milton-keynes.gov.uk](mailto:chris.nash@milton-keynes.gov.uk)

## Summary

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its design and appearance and impact on neighbouring residential amenities. Whilst the proposal removes the only on-plot vehicle spaces (3) to replace with all disabled parking, there is already a significant shortfall in parking with around 30 spaces required on-site. The loss of the 3 spaces is not considered to be significant, with accessible spaces still provided at the site and a car park further along Castlethorpe Road available for anyone to use. For these reasons, the proposal should be **approved**.

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The application has been referred to Panel due to a material conflict with Policy CT10 through it failing to provide parking on site to the degree that the shortfall against the Parking Standards is substantial.

## 2.0 Background

### The site and its context

- 2.1 The site comprises a part two-storey, semi-detached building that was originally a residential dwelling until it was converted into a medical surgery (Use Class E(e)) circa 1978. Several single storey additions have been added to the surgery over the years, with the most significant additions occurring around 2005.
- 2.2 The site occupies a corner plot at the junction of Western Drive and Castlethorpe Road. The site is bordered by a residential dwelling attached to its north-west side, paved parking areas to the north-east and south-west elevations and a footpath with a triangular section of greenery to the east. There are no planning constraints attached to the site.

### The proposal (to be read in conjunction with the plans pack)

- 2.3 It is proposed to erect a single storey side extension to the south-west elevation of the existing surgery. The extension measures approximately 8.4 metres in length, with a ridge height of 4.1 metres with a saltbox style pitched roof. It is also proposed to alter the on-site parking arrangements. The existing parking comprises 3 standard parking bays and 2 disabled parking bays, which will be altered to provide only 3 disabled parking bays.
- 2.4 The proposal has been amended during the course of the assessment to remove a first-floor side extension to the north-east elevation, and provide a re-design of the proposed extension to be more in-keeping with the existing building.

## 3.0 Relevant planning history

### 3.1 Application site

MK/732/76	Change of use from dwelling house to doctors surgery. Permission Limited – 18/10/1976
MK/881/77	Conversion of dwelling house to doctors surgery and associated car park provision. Approved – 12/01/1978
MK/1218/88	Extension to doctors' surgery, alteration to access and car parking. Approved – 01/02/1989
04/00666/FUL	Single storey front, side, and rear extensions, first floor side extension, external staircase, and additional car parking. Approved – 05/08/2004

## 4.0 Consultations and representations

All responses and representations received can be viewed in full, online at [www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/publicaccess](http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/publicaccess) using application ref. 23/02748/FUL. The following paragraphs summarise those responses and representations.

### 4.1 Hanslope Parish Council

#### *Initial comments*

Although the application removes some parking spaces on site, there is ample parking in the immediate vicinity. In order to address inconsiderate parking for the immediate neighbours, parking restrictions should be implemented on Castlethorpe Road adjacent to the surgery and at the bottom of Western Drive, as a condition of planning approval. Otherwise, the proposal is supported.

#### *Revised/additional comments*

The new Hanslope Fields estate has a significant car park that was provided by the developer at the time, and which is used by both residents and visitors to the doctor's surgery to relieve congestion on Castlethorpe Road. Unfortunately, the surgery is not permitted to direct people to park in the car park. The Parish Council will be adopting the public open space on the estate, which will include the car park. Once the transfer is complete, there will be no parking restrictions imposed and, if permitted to, the Parish Council will encourage use of it by visitors to the surgery by installing signage directing visitors to the car park, through the website and social media.

### 4.2 Councillor Alison Andrew (Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope Ward)

Support the application in line with the comments received from Hanslope Parish Council in relation to parking restrictions being made a condition of planning.

### 4.3 Councillor Liam Andrews (Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope Ward)

No comments received.

### 4.4 Councillor Chris Wardle (Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope Ward)

No comments received.

### 4.5 MKCC Highways Officer (Local Highway Authority (LHA))

#### *Initial comments*

No objection in principle. There is no obvious connection between the parking area located south of the site on Castlethorpe Road and the site and so cannot be tied to the application as it is neither in the red or blue line. There is some ambiguity over the use of the car park, whether

it is solely for the surgery or shared with the public, which would impact the availability of spaces. The reduction in on-site parking is a concern given the ambiguity of the alternative car park.

*Revised/additional comments*

There have been no substantive changes to the proposal and so the comments made initially continue to apply. Whilst the Parish seeks parking restrictions via a condition, this is not within the gift of the applicant to impose.

4.6 Environmental Health Officer (EHO)

No comments.

4.7 Representations from interested parties

9 comments have been received from 8 addresses. The matters raised are summarised below:

- Inadequate parking and no parking management; and
- The first-floor extension would result in 4 windows causing overlooking.

A number of other concerns have been raised which are not considered to be material planning considerations, and therefore cannot be taken into account in the determination of the application. These relate to:

- The surgery does not promote using the recreation car park or other parking bays as a solution to the dangerous parking;
- The Council needs to enforce parking management by way of yellow lines and tickets;
- Cannot get appointments at the surgery due to the increased demand from the new home residents;
- A consultation process regarding parking restrictions should be underway before any planning is granted;
- Further development within Hanslope should provide a new health centre with adequate parking.

**5.0 Relevant policies, guidance and legislation**

The Development Plan

5.1 [Hanslope Neighbourhood Plan](#) (made September 2019) ('the NP')

- Policy HAN4: Design and Development Principles in the Parish
- Policy HAN7: Community Facilities

5.2 [Plan:MK](#) (adopted March 2019)

- Policy CC4: New Community Facilities
- Policy CT2: Movement and Access

- Policy CT6: Low Emission Vehicles
- Policy CT10: Parking Provision
- Policy D1: Designing a High-Quality Place
- Policy D2: Creating a Positive Character
- Policy D3: Design of Buildings
- Policy D5: Amenity and Street Scene
- Policy EH5: Health Facilities
- Policy NE3: Biodiversity and Ecological Enhancement

#### Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPDs/SPG)

5.3 The following [topic-based SPDs/SPGs](#) are relevant:

- Parking Standards SPD (2023)

#### National planning policy and guidance

5.4 The [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) and [Planning Practice Guidance](#) (PPG) are also material considerations.

#### Legislation

5.5 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (TCPA) and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) (PCPA).

### **6.0 Planning considerations**

6.1 Taking account of the application type, the documents submitted (and supplemented and/or amended where relevant), the site and its environs, and the representations received; the main considerations central to the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Highway capacity, safety, and parking provision;
- Character and appearance;
- Residential amenity and living conditions; and
- Ecological impact and biodiversity gain.

### **7.0 Appraisal**

#### Principle of development

7.1 Policy CC4 of Plan:MK supports proposals where they retain and maintain existing facilities valued by the community and improve the quality and capacity of facilities valued by the community. The proposal would increase the size of the internal dispensary area at the surgery, as well as include an external automatic dispensary for patients to receive repeat prescriptions without having to make an appointment. This would free up more appointments so more patients could be seen, thereby increasing the capacity of the surgery. The side extension would allow two of the existing consulting rooms to be moved into this space.

- 7.2 The Policy also requires there to be adequate parking, which is discussed in further detail in the below section. However, given the enlarged dispensary and the automatic dispensary will increase the overall capacity, it will therefore improve the quality of care to be received, and in principle the development is considered acceptable.
- 7.3 In addition, the surgery is identified as one of the Parish's community facilities within NP Policy HAN7, which supports proposals to improve the viability of such facilities through extensions and redevelopment, provided the design is appropriate and the amenity of adjoining residential properties is protected.

#### Highway capacity, safety, and parking provision

- 7.4 Policy CT10 seeks to ensure all development meets the Council's full Parking Standards, unless mitigating circumstances indicate otherwise. On-site parking should not be reduced below the Council's full expectations if this would increase additional pressure in off-street parking that could not be resolved by on-street parking controls. Policy HAN4 of the NP requires all proposals to have regard to their effects on the local highway network ensuring safe access can be achieved.
- 7.5 Hanslope resides within Zone 5 of the Parking Standards where the requirement is 5 parking spaces per 1 consulting room. Within the existing floor plan, there are 6 consulting rooms and therefore the existing parking provision on site should be 30 spaces in total. There is therefore an existing, substantial shortfall on site as only 5 spaces are provided.
- 7.6 Whilst the shortfall is acknowledged, it is noted the scheme would not increase the requirement for 30 spaces as 6 consulting rooms would remain in the surgery. It would, however, remove the existing 5 spaces in order to accommodate 3 disabled parking bays instead. There is, therefore, conflict with Policy CT10.
- 7.7 Approximately 80 metres from the surgery entrance, there is a car parking area containing a total of 24 spaces. This was secured under a s106 agreement (attached to permission ref. 16/02106/OUT) for use as an overflow car park for the residents of Hanslope, users of Hanslope Doctors Surgery and users of Hanslope Pavilion. Whilst not for the sole use of those using the surgery, additional parking is available for the site to utilise, and can be considered to make up for the current, significant shortfall. Indeed, it is noted that this car park provides a betterment to the current on-site provision, which existed prior to the delivery of this parking area.
- 7.8 Comments have requested that parking restrictions be implemented on Castlethorpe Road and at the entrance to Western Drive as a condition of planning approval. As acknowledged by the Highways Officer, parking restrictions are subject to separate legislation under a Traffic Regulation Order – the outcome of which cannot be guaranteed at the planning stage. It would therefore not be reasonable or enforceable to include a condition for this purpose.
- 7.9 The Highways Officer doesn't object. However, they have raised some concern over the relationship between the alternative car parking and the site which cannot be secured through this application. This, however, is not a cause for concern because as stated in paragraph 7.6 above, the car park is secured for use by the surgery, as well as others. The provision of three disabled parking bays on site is desirable and therefore, the net gain in accessible spaces is a

positive for the site. However, it is acknowledged the negative is the loss of three normal spaces, which may result in some additional harm to the wider area. Although, there is the car park nearby, which is no more than 80m from the site. It is further suggested by Highways that it would be appropriate to seek the funding of a consultation exercise for a Traffic Regulation Order and additional funds to carry out restrictive works if and when appropriate. This is not, however, requested as an obligation as it is not considered to meet the necessary tests.

- 7.10 The semi-controlled car parking area connects to an existing footpath which leads to the site and is relatively flat. It is not considered there would be a resulting harm in relation to Policy CT2 which requires proposals to provide safe and suitable layouts for all users and what does not result in inappropriate traffic generation. Comments from residents have provided some photographic evidence to show vehicles parked on Castlethorpe Road for use of the surgery. However, given the existence of the nearby car park and the connectivity to the site, the proposal complies with Policy CT2 of Plan:MK and Policy HAN4 of the NP and permission should not be withheld on this basis.
- 7.11 Policy CT6 requires rapid and fast charging points for electric vehicles to be located throughout the Borough and at key locations. It would be beneficial for EV chargers to be provided within the on-site car park. Rapid chargers would be most appropriate in this location given the length of time patients are likely to be in the surgery for (between 20-30 minutes) and it is considered appropriate to attach a condition for details of an EV charger to be provided. Subject to condition, the proposal complies with Policy CT6 of Plan:MK.

#### Character and appearance

- 7.12 Policy D3 of Plan:MK seeks to ensure that all extensions to buildings are of a size and scale that relate well to the existing building and plot, as well the surrounding area. This is also reflected in Policies D1 and D2, which seek to ensure that proposals respond appropriately to the site's appearance and exhibit a positive character. NP Policy HAN7 also seeks to ensure that extensions to community facilities are of an appropriate design.
- 7.13 The proposed extension is considered to be of a size, scale and mass that would be subservient to the existing building and would not appear overwhelming to the host or neighbouring dwellings. The extension would be in keeping with the character of the existing building by utilising similar materials and would appear cohesive with the wider area character. The proposal would be visible from the public realm; however, it is set back and single storey such that it would not be overbearing upon the street scene.
- 7.14 The proposal complies with Policies D1, D2 and D3 of Plan:MK, and Policy HAN7 of the NP.

#### Residential amenity and living conditions

- 7.15 Policy D5 of Plan:MK seeks to ensure that development proposals do not cause an unacceptable loss of light, loss of privacy or create a visual intrusion. NP Policy HAN7 also seeks to ensure that extensions to community facilities do not harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

- 7.16 The site is semi-detached with a residential dwelling and a further residential dwelling is found along the rear boundary. The altered parking bays on site would be closest to the side elevation and garage of No. 2 Castlethorpe Road. However, as the total number of spaces would be reducing from 5 to 3, there would be less car movements on site and therefore, less noise arising. It is not considered there would be increased levels of noise disturbance to either neighbour as a result. The proposed extension would rearrange the internal layout and move two of the consulting rooms into this space, therefore, two consulting rooms would be within proximity to the neighbouring residences than before. The increased proximity of the consulting rooms to No. 3 Western Drive and their private amenity space may make the usual noise generated from a practice appear more apparent. Any noise generated however, is not considered to be so significant that it would alter the use of the private amenity space and rear habitable rooms given the surgery is open during normal working hours and not at all over weekends. Any noise, therefore, would be limited to during an individual's working day which is considered acceptable and non-disruptive, complying with Policy D5 of Plan:MK.
- 7.17 Given the proposal's single storey nature, it would not result in an adverse impact to residential amenity to neighbouring residences, complying with Policy D5 of Plan:MK , and Policy HAN7 of the NP.

#### Ecological impact and biodiversity gain

- 7.18 Policy NE3 of Plan:MK seeks to ensure development proposals maintain and protect biodiversity and geological resources, and wherever possible result in a measurable net gain in biodiversity.
- 7.19 There are two trees to be found within a small, square vegetated area to the western corner of the on-site parking. The plans indicate one tree as well as some vegetation will be lost in order to facilitate the development, whilst the other tree and vegetation would be retained. Neither tree is protected and therefore could be removed without any consent. Although it would be an initial minor loss in terms of biodiversity, this could be mitigated in the long-term through replacement planting. It is therefore considered appropriate to secure details of replacement planting to ensure appropriate species are chosen that would result in a biodiversity net gain.

## **8.0 Conclusions**

- 8.1 Whilst the proposed extension would result in a net loss of parking on-site, the provision and availability of parking nearby and the social benefits gained from increasing the size of the dispensary to meet the needs of a growing number of patients is considered to outweigh these concerns.
- 8.2 None of the other matters raised through the publicity and consultation process amount to material considerations outweighing the assessment of the main issues set out above, noting that conditions or obligations are recommended where meeting the tests for their imposition.
- 8.3 Where relevant, regard has been had to the public sector equality duty, as required by section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and to local finance considerations (as far as it is material), as required by section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as well as climate change and human rights legislation (including Article 8 and Article 1 of the First



Protocol regarding the right of respect for a person's private and family life and home, and to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions).

## 9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1 It is recommended that permission be **granted** subject to the conditions set out below (as may be supplemented/modified in any accompanying written or verbal update to the Panel).

## 10.0 Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans/drawings listed below unless as otherwise required by condition attached to this permission or following approval of an application made pursuant to Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:

*Plans received 13/02/2024:*

003 Rev. B – Site/Block Plans

002 Rev. B – Plans and Elevations as Proposed

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of securing sustainable development.

2. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent the accumulation of planning permissions, to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the suitability of the development in the light of altered circumstances, and to comply with section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

3. The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed only of materials of a type and colour which match those of the existing building except where indicated otherwise on the approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure that the new work compliments the existing building and to ensure the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area.

4. The development hereby permitted shall have no more than 6 consulting rooms at any one time.

Reason: To maintain control in the interest of the effect of additional rooms upon the facility capacity and neighbouring amenities and prevent the intensification of the use and subsequent effects of parking demand and highway safety.

5. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, the disabled parking bays to be provided on-site shall be permanently marked out and surfaced in accordance with

the approved plans and shall be maintained throughout the life of the development free of any impediment to their designated use as such.

Reason: To ensure adequate disabled parking in the interests of highway safety.

6. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing demonstrating x1 fully operational electric vehicle charging point. The installation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. At no time shall any of the points be removed without prior written consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To meet environmental requirements relating to low emission vehicles.

7. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no development shall take place above slab level until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include existing trees and/or hedgerows to be retained and/or removed accurately shown with root protection areas. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans at a minimum scale of 1:200 with schedules of plants noting species, plant supply sizes and proposed densities; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with tree, plant and grass establishment; and the implementation programme. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of two years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree and shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed, dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees and shrubs of equivalent size, species and quantity.

Reason: To ensure no net loss of biodiversity and in the interest of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.