



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/22/3309613

7 Hawkfields, Luton LU2 7NN

- 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 Dave Pucknell against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00826/FULHH, dated 27 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. Although described a 2-storey extension, the proposed development includes the erection of what would be perceived from the road as a first floor side extension above the existing garage. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling with a dual pitched roof situated within a predominantly residential area. The surrounding area is characterised by detached properties of varying designs possessing dual pitched gable or hipped roof forms. There is generally a visual and physical gap between the dwellings at first floor level. Whether through their original design or subsequent alteration, there are examples of smaller gaps between 2-storey flank walls of some dwellings, including the property and 5 Hawkfields. However, because the property is sited forward of Nos. 5 and 9 then each of these 3 dwellings has its own identify within the streetscene.
4. The front elevation of the proposed side extension would not be materially set back from the first floor front elevation of the property. Further, the ridge height of this proposed extension would only be slightly lower than the height of the property's roof. The existing and proposed eaves of the roofs would also be of a similar height. By reason of its scale, when viewed from the road the appeal scheme would be both ancillary and proportionate to the size of the host property. Further, because of the variations in the siting of the property and Nos. 5 and 9 there would not be the appearance of a terracing effect within the streetscene associated with the enlarged property.

5. From the road, the design of the proposed side extension would be consistent with the property, including its roof style and pitch. However, the rear the proposed side extension would have a roof style which is not in keeping with the host property. The roof would be of catslide style of design extending above part of the proposed single storey rear addition rather than respecting the simple dual pitched roof form of the property. Further, the eaves height of the proposed roof would not relate to the eaves levels of either the host property or the rear addition.
6. Although the resulting property would not cause unacceptable harm to the streetscene this matter is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the rear roof slope not being in keeping with the property's original roof and, as such, this would conflict with the design requirements of Policy LLP19 of the Luton Local Plan (LP). The appeal scheme would also conflict with the high quality design requirements for development contained in LP Policy LLP 25.
7. From what could be observed, it does not appear that the alterations at No. 16, referred to by the appellant, included a similar catslide style of roof as proposed as part of this appeal and, as such, this other scheme has been given only limited weight in the determination of this appeal. The letters of support for the appeal scheme have been noted but the proposed development has been assessed on its own planning circumstances. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with the design requirements of LP Policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP 25.
8. The appellant has referred to concerns associated with the assessment of the appeal application by the Council. However, this is not a matter for determination as part of this appeal. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR