
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2016

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/16/3156725

4 The Groves, Kingston upon Hull HU4 6QR

- 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 & Mrs Rex against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00638/FULL, dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal consist of the erection of a detached double garage to the front of the appeal property, which is a detached 2-storey dwelling that stands at the end of a row of four detached dwellings. It was apparent that the integral garage at the appeal site had previously been converted into a habitable room.
 4. The appeal site is located within a modern residential estate and views from the front elevation of all four dwellings are of a bank of mature vegetation. This provides a significant level of screening from the business park located to the rear of the vegetation.
 5. All four dwellings are served by a short, private access drive off Summergroves Way. A landscaped strip and mid height railings separate the dwellings from the pavement on Summergroves Way. Nos 1 and 2 have gravelled the strips directly in front of their houses. At the time of my site visit both dwellings were utilising these areas to park cars
 6. The layout of the four dwellings, coupled with the open frontages, gives a spacious feel to the street scene which is locally distinctive. I find that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of design as the external materials would match the dwelling. However, the introduction of a new built form in this location would, due to its considerable scale and bulk, have an unduly imposing presence. As such, the sense of openness would be significantly
-

eroded, which would be noticeable from various public vantage points on Summergroves Way. As the only example of a large freestanding building set forward of the main dwelling within this part of the residential estate, these features would also interrupt the established pattern of development.

7. Furthermore, the location of the proposal would be directly adjacent to the pavement on Summergroves Way and the rear elevation, which would consist of a blank wall, would face the pavement. In this position, given the proposed scale, the new building would appear as an alien and overly dominant feature to pedestrians using the pavement. Consequently, I find that the proposal would appear as a visually disruptive and uncharacteristic intrusion into a largely open aspect.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to photographic examples of other detached garages. However, from the limited information provided I cannot be certain that their particular circumstances are the same as, or are very similar to, the appeal scheme. In any event each proposal should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done in this instance.
9. I accept that the proposal would provide secure off street car parking for the appellant. However, the significant harm I have found with regards to the character and appearance of the local area is decisive. Accordingly, I find that the proposal conflicts with Saved Policies BE1 and BE5 of the Hull City Plan 2000 and guidance within the Hull City Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 – Designing a house extension. Taken together these policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals contribute to the quality of the local environment and are sympathetic to the area.

Conclusion

10. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Cassini

INSPECTOR