



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/25/3368864

14a Mangrove Road, Luton LU2 9BW

- 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 Mrs Elsie Law, MFKL Properties Limited against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00319/HH.
 - The proposed development is erection of single storey front and two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 14a Mangrove Road, Luton LU2 9BW in accordance with the terms of application ref: 25/00319/HH, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted, which for the avoidance of doubt relates to the single storey front extension only, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 OS Location Plan, 1:500 Block Plan, 114/MAN/MAR25 (existing floor plans), 114A/MAN/MAR25 Rev. A (proposed floor plans), 114B/MAN/MAR25 Rev. A (existing and proposed front elevations), 114C/MAN/MAR25 Rev. A (existing and proposed side (north-west) elevation), 114E/MAN/MAR25 Rev. A (existing and proposed side (south-east) elevation).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area which comprises mainly of terraced dwellings constructed some years ago. In contrast, the dwelling on the appeal site is a recently constructed L shaped, two storey detached dwelling with single storey front element, of modest proportions. It is situated on a relatively small plot at the end of one of the terraces on land that appears to have been formerly part of the adjoining property's garden area.

5. The single storey front extension would be a modest addition to the existing single storey element and would reflect its design and appearance, would be set back from the road frontage and would not impinge on the parking spaces to the side. Overall, it would be a complementary addition to the host property.
6. The proposed two storey rear extension would occupy an existing patio area located to the rear of dwelling and would infill an area to the side of the rear projection thus 'squaring off' the footprint of the dwelling. Whilst the walls and other elevation details would match those of the existing dwelling, it would have a flat roof rather than a pitched roof as on the existing dwelling.
7. I do not consider that it would be of unduly large scale in relation to the host dwelling and a reasonable amount of garden area would remain to serve the dwelling. However, the proposed flat roof would be an incongruous element, unsympathetic to the simple but well-designed appearance of the existing dwelling. Whilst this two-storey element would be to the rear, its upper level and flat roof would nevertheless be visible within the street scene in approaches from the northern end of Mangrove Road. This area is characterised by pitched roofs at two storey level with only a few flat roofs visible as part of ground floor additions. I therefore find that this would be an unacceptable element of the proposal.
8. Overall, the proposed single storey front extension would satisfy Policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the Luton Local Plan 2011-2031 (2017) which seek sustainable development of high quality design which ensures that extensions to dwellings that are consistent with the design and form of the principal dwelling and the streetscape and character of the area. However, the two-storey rear extension would not, for the reasons set out above, accord with the above policies and in addition, 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.
9. The Appellant suggests that the flat roof design reduces bulk and ensures that the extension would be subservient in scale. However, I see no reason why an alternatively designed, more complementary, roof could not be of suitable scale and subservience.
10. I therefore intend to issue a split decision, allowing the front extension but dismissing the appeal for the two-storey rear extension. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary to impose conditions to refer to the relevant approved plans and to secure matching materials in the interests of proper planning and the character and appearance of the area respectively. As only the single storey front extension is being allowed, it is not necessary to impose a condition restricting the insertion of side windows as suggested by the Council.

Conclusions

11. I therefore concluded that this appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR