



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/23/3333928

16 Latimer, Stony Stratford, Milton Keynes MK11 1HY

- 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 Reynolds against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application Ref P23/01495/HOU, dated 6 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is part demolition of, and construction of, single storey side extension to existing garage and central mezzanine store extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Preliminary Matter

3. The property was subject to a previous application which was granted permission for extensions to the existing garage.

Reasons

4. No.16 Latimer is a detached 4-bedroom dwelling located at the end of a shared driveway. It is part of a modern housing development which has a varied layout and buildings of a mixed character and size. Garages in the area are generally forward of the dwellings and have flat roofs. Boundary treatment and vegetation, as well as a detached garage, provide screening of views towards the property from the public highway. However, the front elevation of the dwelling can be seen at a higher level from the public road, along the shared driveway. It may also be seen from the adjacent neighbouring properties.
5. At the time of my site visit it was apparent that the detached double garage at the front of 16 Latimer had been demolished. However, having regard to the submitted plans, the proposed pitched roof would add considerable height and bulk making the proposed building appear a dominant feature that would not be subordinate to the dwelling. It would also result in the front elevation of the dwelling being unduly obscured when viewed along the driveway, and when compared to the previous garage which had a lower flat roof. A pitched roof

would also be contrary to the form and design of garages in the vicinity which are generally small in size and scale with flat roofs.

6. I find that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Plan:MK policies D1, D2 and D3 and policy 9 of the Stony Stratford Neighbourhood Plan which together seek to ensure that the design of buildings creates a positive character and high-quality places. It would also conflict with the objective of good design in the National Planning Policy Framework

Conclusion

7. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR