
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 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/D/19/3231948

192 Priory Road, Kingston Upon Hull HU5 5RX

- 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 Hunt against the decision of Kingston-Upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00347/FULL, dated 29 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene and the effect on the proposed living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties in relation to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an end terrace house with a small passageway running between it and another terrace of housing. A vehicular access lies to the rear of the properties, the majority of which have ground floor extensions to the rear. Given the depth of the ground floor extensions at the neighbouring properties the Council raises no objection to the principle of the ground floor element of the proposal.
4. The flat roofed two storey element would extend the whole width of the house and project 5 m from the rear wall and would reach the eaves of the existing hipped roof. As such it would dominate the host property and would not appear subordinate to the main dwelling. Moreover, the use of a light render, in an area characterised by brick housing, rather than reducing the dominance of the extension would draw attention to it. As such, the appeal proposal would have a significantly adverse impact on the appearance of the host property and the wider area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy 22 of the Hull Local Plan adopted 2017, which remains broadly consistent with the provisions of the Framework.

Living conditions

5. The two-storey extension would be very close to the immediate neighbouring property's bedroom window. However, I note that direct views to the rear would be unaffected. Nonetheless, due to the proximity of the wall it would be highly visible from within the bedroom, with a significant adverse impact on views from the room leading to an oppressive outlook. However, it would not adversely affect impact on the living conditions of other first floor rooms in properties which are further away. I am also aware that no objections have been made by those living at no 190 Priory Road. However, in determining the appeal, I must consider the impact on future occupants.
6. Moreover, due to the scale of the proposed extension and its imposing nature, it would appear overbearing when sat out, or playing in the private outdoor space at the rear of the neighbouring properties.
7. Consequently, as a result of the oppressive outlook from the bedroom at no 190, and the overbearing nature of the proposed development when viewed from the rear gardens, or outdoor space, in the immediate vicinity, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 22 of the LP, the objective of which is to minimise the impact of developments on the amenity of those living nearby and within the surrounding area.

Other matters

8. I have been referred to examples, elsewhere within the Unitary Authority, where two storey flat roofed extensions have been permitted. However, I am aware that they were not so deep as the development before me. Moreover, I do not have details of the specific circumstances, and in any case, I must consider the appeal before me on the basis of the individual merits of the case.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR