



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 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: 21 June 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/23/3318755

30 Ambleside, Luton LU3 2SF

- 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 Iqbal Miah against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01484/FULHH, dated 20 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2023.
 - The development is the erection of a front porch, a front and side canopy and alterations to the fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Fronting Ambleside and other near-by roads there is a group of similarly designed semi-detached dwellings which are of pre-cast reinforced concrete construction with grey tiled mansard roofs. Although the ground floors have been clad in different materials, there is a consistency to the character, form and general appearance of these dwellings. With 2 exceptions noted during the site visit, including at the appeal property, the front elevations of these dwellings are unaltered and contribute positively to streetscene.
4. By reason of the consistency in the character, form and general appearance of this group of dwellings, the front porch and canopy which has been erected represents an incongruous addition to the host property and a visually prominent feature within the streetscene. The porch and canopy also unbalance the appearance of the front elevation of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. Although overall its scale is subordinate to the host property, the reasons for the unacceptable harm of this element of the appeal scheme caused to the host property and the streetscene are related to its siting, design, width and materials.
5. The use of matching external materials to fully reflect the property's brick cladding and roof tiles would help to reduce the visual prominence of the canopy and porch. However, the design, siting and form of this element of the appeal scheme would still not represent a high quality design that would be

consistent with the character and appearance of the surrounding dwellings and the streetscene.

6. The side extension is a light weight canopy of timber and polycarbonate construction. There are examples of other side additions and, as with this element of the appeal scheme they are viewed against the context of the host dwellings' flank wall. For this reason, the principle of a side canopy does not harm the character and appearance of streetscene or the host property.
7. However, because of the choice of external materials there is some harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The materials are not compatible with those of the property or other side additions which have been erected. Although the degree of harm is not significant and alone is not a reason for this appeal to fail, the choice of materials does add to the unacceptable harm that has been identified.
8. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme is not of a high quality of design which is compatible with the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene established by the group of dwellings. It is, therefore, concluded that the development does cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it conflicts with Policies LLP19 and LLP25 of the Luton Local Plan (2011-2031) (LP). Amongst other matters these policies require high quality design and for the design and external materials of extensions to be consistent with the principal dwelling, surrounding properties, streetscape and character of the area.
9. LP Policy LLP1 is a statement about the presumption in favour of sustainable development rather than a specific development management but this does not affect the assessment of the appeal scheme. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR