



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 11 August 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/25/3366429**

**232 Stockingstone Road, Luton LU2 7DG**

- 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 Omar Choudray against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
  - The application Ref. is 25/00106/HHFT.
  - The proposed development is erection of two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a residential area on the northern side of Stockingstone Road. It comprises a large, detached dwelling which has been previously extended comprising single storey rear addition and roof additions and alterations to create a larger half hip roof with central 'crown roof' and rear flat-roofed dormer. These alterations were carried out under permitted development rights, a related lawful development certificate having been permitted in 2024<sup>1</sup>.
4. The site sits within a small group of detached dwellings fronting the road between its junction with Elmwood Crescent and an area of woodland. The dwellings are set back from the road frontage and step up from Elmwood Crescent, following the slope of the land, and are predominantly of brick elevations with hipped roofs of traditional appearance. Number 230 to the east of the appeal site is somewhat different in design and appearance comprising a 2/3 storey dwelling of render elevations and modern design.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension would introduce a full hip roof to the west side of the dwelling formed by extending the existing half-hip. Whilst the additional bulk at roof level introduced would be relatively modest compared to the existing large roof, the extended roof and the first-floor element would have the effect of unbalancing the existing symmetry and relatively well designed appearance of the existing dwelling resulting in an overall roof design that would appear awkward and incongruous.

---

<sup>1</sup> Application ref:24/01044/LAWPFT

6. Furthermore, the first-floor addition, which would be sited right up to the side boundary, would reduce the visual gap between the dwellings at this level. The spacing between dwellings, which retain gaps to the boundary on both sides, is part of the established character of this group of dwellings and such visual gaps are a feature of their layout and appearance. The 'filling in' of this gap would result in harm to this reasonably spacious layout resulting in a cramped appearance with the dwelling on the adjoining site to the west. This would be exacerbated by the difference in levels whereby the proposed extension, which would be visible within the street scene, would disrupt the fairly regular 'stepped' relationship between dwellings.
7. The resulting dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would thereby fail to comply with Policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the Luton Local Plan 2011-2031 (2017) which seek sustainable development of high quality design by ensuring that extensions to dwellings that are consistent with the design and form of the principal dwelling, the streetscape and character of the area and that respect the prevailing gaps and spaces between buildings. In addition, it would fail to satisfy policy in the National Planning Policy Framework that seeks to achieve well designed places that function well, are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.
8. The Appellant has referred to other extensions that have been recently permitted including one on the same road. However, none of these are within the same group of dwellings and many relate to terraced and semi-detached properties where the character of the street scene is quite different. Therefore, they are not directly comparable. I acknowledge that the proposal would enhance the accommodation for the Appellant's family, but these benefits do not outweigh the harm arising.

### **Conclusions**

9. It is therefore concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

*P B Jarvis*

INSPECTOR