



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2020

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/20/3249969

20 Richmond Way, Newport Pagnell, MK16 0LF

- 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 & Mrs Cooper against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00025/FUL, dated 28 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the existing first floor front dormer and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in a residential street amongst properties of a very similar design, resulting in a great deal of uniformity in the street scene. The existing dormer window is a design feature common to the majority of properties in the area, including those either side of the appeal site.
4. The appeal proposal would involve significantly increasing the height, width and depth of the existing dormer window, resulting in a noticeably larger protrusion from the roof plane. The appeal property is visually prominent in the street and the staggered nature of the buildings mean that the side elevation is also readily visible on travelling along Richmond Way.
5. Therefore, the proposed dormer would become an overly large and visually intrusive addition to the property that would dominate and overwhelm the existing roof structure. It would be a discordant feature in the street that would harmfully diminish the collective design uniformity and appearance of the area.
6. Some alterations to existing properties are apparent in the surrounding area but I saw none during my site visit that were comparable to that being proposed as part of this appeal or that alter the harm that I have identified in this case. Whilst there may be a need for four-bedroom houses in the local area, the contribution that would be made from this appeal does not outweigh the harm identified.

7. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be in conflict with Policies D2 and D3 of the Plan:MK (March 2019); the New Residential Development Design Guide (April 2012); and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which require good design that is appropriate to its context.
8. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR