



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/20/3255010

22 Purcell Road, Luton LU4 0RD

- 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 Farman Ali against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/00477/FULHH, dated 20 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of single/two storey side and rear and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

- The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. No.22 is an end terrace dwelling and its flank elevation faces Purcell Road. The garden for No.22 wraps around the dwelling and the proposed extension would be built in the side garden next to Purcell Road. Due to the alignment of the terrace, at right angles to the street, the property is extremely prominent with the front, side and rear elevations being visible within the street scene. The dwellings within the wider street scene are typically two storey terrace dwellings that are similarly designed with some small variations in appearance. The dwellings are generally set behind front gardens and driveways and the dwellings are rarely built up against the roadside. The garden at the appeal site conforms to that pattern. In front of No.22 and the run of terrace dwellings is an area of public open space which, in addition to the gardens, contributes to the open suburban appearance of the street scene.
4. Planning permission has been granted for an extension to the dwelling (Ref:20/00210/FULHH). The main difference between the approved scheme and the one before me would be the increase in width of the side extension on both the ground and first floor as well as the larger two storey rear extension.

5. Given the location of the dwelling and the incline of the road towards the dwelling, the first floor of the proposed extension would be particularly prominent. It would be around twice the width of the approved extension and when combined with the wider ground floor extension, the flank wall of the building would be built demonstrably closer to the roadside than is typical within the street scene. The substantial erosion of this undeveloped gap on both the ground floor, and more importantly on the first floor, would be uncharacteristic of the surrounding environment and would cause harm to the appearance of the street scene. Furthermore, the combined scale and bulk of the side extension and the substantial rear wing would produce a bulky and disproportionate addition which would fail to respect the modest proportions and scale of the host dwelling.
6. As noted above, the side and rear of the property are clearly visible within the street scene and the additions would appear out of character with the dwelling and the wider area. I recognise that the first floor would be set back from the front elevation and below the roofline of the host dwelling but those design features would not be sufficient to compensate for the harm caused by the excessive width of the side extension and overall scale of the first floor additions.
7. Whilst the ground floor rear extension would be large, it would not be particularly visible from the roadside and because of this it would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the street scene, of itself. The appearance of the proposed porch would be similar to the approved scheme and the addition of the porch to the front of the dwelling would be appropriate given the scale of the addition and the materials that are proposed.
8. Therefore, the proposed extension would be a disproportionate addition to the dwelling and by developing close to the roadside, the extension would result in the loss of an important characteristic of the street scene. Consequently, the development would be contrary to Policy LLP1 of the Luton Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (LLP) (adopted 2017) which states that the Council will require all new development in the borough to contribute to enhancing a sense of place preserve or improve the character of the area. The proposal would also not comply with the specific design aspects of Policy LLP19 which notes that scale, mass, layout, design and external materials of extensions should be consistent with and proportionate to the principal dwelling, surrounding properties, streetscape and character of the area. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to the design aspects of Policy LLP25 which looks to ensure that development enhances the distinctiveness and character of the area.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to other dwellings on corner plots that have been extended. The dwellings referred to are located on different streets to No.22 and as such the street scenes are not necessarily comparable. Furthermore, the approved extensions were not as disproportionately large as the proposal before me nor did they propose such extensive alternations to the appearance of the host dwellings. The extensions, whilst located on corner plots, were proportionate additions to those dwellings and consequently, were found to not harm the character and appearance of the dwellings or the street scene. Each case must be assessed on their own merits and the approved schemes do not justify the current proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR