



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25th June 2021

by Steven Hartley BA(Hons) Dist. TP(Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/21/3272452

57 Barnfield Avenue, Luton LU2 7AS

- 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 Ali Shan against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00084/FULHH, dated 21 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side/rear extension, a single storey front/side extension and a detached garage to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's refusal notice rather than from the appellant's application form as this more clearly reflects what is shown on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is semi-detached and is positioned on the corner of Barnfield Avenue with Blandford Avenue. There is a variety of different house types in the area though, in the main, they are brick built with two storeys and a number of them have been extended in different ways. However, where extensions have taken place to properties, they are mainly subordinate in scale to the original dwellings.
5. The other half of the pair of semi-detached properties has already been extended, but the extension is subordinate to the host property and is set back from the front elevation. While the pair of semi-detached properties do look different in terms of the inclusion of later additions, there is nevertheless a pleasing degree of design balance and symmetry that exists across the two dwellings.
6. The proposed extension to the appeal property would be large in scale relative to the main property. The extension would be largely hidden when seen from the side and along Blandford Avenue, but would be highly visible when viewed from Barnfield Avenue. Owing to the scale and design of the proposed

extension, it would give an unbalanced and incongruous appearance to the pair of semi-detached houses and hence would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. I do not have the same concerns with regard to the proposed garage to the rear of the property. This would be acceptable in terms of its position, design and scale.
8. I have taken into account the examples of extensions referred to by the appellant elsewhere, including comments made by other Inspectors. However, I have found that the quoted cases are not directly analogous to the current appeal. Indeed, one example relates to a detached property and another to a terraced dwelling and the third, while a semi-detached property, is some distance away. It has a different design effect relative to its host building from that of the appeal proposal to its host building, and it does not extend beyond the existing front elevation. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits and taking into account the site conditions that are relevant to this appeal proposal.
9. For the above reasons, and when the proposal is considered as a whole, I conclude that material harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. It would not therefore accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the adopted Local Luton Plan 2017.

Conclusion

10. The development as a whole would not accord with the development plan for the area and there are no material considerations that indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR`