



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/25/3370303

1A Brooklands Close, Luton, LU4 9EH.

- 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 Ms Hayley Smith Pryce against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00407/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dormer roof extension to the main rear roof and the installation of two rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect the proposed dormer would have on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, considered in its local context.

Reasons

3. From the street, the only effect of the development would be an increase in the ridge height of the pitched roof of No 1A of about a metre and the insertion of two relatively modest rooflights, neither of which I find objectionable in themselves.
4. However, the Council is concerned that the roof height would then be out of keeping with the lower roofs of Nos 1B and 1C adjacent, which form a visual transition to the higher roof at the next house at No 1.
5. Significantly though, the appeal dwelling at No 1A is of different detailed design from Nos 1B and 1C. I do not agree with the Appellant that a 1m increase in roof height in this case is marginal. However, I do consider that, even with the raised roof, still little or no higher than that of No 1, the appeal dwelling would continue to make an acceptably individual design statement of its own, without detriment to the character or appearance of the Brooklands Close street scene.
6. From the rear, the flat-roofed dormer would be seen to rise virtually to the level of the raised main ridge. I accept that it would be a little above the eaves line and a little set in from the gable ends of the main building and that this complies broadly with the approach of planning policy and permitted development provisions for dormer extensions.
7. Importantly however, in large part due to the significant increase in the overall height of the main roof, the proposed dormer would dominate the back of the house

and cause the rear elevation to the dwelling to appear top-heavy. The height and bulk of the dormer would, in my view, seem excessive, disproportionate and insubordinate with respect to the existing dwelling. Although not visible from the street, it would be seen from the rear of other properties along Brooklands Close, as well as in only partly screened views from Toddington Road, to which the appeal property enjoys a flank frontage.

8. I recognise that roof dormers are increasingly common in the area and, plain in the view from the garden of the appeal dwelling, there is a substantial dormer on the rear roof slope of No 1 Brooklands Close. I am not aware of the precise background to that example but it appears that it was achieved without raising the original roof and its proportionality with the rest of the building may thus not be comparable.
9. I recognise too that there is a substantive fallback position due to the potential for the addition of a dormer by permitted development within the existing roof profile. But therein lies the essential difference from the present case, where permitted development provisions do not apply due to the raising of the main roof. In my judgement, implementation of the fallback option would not result in the same level of disproportionality as the appeal proposal.
10. For the reasons explained, I find that, properly assessed on its own individual planning merits, the proposed roof and dormer extension would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the immediately surrounding area. The development would thus be unacceptably contrary to Policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the adopted Local Luton Plan which, together and consistent with national policy, require roof extensions to be of high-quality design and subordinate to their host in scale and mass.
11. I have considered every matter raised, including the potential economic and personal benefits of the proposed development, but consider that these would be slight, compared with the overriding objection I have identified in terms of character and appearance.
12. I conclude therefore that this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR