



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/D/25/3365797

36 Stanmore Gardens, Newport Pagnell, Milton Keynes MK16 0PD

- 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 McGlue against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application Ref is PLN/2025/0026.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension over the existing garage, a garage conversion and a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension over the existing garage, a garage conversion and a two storey rear extension at 36 Stanmore Gardens, Newport Pagnell, Milton Keynes MK16 0PD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLN/2025/0026, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing numbers: PL01, PL02, PL03 and PL04 Revision A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the window serving the first floor dressing room has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed, it shall be retained as such thereafter.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision refers, amongst other things, to the Milton Keynes New Residential Development Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012. However, whilst I have had regard to that document, as it provides guidance on the design of new residential development, it is of little relevance to this scheme for a house extension.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:

- The character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
- The living conditions of adjacent occupiers, with particular regard to the outlook from 37 Stanmore Gardens ('No 37').

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Stanmore Gardens comprises two storey detached houses which face the highway across front gardens and driveways. They are finished in a mix of red brick and light render, sometimes with timber detailing. The proportions of the buildings vary, some being narrower with single storey attached garages, whilst others have wider two storey frontages, sometimes with projecting garages.
5. Additionally, there are subtle design differences between the houses. For instance, some, including the host, have a single gable to the front, whilst others have bay windows, or gablets at eaves level, and No 33 has twin two storey front facing gables. Consequently, whilst the materials, siting and two storey scale of the houses on this estate provides a sense of cohesion, there is some variety in their individual form and appearance.
6. The proposal would result in a second gable on the host's front elevation. It would be finished in brickwork to match the host's main walls, thus providing some visual distinction and contrast with the host's original, partially rendered, gable, whose form and proportions it would broadly mirror. The rear projecting gable would be broadly similar to the gable at No 38; and based on the scaled drawings and the appellant's grounds of appeal, the length of the side extension would be around 12.8 metres, not 25.5 metres as claimed by the Council.
7. The scheme would respect the siting and materials of other houses on the estate, and although the scale and mass of the host would be increased, the resultant building would not appear out of place given the varied proportions and design detailing of the houses on Stanmore Gardens. The scheme would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
8. Amongst other things, Policies D1, D2 and D3 of the Plan: MK 2016 - 2031 (2019) ('MKP') and Policy NP6 of the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan 2016 - 2031 ('NPNP') set out that development shall respond appropriately to its context having regard to matters such as layout, massing/scale and appearance; and that the scale and design of extensions shall relate well to the existing building, and shall not detract from its character, or from that of the surrounding area.
9. For the above reasons, the scheme would not conflict with those policies; nor with the stance at Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 ('Framework'), and in the Planning Practice Guidance, regarding the need for good design which is sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

10. As a result of this scheme, in place of the single storey attached garage, study and utility room, there would be a deeper two storey development, which would be set in a similar distance from the boundary with No 37. Given the slightly staggered building line, the front of the proposed extension would broadly align with No 37's front face.

11. The proposed extension would not project significantly further to the rear compared to No 37, and its closest first floor rear-facing window would be fairly small and would serve an en-suite. Moreover, No 37 is also set away slightly from the side boundary, as are its closest openings, which include rear-facing patio doors.
12. Consequently, I have no reason to doubt that the proposal would not breach a 45 degree line drawn from those patio doors, and the outlook from them, and from No 37's other rear windows down that property's fairly wide garden, would not be significantly impacted. Thus, the scheme would not result in a significant sense of enclosure, or significantly diminish privacy, within No 37 and its garden, and it would not affect those occupants' living conditions to a harmful degree.
13. It would not therefore conflict with MKP Policy D5, and that part of NPNP Policy NP6, which require a good standard of amenity, having regard to matters including overbearance and outlook; nor with the similar stance at paragraph 135 f) of the Framework.

Conditions and Conclusion

14. I have considered suggested conditions against the tests in the Framework. As well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. In the interests of good design, and to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the extension be faced with matching materials.
15. Finally, given that the scheme includes a first floor side-facing window serving a room which could be used as a habitable space, in the interests of protecting No 37's living conditions, I have attached a condition requiring that it be obscurely glazed and fixed to a height of 1.7 metres.
16. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, including a representation from a neighbour, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR