



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/24/3346518

8 Tippet Close, Browns Wood, Milton Keynes MK7 8EJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr J Skackauskas against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
- The application Ref is 24/00732/HOU.
- The development proposed is construction of rear roof dormer, rear single storey extension, outbuilding, carport and garden wall.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I saw on my site visit that a similar development has been carried out at the appeal site. However, for the avoidance of any doubt, my recommendation is based on the proposed development as shown on the plans submitted with the appeal.
4. The reason for refusal on the Council's decision notice specifically relates to the proposed dormer. I have therefore defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear roof dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and on the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. 8 Tippet Close (No 8) is a two-storey detached dwelling situated within the Browns Wood suburb of Milton Keynes. The area is largely characterised by the traditional design and materials of the dwellings. The majority feature unaltered pitched roofs and regular window proportions, with materials including light brown brickwork with red brick detailing and dark brown roof tiles and window frames. The original form and materials of the host building conforms to this overall design and material palette and in that regard positively contributes to the order and consistency of the area's built form.
7. Due to its considerable mass and form, the proposed rear roof dormer would dominate the rear roof slope of the dwelling. Together with the large

proportions of its windows, the black aluminium window frames and the 'midnight' composite panels to the external walls, the proposal would have a bold, contemporary appearance. This would significantly contrast with the traditional aesthetic of the host dwelling and other roofs in the locality. Consequently, the dormer would be an incongruous addition to the host building and given its elevated position on a corner plot it would appear very conspicuous in the street scene. The provision of black window frames to the dwelling's other windows would not be sufficient to assimilate this striking addition into its surroundings.

8. I conclude, the proposed rear roof dormer would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and on the surrounding area. In that regard, it would conflict with Policies D1 (Designing a High-Quality Place), D2 (Creating a Positive Character) and D3 (Design of Buildings) of the Milton Keynes Council Plan:MK (2019), and Policy WNP 15 (Design Principles) of the Walton Neighbourhood Plan (2022) which amongst other things require that development proposals respond appropriately to the site and surrounding context, are locally inspired, that extensions relate well to the existing building and do not detract from its character or that of the surrounding area, that design and materials seek to enhance the quality of the built environment and that new features, such as coloured cladding, should be avoided.

Other Matters

9. The appellant suggests that the dormer would usually be within permitted development rights limits other than the materials. However, permitted development rights relating to additions or alterations to the roofs of dwellinghouses are predicated on the materials used in any exterior work being of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse. For the reasons described, the combination of form and materials would not make for sympathetic development in this instance. Even if other materials would be more costly or unsuitable from a construction perspective this does not justify the proposed dormer's unacceptable appearance.
10. I am conscious that an appeal against the Council's refusal of a separate certificate of lawfulness for a similar scheme at the site is in progress. However, matters relating to that appeal are independent of the appeal before me which seeks planning permission and so must be assessed accordingly. In addition, the approval of building regulations and the Council's handling of the planning application are not material to my own assessment of the proposal against the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed since it would conflict with the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR