
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2016

by Lesley Coffey BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/16/3156371

162 Wolverton Road, Newport Pagnell, MK16 8JQ

- 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 Rory Mynett against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00828/FUL, dated 31 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached double garage and additional hardstanding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling situated on the south side of Wolverton Road close to the junction with Walnut Close. The access road serving the dwellings to the south of Walnut Close is separated from Wolverton Road by an area of grass.
4. The appeal property adjoins the service road at its junction with Wolverton Road. Part of the front garden extends up to Wolverton Road and is deeper by comparison with the dwellings to the south- west. The proposed garage would be situated close to the boundary with Wolverton Road. It would be about 5 metres in width and 6 metres in length and would be set back about 2.1 metres from the front boundary of the property.
5. The Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011 (Adopted 2005) expects all development to achieve a high standard of design. Policy D2 sets out the general principles against which the design of a proposal will be assessed. Amongst other matters proposals should relate well to and enhance the surrounding environment, and extensions should not detract from the character of the original building.
6. I agree with the Council the design and appearance of the proposed garage would be in keeping with the existing property. The Council is also satisfied that it would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of the

neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or harm the outlook of these residents.

7. The proposed garage would occupy a prominent position close to the front of the property and would fail to respect the established pattern of development. Whilst the dwellings to the north-west of the appeal site are closer to the road by comparison with those to the south a generous degree of separation remains. The proposed garage would be prominent in views from Wolverton Road, and Walnut Close. There would also be more distant views from the junction of from Little Linford Lane with Wolverton Road. I consider that due to its location the garage would be unrelated to the existing pattern of development and would harm the spacious character of this part of Wolverton Road.
8. The appellant suggests that the pitch to the roof of the garage could be reduced thereby reducing the height of the garage overall. However, it is the location of the proposed garage, rather than its height that would give rise to the harm identified above. Therefore a reduction in the height of the roof would not overcome my concerns above.
9. I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would fail to comply with Local Plan policy D2.

Other Matters

10. Whilst the garage would be situated close to the junction of the access road and Wolverton Road, it would be set back from the front boundary, and this distance together with the adjacent footway would ensure that it would not obstruct visibility for drivers.
11. It has been suggested by interested parties, including the Parish Council, that the appellant is operating a business from the appeal site. At the time of my visit there was no evidence to suggest that this is the case, and I have assessed the proposal on the basis that the proposed garage would be used for domestic purposes.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Lesley Coffey

INSPECTOR