



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/D/25/3374787

75 Linden Road, Luton LU4 9QZ

- 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 Md Hussain Ahmed against the decision of Luton Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 25/00560/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and the extent to which it would set a precedent.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located in a part of Linden Road which is set back from the road, and which is made up of dwellings arranged loosely in a three-sided square formation. Those dwellings are two storey and semi-detached (57 -79 odd numbers). Linden Road is predominantly semi-detached bungalows with some two storey dwellings.
4. The front elevation of no.75 has a two storey protruding front gable feature which is mirrored by its semi pair (no.73). It is proposed to construct a front extension in the recessed area adjacent to the two storey gable. The extension would be single storey only and about 3m deep (on the flank side) about 4.4m wide and about 3.7m high to the apex of a double pitched roof. It would have a new front entrance door and one flank window.
5. Whilst the extension would make use of the infill area at the front of the dwelling, it would nevertheless be a wide structure with a roof profile that would vary markedly from the front double gable angle. This would not be sympathetic to the host dwelling and given the siting of the proposed extension at the front of the dwelling, it would also be prominent.
6. The dwellings comprising 73-79 (odd numbers) in which the appeal site is located have a very pleasing uniformity of appearance which is viewed over long front

gardens from the pedestrian path which dissects the square. They are not entirely identical (for example no.77 has a very small non-protruding front porch), but nevertheless the rhythm is noticeable. The articulation of the double height protruding gables contributes strongly to the visual attractiveness of the sets of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed front extension would disrupt that rhythm to the detriment of the character and appearance. Part of no.73 would be obscured from some views and this would also be to the visual detriment of the area.

7. The dwellings comprising 57- 63 (odd numbers) which are opposite 73-79(odd) also have a pleasing uniformity in spite of a number of differences between them, including single storey front extensions at 61 and 57. However, in my view, neither of those are particularly sympathetic to their host dwellings and neither have the same degree of adverse impact on the character of the host dwellings or wider area as I judge the appeal proposal would have. I am obliged to consider the appeal proposal on its own individual merits and impacts, and I find that it would result in unacceptable impacts.
8. On occasions, a development which is permitted by express planning permission is capable of setting an undesirable precedent which make future similar applications difficult for a local planning authority to resist. This, to my mind, is the case here, where future applications on the other semi-detached dwellings in this square with similar scales, sitings and designs would be difficult to resist. This would lead to more detriment to the character and appearance of the host dwellings and surrounding area if such permissions were implemented.
9. I have taken into account the benefits of additional internal space to the current and future occupants of the dwelling and the additional security it would bring by providing a secondary door, however, neither of those factors outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. In summary, I find that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the area and set an undesirable precedent which the Council would find difficult to resist. The proposal would be contrary to policies LLP1, LLP19 and LLP25 of the Local Luton Plan (adopted 2017) and advice on design in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

11. Having considered all representations made, particularly those which refer to other extensions in Linden Road, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector