



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2021

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/21/3273512

54 Grantham Road, Luton, LU4 8JY

- 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 C Khan against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref:21/00095/FULHH, dated 21 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion, internal alterations, extension as porch and garage.
-

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 building and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semi-detached dwelling, with a single storey rear extension. It is located within a row of dwellings of similar age, form, design, detailing and external materials. This includes rounded bay windows and front porches with mono-pitch tiled roofs. Dwellings on the opposite side of Grantham Road are also similar in design, having rounded or in some cases more angular front bays. Whilst there have been changes to some of the dwellings, overall, the original uniformity in building styles and design remains coherent.
4. A large flat roofed dormer would be added to the rear roof slope of the dwelling. Similar dormers exist in the vicinity. The dormer would have no significant impact on the street scene and there would be a generous separation distance from the rear elevations of opposing houses. However, this element of the proposal would add to the overall scale of development.
5. The appeal proposal would include significant changes to the front elevation of the dwelling. A two storey front extension would be added with a glazed gable and a pitched roof. The ground floor of the extension would project forward to provide a flat roofed extension with an entrance door and garage door. The fenestration provided by the existing front bay windows would be radically altered through the use of large, glazed windows to complement the scale and

design of the windows proposed in the glazed gable of the front extension, above ground floor level.

6. I acknowledge that the appellant wishes to introduce a more contemporary form and appearance to the front elevation of the dwelling and to increase the living space through the addition of a rear dormer and loft conversion. The intention is to provide a high quality architectural design as a contribution towards, and improvement to, the street scene. However, in view of the general regularity in the design of semi-detached houses in Grantham Road, the proposed front extension and introduction of large areas of glazing would make the dwelling appear unduly prominent and obtrusive. The other dwelling which forms the semi-detached pair with the appeal building is not identical because of the existing two-storey side extension to No.54. The dwellings in Grantham Road also have no specific design protection. However, there is sufficient uniformity in the front elevation of the pair of semi-detached dwellings to indicate that their appearance would be disrupted and harmed by the proposed front extension to No.54 and changes to its fenestration.
7. I find that the proposal would be out of keeping with the general design and uniformity of neighbouring dwellings in Grantham Road and would significantly harm the character and appearance of the building and street scene. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Luton Local Plan 2011-2031 policy LLP1 concerning the presumption in favour of sustainable development, Local Plan policy LLP19 regarding house extensions, and would conflict with Local Plan policy LLP25 relating to high quality design. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. I have taken all other matters raised into account, but for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR