
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/20/3258379
40 Wolfreton Road, Anlaby HU10 6QP

- 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 & Mrs Alexander Zaky & Gemma Nasr against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01685/PLF, dated 3 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is 'proposed two storey rear extension'.
-

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 the surrounding area, including the effect on the Forty Acre street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is within a residential area in Anlaby which is located to the west of Hull city centre. It comprises a two storey mid-terrace dwelling within a row of four properties facing onto Wolfreton Road.
4. The rear elevation and garden of the appeal dwelling and the adjoining properties in the row are readily visible from Forty Acre, a residential cul-de-sac to the north. To the south, when viewed from The Avenue, the rear elevations of all four dwellings in the row are partly screened by the vegetation and trees in the side garden of No 1 The Avenue.
5. The appeal dwelling together with Nos 38 and 42 all have single storey extensions to the rear. When viewed from Forty Acre, the difference in their form, materials and design creates a diverse character and appearance in the rear elevation at ground floor level. However, due to their single storey height the extensions appear as subordinate additions and the original form of the terraced row at first floor level has been retained. This incorporates distinctive features such as the centrally positioned gable shared between No 38 and the appeal dwelling which creates a degree of symmetry at first floor level, the catslide dormers on Nos 36 and 42, the compact windows under the eaves and the lower eaves level of Nos 36 and 42 at either end, creating a characterful appearance in the street scene when viewed from Forty Acre. The appeal

- dwelling has solar panels installed on the rear roof slope but these do not undermine or interfere with this character.
6. The existing ground floor conservatory to the rear of the appeal dwelling would be removed to accommodate the proposed extension. The ground floor element would be positioned between the extensions to the rear of Nos 38 and 42 and would not project beyond their rear walls. The appeal dwelling has a large rear garden and the extension would not appear cramped within the plot.
 7. However, the first-floor section would project above the adjoining extensions. Due to the combination of its width, height and flat roof form the first floor extension would appear as a cumbersome and bulky feature which would be unsympathetic to the pitched roof form of the existing dwelling. The lean-to roof on the ground floor would not break up the horizontal form of the flat roof at first floor level. The extension would also obscure the features which contribute to the symmetry and cohesive character in the rear elevation at first floor, in particular the first-floor window in the gable shared with No 38 and the two under the eaves windows. The eaves level would also be raised above the eaves of No 38 creating a discordant and jarring appearance.
 8. Due to its location to the rear of the dwelling, the extension would be largely screened from wider public vantage points on Wolfreton Road. However, when viewed from Forty Acre the proposal would appear bulky and unduly dominant and would harm the unity and cohesiveness of the terraced row which makes a positive contribution to the street scene.
 9. My conclusion in relation to the main issue in this case is that the proposed extension would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the street scene when viewed from Forty Acre. As such, it would be contrary to Policy ENV 1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (2016) (ERLP) which indicates that development should be of a high quality design, of an appropriate massing and height and which has regard to the characteristics of the site's wider context. The development would also be at odds with the provisions of the Framework that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that development should add to the overall quality of the area.
 10. I have considered that the options for extending the property are limited due to its layout and that the proposal would provide additional accommodation for the appellants' family. However, these are personal circumstances which can change over time and the development would remain long after such circumstances have ceased to be relevant. Accordingly, I do not consider that the personal circumstances in this case are sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and the conflict with Policy ENV 1 of the ERLP. The absence of objections from adjoining occupiers does not alter my conclusion in this regard.
 11. For the reasons outlined above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR