



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2024

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/23/3332329
8 Clevedon Road Luton LU2 9ED

- 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 Hossein Delgosha against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/00786/FULHH 6 July 2023 was refused by notice dated 13 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is Erection of single storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision notice has two refusal reasons which substantially overlap and can reasonably be addressed under a single main issue which I set out below. In addition, the officer report concludes that the limited space between the proposed extension and boundary of No.10 would adversely impact the existing outlook from the side facing kitchen windows of the adjacent (non-paired) property, stating this would be contrary to the requirements of Policy LLP19, although this apparent conclusion does not appear as a refusal reason. I have nevertheless addressed this within my reasoning as an 'other matter'.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal concerns a suburban family property located in an area dominated by linear configurations of mid-twentieth-century suburban housing in a mix of terrace blocks and individual dwellings, with some bungalows but mostly two-storey semi-detached housing of which No.8 is an example. Found at the western end of Clevedon Road, paired to No.6 Clevedon Road with which it shares a plain tile hipped roof and a single central flue stack, the front elevations of both dwellings largely retain their original form. Although variously extended and altered at the rear, houses in Clevedon Road present a consistent street scene, albeit one in which the loss of almost all foregardens to hard paving for off-road parking is a notable, if detracting, characteristic.

5. The proposal intends to increase the depth of an existing, mono-pitched rear extension but to a width which reduces the gap between the flank wall of the main house and side boundary from around 2 metres to 0.7m for the depth of the proposed extension. How this additional accommodation would be detailed to address the introduction of different external finishes or the visually awkward intersection of flat roofing with the low-pitched tiled roof of its predecessor is not wholly apparent in the submitted drawings. However, neither the detailing nor use of materials appear to be informed in design terms, by the original building. The resulting discontinuity of architectural treatment to wall surfaces and junctions, would appear as a visually clumsy 'extension to an extension' rather than a coherent design response which seeks to integrate new with existing.
6. For that reason, although not prominent in the street scene, the result would nevertheless undermine the objectives set out in Policy LLP19 of the Local Luton Plan 2017 (LLP), that extensions should be consistent with the host dwelling both in design and materials and, in Policy LLP25, a requirement for high quality design that enhances distinctiveness and character of an area.

Other Matter

7. Although the Council refer to the potential impact of reduced access to daylight upon side-facing windows at No.10 due to the proximity of the proposed extension, it is not clear whether the suggested effects are in relation to habitable or non-habitable rooms. From my observations and information provided, noting that the occupiers of No.10 have already slightly reduced access to daylight on their side of the boundary by the insertion of a translucent over-roof, it is unlikely that the increased depth of built form at No.8, albeit in closer proximity to the boundary than the existing flank wall, would have an unacceptable impact unless the windows concerned (which are inset from the boundary) are the only source of light to a habitable room, something which has not been addressed by either appellant or Council. However, given my conclusion on the main issue, it is not necessary to determine the acceptability of what is proposed in relation to the suggested loss of daylight.
8. I have concluded that the proposal would conflict with policies of the development plan which are most relevant to the proposal and, in consequence, with the development plan taken as a whole. Therefore, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR