



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2024

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/24/3344387
7 Millfield Road, Luton LU3 1RT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Saleh Choudhury against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00121/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension to the rear to extend the footprint of the back 2 bedrooms.
-

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 house and local area.

Reasons

3. 7 Millfield Road is a detached 2 storey house prominently placed on a corner plot within a residential area. Previously a semi-detached house, the other half of the pair was demolished to provide access to residential development at the rear. This has left No 7 with a hipped roof to one side and a gable facing St Christopher Place.
4. The proposal is stated to be for a first floor extension. This would be on top of a rear single storey section with the new wall to sit flush to the existing side gable, on the street boundary. The submitted plans appear to be inaccurate in this respect, however. The existing single storey rear projection actually stops short of the gable wall, so there would need to be a new wall at ground floor level on the boundary. The proposal as drawn would create a more than 10m long section of 2 storey, gabled wall sitting right up to the highway verge, with only one window to break up its massing. This would be an overly bulky and visually dominant feature, as seen from St Christopher Place and Millfield Road.
5. The drawings furthermore show a few different roof pitches on the existing house, and propose another different pitch on the new extension. The resulting roofscape would be unnecessarily complex and inharmonious. I once again find some reason to question the accuracy of the submitted plans here as the hipped roof might not be drawn properly, but this is not crucial to my decision.

6. The appellant points out other extensions in the local area. I note that some nearby houses have rear extensions, but I saw nothing directly comparable to this proposal for development of a highly visible corner plot. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits.
7. I find no objection to the general scale of the proposal, but conclude that the detailed design would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the house and local area. The proposal conflicts with policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the Luton Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, which aim to secure high quality design for extensions, where the mass, layout and roofscape are in keeping with and proportionate to the dwelling and streetscape.
8. I have considered all other matters raised and recognise the appellant's reasonable wish to improve the family home. The appellant refers to the possibility of a permitted development hip to gable extension as a fall-back position here. That type of extension would have a much different visual impact, however, and does not justify the current proposal.
9. I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR