

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/16/3153711

85 Goddard Avenue, Kingston upon Hull HU5 2AW

- 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 Nick Wilson against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00623/FULL was refused by notice dated 29 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear 2-storey extension and single side extension to kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace, mainly 2-storey house that occupies a modest sized corner plot at the junction of Goddard Avenue and Ashdene within a predominantly residential area. In the vicinity of the site, 2-storey residential terraces predominate, within which dwellings are generally traditional in style with some variety in their built form at the rear due to various extensions and external alterations that have been carried out.
 4. The proposal is to erect a 2-storey rear extension following the demolition and removal of an existing single storey outbuilding and to infill the existing rear recess with a single storey addition. Both new extensions would include a mono pitched roof and external materials to match the existing building.
 5. Taken together, the proposed extensions would elongate the 2-storey built form of No 85, enlarge its footprint and significantly add to its scale and mass. The appeal scheme could not reasonably be described as a subordinate to the host building, to which the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note No 5, *Designing a house extension*, (SPG) refers. Specifically, paragraph 5.8 of the SPG states that the size and design of a house extension should respect the existing building and be subordinate to it.
-

6. With the new built form in place, the 2-storey rear projection of the appeal dwelling would be significant in length. Its relatively long ridgeline running parallel to Ashdene would visually accentuate the scale and bulk of the rear projection when seen from this road. Although set back from Ashdene, this part of the completed building would appear overly long and large in relation to the host building. Furthermore, there would be little by way of detailed articulation to the new flank and rear walls to reduce its visual impact. By relating poorly to the scale and proportions of the host building, the proposal would spoil the intrinsic character of the existing dwelling.
7. The new single storey extension would infill the gap between the existing side return of No 85 and the adjacent footway with the proposed flank wall forming part of the boundary wall to Ashdene. As a result, the proposal would noticeably reduce the sense of space to the side and rear of the site, which would be evident particularly from the footways along Ashdene. In doing so, the proposed development would fail to comply with the Council's SPG, which advises that space should be retained between any pavement and the sidewall of an extension to a corner building with a gable facing the road to protect the visual amenities of the street scene. Furthermore, with limited space around the side and rear of the finished building, the proposal would cause No 85 to appear cramped in terms of layout even amongst the varied built form at the rear of the terrace to which No 85 belongs. For these reasons, the proposed development would be obtrusive in the local street scene and it would be an unwelcome addition to the local area.
8. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policies BE1 and BE5 of the Hull City Plan and the Council's SPG. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development proposals achieve a high standard of design and are in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it states that new development should respond to local character and add to the overall qualities of the area.
9. In reaching this conclusion, I acknowledge that the proposal would provide additional accommodation, which would improve the living conditions of the occupiers of No 85. I also note that the new side window would include obscure glass. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
10. Others do not object to the proposal. However, the lack of objections from interested parties such as the occupiers of neighbouring properties or the Parish Council does not necessarily mean that the new development is therefore acceptable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR