



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 January 2021

by **Bhupinder Thandi**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/20/3261457

18 Wellgate Road, Luton LU4 9TD

- 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 Nasir Hussain against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00918/FULHH, dated 29 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front and rear extensions, roof alteration including raising height with erection of front and rear dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow located within a residential area. The property is set back from the road and has a simple hipped roof form with a forward projection. The property has been extended to the side and rear.
5. The road has no uniformity in terms of architecture and many properties have been extended and altered. Whilst there are two storey dwellings along the road the majority of properties are bungalows. The setback from the road, low heights of many properties and noticeable gaps between them creates a sense of openness to the area.
6. I acknowledge that the proposed development would have a lower ridge than the properties either side and would maintain separation distances. However, the proposed development would extend the host property considerably. The proposed development would be disproportionately and uncharacteristically large when considering the size and height of the host property unduly affecting its character.

7. Front dormer windows whilst a feature of the street tend to be modest in size and leave large sections of roof. In contrast the dormer windows proposed due to the overall number, size and positioning would unduly dominate the front roofscape resulting in a cluttered appearance that would undermine the appearance of the host property.
8. The rear dormer window would lack architectural subtlety and would not be sympathetic to the appearance of the host building. Its overall width combined with lack of set in from the eaves and its height very close to the ridge would result in a structure that unacceptably dominates the roof. The change in the form of the roof combined with the dormer windows would result in unduly large and bulky features that would unacceptably dominate the dwelling.
9. Notwithstanding the varying designs and roof forms of houses in the area the form and bulk of the proposed development would be overly dominant and prominent, particularly from the street. Whilst reasonably localised, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
10. I acknowledge that a large proportion of the plot would remain undeveloped, however I find that the proposal would be disproportionately large in comparison to the host property and would completely subsume it. The extent of the remaining plot does not justify uncharacteristic additions to the property.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area contrary to Policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the Luton Local Plan (2017) which, amongst other things, require extensions to dwellings to be consistent, proportionate and of an ancillary scale to the principal dwelling and development to be of a high quality design that enhances the distinctiveness and character of the area.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of existing nearby occupiers in terms of privacy, light and outlook. However, these factors would not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
13. The appellant has made reference to an application¹ and an appeal² which they consider relevant to the appeal. Based on the limited information before me I find that their context is not comparable to the appeal site. In any event every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done. The examples provided do not lead to me reach a different conclusion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

Bhupinder Thandi

INSPECTOR

¹ 18/01852/FULHH

² APP/B0230/D/16/3144130