
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by **R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCIArb MCIL**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/Y0435/W/25/3370641

6 Rowlandson Way, New Bradwell, Milton Keynes MK13 0FA

- 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. D. Cirnu against the decision of Milton Keynes City Council.
 - The application reference is 24/01666/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as follows: *“Change of Use of a single garage from a Class C3 dwelling house Use to facilitate a car detailing business (Use Class E) including a single storey side extension and internal alterations”*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is whether the proposed development would cause unacceptable noise and disturbance to neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located near to the northern edge of the City of Milton Keynes. Newport Road is a busy connecting route that links different locations in the north of the City and Rowlandson Way is a small cul-de-sac off the north side of Newport Road. The cul-de-sac is designed in a strikingly contemporary idiom, with two- and three-storey semi-detached pairs of houses. The houses are constructed of brickwork, with flat roofs, in a modern architectural style. They have garages alongside (but set back from the road), with small back gardens.
4. Number 6 Rowlandson Way is a semi-detached house with number 4, in the same style as its neighbours, with its own garage.
5. It is now proposed that the use of the garage should be changed from the current use as a domestic garage, ancillary to the dwellinghouse, to facilitate a car detailing business. In addition, the garage would be increased in size by the addition of a single storey side extension and internal alterations would be carried out.
6. The ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ emphasises the aim of “achieving well designed places” in the broadest sense (notably at Section 12), while making effective use of land and encouraging economic activity. It is aimed at achieving good design standards generally, by adding to the overall quality of the area and being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, although it

is also recognised that appropriate change may include increased densities. The achievement of good design includes protecting existing residential amenities.

7. Policies in the Development Plan share these basic design principles, including Policies that are specifically intended to protect existing residential amenities. “Plan:MK 2016-2031” was formally adopted in March 2019. Among other things, relevant Policies stress the importance of good design and the need to protect residents from undue noise (for example, at Policies D1 and NE6). Notably, Policy ER4 specifically identifies the issue of “Home Based Business”. It is generally supportive of such businesses, but subject to various planning criteria that need to be satisfied in any particular case.
8. In this case, the submissions explain that the “car detailing business” would comprise “a low-impact foil wrapping and tinting service”, in the extended garage. It is argued that sound insulation could be added to the building and that the machinery used is not noisy (said to be similar to that of a domestic vacuum cleaner). The house itself would remain in residential use and the business would be carried on by only one person, during limited hours of operation.
9. Nevertheless, I share the concern that the proposed use would significantly change the character of the premises. The use of the equipment would be much more continuous than would be the case for domestic equipment and there would be significant levels of movement associated with the business, uncharacteristic of a solely residential property. These impacts would no doubt be amplified if the business were to flourish.
10. The proposed extension to the garage would create a more cramped private garden, but it would not amount to an overdevelopment of the site in itself, while such an outbuilding could evidently be used for other purposes (such as hobbies), ancillary to the residential use of the house.
11. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the proposed business use would be more intrusive and disruptive than would be appropriate in a residential area. It would be quite different from a “home office” or the like and out of character with its surroundings.
12. I am conscious of the need to promote economic activity where this can be done satisfactorily but, in this case, I am convinced that the proposed development would cause unacceptable noise and disturbance to neighbours and that it would conflict with the Development Plan. It ought not to be allowed, therefore, and, although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.

Roger C. Shrimplin

INSPECTOR