
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 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: 6 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/17/3169224

139 Lambwath Road, Kingston-upon-Hull HU8 0HE

- 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 James Costello against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/01645/FULL, dated 18 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension to a residential property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr James Costello against Kingston-upon-Hull City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building, streetscene and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located at a junction and so has road frontage to Lambwath Road and, to the side, Lancaster Drive. The dwelling is an end of terrace house. Whilst the extension would be set back from the front building line, with the roof hipped in the match the existing roof form, it would project to the boundary of the site with Lancaster Drive. As a consequence it would be wholly out of keeping with the layout of housing in that road. It would appear unacceptably dominating at a prominent junction location.
 5. Moreover, the proposed extension would be a significant width to the side of the dwelling and, with its consequent long ridge line compared to the host dwelling, would appear to dominate the house.
 6. Further, the proposed windows would not relate acceptably to the fenestration of the existing dwelling in terms of size, position or detail. This poor element of the design would further compound the other harms identified. Whilst the appellant now agrees that the design could be improved by adding a bay window I am not satisfied that such a significant change, requiring careful
-

- detailing, should be left to a condition. Furthermore, it would not overcome the other fundamental harms identified.
7. I appreciate that the proposed extension would result in the removal of the existing single storey extension with its poorly matched brickwork. However, that is a subservient addition, with a reasonably matched roof plane, and is significantly less harmful than the proposed appeal scheme.
 8. I have considered the other developments put forward by the appellant as visually worse than the appeal scheme. I agree that the two storey flat-roofed side extension is visually poor but this does not sit in the same prominent location as the appeal proposal and poor design just not justify further harm. The other two-storey side extension to which the appellant refers, at James Reckitt Avenue, is not on a corner site and has been designed to be subservient to the pair of semi-detached houses to which it is attached, including in use of materials. While window design at that property could be a little more sympathetic, it does not have the uncharacteristic window detailing proposed in this appeal. Thus, these existing extensions, or indeed others I saw in the locality, do not justify the appeal proposal.
 9. In dealing with this appeal proposal it is not for me to prejudge any other form of extension at this property. However, I acknowledge the point that a side extension rather than a rear extension would have lesser impact on the occupiers of the attached property. Nevertheless, this does not resolve the harm which has been identified.
 10. Whilst there have been no neighbour objections to the scheme this does not alter the harm which has been identified.
 11. The harm I have identified results in conflict with policies BE1 and BE5 of the Hull CityPlan (2000), which taken together seek a high standard of design, including in terms of scale, massing, detailing and relationship to other buildings and the surrounding area. Additionally the scheme conflicts with the clear advice of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 – Designing a House Extension which resists extensions that project towards a corner so that they fail to protect the open character and visual amenities of the streetscene. It also conflicts with advice in the National Planning Policy Framework which explains that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and makes it clear that it is proper to seek to reinforce local distinctiveness.
 12. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Zoë Hill

Inspector