The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/16/3159248
99 Linden Road, Luton, LU4 9QZ

- 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 V Subakaran against the decision of Luton Council.
- The application Ref 16/00982/FUL, dated 31 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of front dormers.

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 area.

Reasons

3. The proposal comprises the provision of two pitched roof front dormers. The existing property is a bungalow, as are the neighbouring properties. Indeed, this part of Linden Road is strongly characterised by the uniformity created by the bungalows on both sides of the road which have the same design, appearance and regular spacing. There are two-storey properties further along Linden Road, the closest to the site being that at No 87. However this property is separated from the bungalows near the site by the vehicular access to the backland development at Linden Place. As such the two-storey properties contribute little to the setting of the site.

4. The proposed dormers would be modest in their scale and, with matching materials, would generally be complimentary to the character and small size of the host dwelling. However as there are no other front facing dormers in any of the other bungalows near the site, the proposed dormers would appear conspicuous and incongruous in the street scene. As a result the bungalow would contrast with the character and appearance of the immediate area.

5. There are other properties in the wider area which do have front dormers including many along Filmer Road just north of the site, and in Linden Place. However none of these are seen in the context of the appeal site and so have little influence on the appeal site's setting, which is the primary factor in assessing the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, the uniformity which strongly characterises this part of

Linden Road is not a characteristic of Filmer Road and so these two streets are not comparable.

6. Consequently, due to their incongruity, the proposed dormers would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore the development would be contrary to Policy H4 of the Luton Local Plan (LLP) which requires extensions to be consistent with the neighbouring properties and Policy ENV9 of the LLP which aims to ensure development enhances the character and appearance of areas.

7. Also by failing to accord with these policies, the proposal would not represent sustainable development and so would fail to accord with Policy LP1 of the LLP and the National Planning Policy Framework which both encourage sustainable development.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR