



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/19/3230486

1 Grosvenor Road, Luton LU3 2EG

- 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 M S Miah against the decision of Luton Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00245/FULHH, dated 26 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the surrounding area, and;
 - highway safety, with particular regard to on-site parking provision

Reasons

Character and appearance of the surrounding area

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwelling occupying a prominent corner plot within an established residential area. This prominence is further pronounced by the land level changes at this location.
4. The appeal scheme seeks substantial extensions to the side of the property. Whilst the 2-storey extension would be set back behind the existing front elevation of the host property and incorporate a lower ridge line, the size in terms of width and rear projection would compete visually with the existing property and appear over-dominant when viewed from the street.
5. Moreover, its positioning relative to Runfold Avenue would result in a built form that would be out of kilter with the present uniformity in the arrangement of buildings within the street. Whilst the existing garage extends to the side of the dwelling, its single storey nature ensures it is not overly intrusive and the open character of this corner plot is largely retained.
6. General comments have been made in relation to other extended properties on corner plots in the surrounding area. I saw on my site visit that some properties on corner plots in the surrounding area have been extended, I did

not however note any extensions or sites which were directly comparable to the proposals before me. In any event I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits.

7. It is acknowledged that the extensions would not be as prominent when viewed from Grosvenor Road. However, due to its overall size, design and positioning the two-storey extension proposed would be a dominant and incongruous addition within the wider streetscene. Consequently, the appeal scheme would harm the open character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.
8. I note that the proposals would provide additional living accommodation for the benefit of the appellant though I do not consider this would outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. On this basis I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the Luton Local Plan which seek to ensure that developments are of a high quality, being proportionate to the existing dwelling and respecting the streetscapes and established character of the surrounding area.

Highway Safety, with particular regard to on-site parking provision

10. There is currently one parking space within the existing garage at the site and this will be retained as part of the proposal. An increase in the number of bedrooms may result in further demand for parking though the proposals do include the provision of an additional on-site parking space.
11. Whilst I noted during my site visit that there was relatively high demand for on-street parking in the surrounding area, based on existing parking provision within the site and its sustainable location the level of provision proposed is considered to be adequate to serve the extended dwelling.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposals would not increase demand for on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety and is therefore in accordance with Policy LLP32 of the Luton Local Plan which seeks to ensure that developments provide appropriate car parking provision.

Other Matters

13. A concern has been raised in relation to the potential for the garage to be converted into living accommodation at a later date. However, there is little evidence that the garage would be used for purposes other than for parking and, in any event, I am required to consider the proposals that are before me. Furthermore, a condition could be imposed requiring it to remain available for such use to address this concern.

Conclusion

14. Whilst I have not found harm to highway safety, I have found that the proposals would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR