
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2022

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/22/3295199

27 Chapter House Road, Luton LU4 0NN

- 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 Miss Charmaine Pratt against the decision of Luton Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01341/FULHH, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is an alteration from hip to gable roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached bungalow positioned on a corner plot at the junction of Charter House Road and Vespers Close. Properties in the vicinity also comprise of semi-detached bungalows of similar size, albeit many of which appear to have been extended with front dormers and side extensions in views from the street. Hipped roofs are a particularly dominant characteristic of the properties on the same side of the street as the appeal property. However, there are some, less frequent, examples of gable roof semi-detached bungalows in the vicinity such as those at Nos. 34 and 36 Charter House Road.
4. A further noticeable characteristic of the semi-detached pair that includes the appeal property is that each have a small front projection that appears to have been part of the original design. This, together with the balancing hipped roof, adds a degree of architectural symmetry to the semi-detached pair.
5. Planning permission has previously been granted for the erection of a single storey side extension with hipped roof and front and rear dormer windows. The proposed development would involve the alteration of the previously approved hipped roof to a gable.
6. I consider that the proposed gable roof would unacceptably erode the architectural symmetry that is currently displayed by the hipped roof of this

pair of semi-detached bungalows. It would have the effect of causing a noticeable visual imbalance in their appearance in the street scene.

7. In addition, the proposed gable would add significant bulk and mass to the roof of the property. It would appear as an uncharacteristic and unacceptable dominant addition to the property. As a consequence, the appeal property would appear as a large and overly bulky dwelling in comparison to others on the street. This would be particularly noticeable due to the location of the appeal property on a corner plot. Consequently, the proposed gable would unacceptably detract from the contribution that the semi-detached pair make to the character of the area and cause the property to appear as being overly bulky in comparison to others in the immediate vicinity.
8. Taking the above factors into account, the proposed development would represent an unacceptably dominant and incongruous addition to the property. This would cause significant harm both to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies LLP1 and LLP25 of the Luton Local Plan 2011-2031. These policies, amongst other things, require development to be designed to a high standard that preserves or improves the character of the area and responds to the site, building context and street scene in terms of form and scale.

Other matters

9. I have taken into account the examples provided by the appellant of properties in the locality that have had hip to gable roof alterations, albeit none of these appear to be located on Chapter House Road. I accept that these examples may demonstrate that the Council may have been receptive to some proposals to alter the roof from a hip to a gable. However, I am obliged to determine this appeal on its own individual merits. The fact remains that Chapter House Road is largely characterised by semi-detached bungalows having a symmetrical roof form which would be eroded in the case of the appeal proposal. Consequently, the fact there may be other examples in the locality does not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole and based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR