



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/W/25/3364006

2 St. Pauls Road, Bletchley, Milton Keynes, MK3 5EF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs A Miller against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01820/OUT.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The appeal proposal is in outline, with matters of access, layout, and scale to be considered, and matters of appearance and landscaping reserved for later consideration.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are: i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and ii) the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the dwelling at No.2 St Pauls Road.

Reasons

4. The site is within a well-established residential neighbourhood of relatively low density, largely of semi-detached or terraced dwellings with spacious front gardens. There are detached dwellings within the neighbourhood, but they are relatively few. Particularly characteristic are the semi-detached dwellings that sit on the corner plots, with a pair of houses taking the development around the junction. The appeal site is one such, at the junction of Saint Paul's Road with St John's Road.

The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area

5. A feature of the semi-detached houses is the outhouse that sits back from the front of the dwellings and is separated by a covered alleyway. However, there are quite a few examples of additions to the side of these houses by way of garages and extensions. That is the case at No.4, that sits on the other side of the appeal site, where a garage and front extension has been built. These largely fit in with the character of the neighbourhood, providing a variation that adds interest, but does not breakdown the pattern and scale of the neighbourhood.

6. The proposed detached dwelling would be constructed alongside the flank elevation and close to No.4 St Paul's Road. The existing curtilage of No.2 would be subdivided so that the boundary would run alongside the proposed dwelling, requiring the outhouse to be demolished, and then canting back towards No.4 to provide a relatively narrow rear garden area to the proposed house. This would have 2 effects; in place of the rather spacious open area separating Nos. 2 and 4 would be a building clearly at odds with the prevailing form, leading to reduced private garden areas which run against the grain of the surroundings. One obvious effect of this, as the council points out, is the need for a bin store well forward of the front elevation of the proposed house.
7. As the appellant notes, there are several building types and many variations with instances of individual detached properties. One such has recently been built between 52 and 54 St. Catherine's Avenue. This part of St Catherine's Avenue is a cul-de-sac, and the example is on a bend just before the turning head. This recent development is markedly different to the appeal proposal in as much as it is not at a junction, but more importantly the house is sited behind No. 52. This is a different situation and not comparable to that of the appeal proposal, but I would simply remark that, in any event, I do not regard this as an example to follow.
8. My conclusion on this issue is that the proposed development would appear incongruous in its location and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

The living conditions of the occupiers of the dwelling at No.2 St Pauls Road

9. The council suggests that the proposed dwelling would infringe the 45 degree line taken from the ground floor rear window and is therefore likely to have an adverse impact on the amount of daylight currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No.2. However, I do not regard this as being of a magnitude to justify refusal of permission.
10. As to overlooking of private amenity areas, I am more concerned about the effect of the proposed house on No.2, than vice versa. An unfortunate effect of the proposed house would be its overbearing presence in the rear outlook and garden area of No.2. These factors are indicative of the proposed building being squeezed into a space that is too small, and poorly orientated with regard to the existing donor property.
11. I note that it is stated that the appeal dwelling would be a self-build dwelling, but that factor does not overcome the considerations that have led to my decision.
12. In view of the shortcomings that I have found under both issues, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D1, D2, D3 and D5 of the development plan, MK 2016 – 2031, adopted March 2019. For these reasons the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR