
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2017

by Mrs Zoë Hill BA(Hons) Dip Bldg Cons(RICS) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 26 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/16/3163662

121 North Road, Kingston-upon-Hull HU4 6JY

- 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 Miss Savage against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/01173/FULL, dated 10 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a garage, hall and lounge extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which are set back by some 2 metres from the building line formed by the terraces of houses to either side. Similar pairs of semi-detached houses and terraces exist on the opposite side of the street and nearby. Indeed the positioning and clear front building lines are a strong feature of residential development in this locality.
 4. The appeal proposal is for an extension which would wrap around the front corner of the property. In this front corner position the proposed extension would detract from the simple form of the host dwelling, and the corresponding simple form of other properties in the streetscene. It would disrupt the distinct pattern and rhythm of development. The size of extension proposed, even at single storey height, combined with its position in relation to the house would also render it unacceptably dominant in terms of the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses. That harm would be exacerbated by the uncharacteristic roof pitch and garage door/fenestration details which are proposed. Thus, as a consequence of its design, position, size and massing, the proposed development would appear uncharacteristic and incongruous within the streetscene.
 5. Whilst the appellant suggests that the proposal would add interest I do not agree, rather it would be a visually jarring addition.
-

6. As a consequence the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene. For this reason the proposal fails to accord with policies BE1 and BE5 of the Hull CityPlan adopted in 2000. Taken together these policies require, amongst other things, high standards of design in terms of the relationship of development to the existing and adjacent buildings in terms of massing, layout, siting, rhythm and other important building detail. It would also conflict with advice contained in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5: Designing a house extension* which requires attention to keeping a regular building line and reiterates the policies already identified.
7. I appreciate that the CityPlan is now a dated document. However, the National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that, as a core principle, planning should always seek to secure a high quality design. That would not be the case here.
8. For the reasons set out I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Zoë H R Hill

Inspector