The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2017

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPl MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/17/3178176
Surreyville, Castle Hill Lane, Hull, East Yorkshire HU7 4TX

- 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 Calvin Moy against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
- The application Ref 17/00330/FULL, dated 9 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2017.
- The development proposed is 'proposed single storey extension with internal works and loft conversion'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential area to the east of Sutton-on-Hull accessed off a single track no-through road. It comprises a detached bungalow set within a large plot with a mixture of hedges and fences on the site boundaries. Part of the area to the side of the property is occupied by a detached outbuilding and areas of concrete hardstanding. Within this area, planning permission has been granted for two dwellings facing onto and accessed off Castle Hill Lane.

4. The Council has adopted a Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 'Designing a House Extension' (2000) (SPG). Whilst of some age, its principles are consistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to secure high quality design and it is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal. The SPG indicates that extensions should be subordinate in size and similar in style, shape and proportion to the existing dwelling.

5. The proposal includes the installation of dormer windows to the rear and side elevations of the dwelling to create living accommodation in the roof space. The Council has not raised any objection to this aspect of the proposal and I see no reason to disagree with that assessment.

6. The proposed extension would replace an existing lean-to structure at the side of the dwelling. There would be an adequate separation distance between it and the consented scheme for two dwellings and the property would retain a large garden area. Accordingly the proposed extension would not appear unduly cramped within the plot or the surrounding area.

7. The flat roofs of the proposed side dormers would project to either side of the main roof but their position set back from the hip and below the main roof ridge would ensure that the original hipped roof form of the property would be retained. Whilst the eaves height of the extension would be lower than the existing roof ridge, the flat roof would have a horizontal emphasis which would be unrelated to the pitched roof form of the existing property.

8. The combination of its horizontal roof, overall length and position to the side of the dwelling would give the extension a dominant and imposing appearance within the front and both side elevations. It would be at odds with the more modest proportions and scale of the existing dwelling and its discordant and utilitarian appearance would be exacerbated by the irregular position of the door and window openings in the front elevation. Whilst there is a variety of dwelling types and styles in the surrounding area, the proposal would represent a discordant and incongruous addition which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

9. The extension at the adjoining property 'The Gables' is positioned to the rear of the dwelling and has a pitched roof reflecting the roof form of the main dwelling. The layout and form of the extension are therefore different from the appeal scheme before me. The extension at No 418 Leads Road referred to me by the appellant is positioned alongside and is of a similar length to the main dwelling and again I consider that the circumstances of that site are not comparable with the case before me.

10. If the consented scheme for two dwellings is implemented, a section of the frontage hedge would be removed to access the properties, opening up views of the dwelling from the west. Views would also be possible from the rear windows of the dwellings to the north. However, the remaining hedge on the road frontage would provide some screening and the lane is lightly used and for these reasons the harm to the character and appearance of the wider area would be limited. However, this does not negate the requirement for a high standard of design which would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

11. My conclusion is that the proposed extension would represent a discordant and dominant addition which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. For these reasons it would be contrary to saved Policies BE1 and BE5 of the Hull CityPlan (2000) (the Local Plan) which amongst other things seek a high standard of design for extensions which is in keeping with the existing building in terms of its size, siting and details. There would be further conflict with the advice in the SPG and with the Framework's advice to secure good design as a key aspect of sustainable development.

12. For the reasons outlined above and having had regard to all of the matters raised in this case, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR