
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/W/19/3236888

The Winding House, Southbridge Road, Hull HU9 1TL

- 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 JRL Homes Ltd against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00112/FULL, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retention of single storey plant room extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The ground floor extension for which planning permission is sought has already been constructed. At my site visit I was aware of other alterations to the building that had taken place. For the avoidance of doubt, I confirm that my determination of the appeal is solely based on the drawings and evidence submitted to me relating to the single storey plant room.
3. I understand that, whilst the extension is described as a plant room, it is used as a store.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locally listed host property, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property, at 77 Ha'penny Bridge Way, with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The host property is a former winding house which has been identified by the Council as a locally listed building. The former industrial building has a prominent position within the streetscape at the entry to the dock and residential development, with a footpath skirting one side elevation and a road on the other. The building is important both as a rare remnant of the former historic docks and as an interesting example of industrial architecture.

6. The building has been extended and converted through the use of contemporary materials and a modern design. I am not familiar with the circumstances of the conversion. However, for the most part, the conversion respects the historic core of the building which retains its integrity. The two brick side elevations have an enhanced significance as, prior to the construction of the extension, they were the only element of the original building which had not been extended.
7. In contrast to the permitted conversion and alterations, the bulky ground floor extension made of dark UPVC, appears to 'bolt on' to the brick side elevation in an ad hoc manner, albeit it matches materials used within the host property. The modern store interrupts and partially obscures one of the two remaining, unextended simple side elevations, which retain the original architectural detailing of the three brick panels and arched windows. As such, the alien feature, significantly detracts from the historic character and the appearance of the building.
8. I note that those living in the converted winding house wish to have convenient access to storage for garden furniture to use in the outside area overlooking the slipway. However, no alternative solution has been put forward, and even if it had, the harm that I have identified to the significant locally listed building is such that the development is contrary to Policy 16 of Hull Local Plan 2007, the objective of which is to avoid harm to the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets and, contrary to the approach to design and heritage matters set out in paragraphs 124, 127, 130, 184, 190 and 197 of the Framework.

Living Conditions

9. A footpath runs between the former winding house and the housing closest to the single storey extension. The ground floor addition to the side elevation brings it closer to one of the ground floor windows at no 77 Ha'penny Bridge Way. However, this window is fitted with obscure glazing, as are the other ground floor windows. Therefore, the occupants are unlikely to actively look out over the footpath. Even if they do, as the Winding House itself, already acts as a visual barrier, the low height of the side extension, together with the distance between it and the window, means the development, the subject of the appeal, does not appear overly dominant or overbearing. Consequently, it does not have an adverse impact on the living conditions, of the occupants with specific reference to outlook. Therefore, the development is not contrary to Policy 14 of the LP.

Conclusion

10. I am aware of the lack of objections other than from the Council's Conservation Officer. I have found that the proposed development does not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of 77 Ha'penny Bridge Way. However, the development has a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locally listed building. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR