



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 May 2021

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/21/3270779

18 Fishemore Avenue, Hessle HU13 9JS

- 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 Ms Simona Raducan against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04104/PLF, dated 7 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two-storey mid-terraced dwelling to the northern side of Fishemore Avenue. It is one of eight dwellings in the terrace, the majority of which have a canted bay window with a hipped roof over. The dwellings are arranged in handed pairs so the windows are also paired, with doors to the outer side. There is a separate, shorter terrace of five dwellings to the east and the terraces to the southern side of this part of the avenue are arranged in opposite groupings. Although several of the dwellings have been extended at the front, the canted ends to bays and hipped roofs have been maintained. These have not therefore diminished the rhythm created by the characteristics of the front projections to the dwellings. Taken together these features make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
4. The proposal is for a replacement squared bay and projecting porch. While the proposed porch would share some similarities with that found at 1 Fishemore Avenue, it would incorporate a lean-to roof, which would continue over the bay window. I appreciate that the appeal site is not situated within a conservation area and Policy ENV1 of the Council's Local Plan¹ does not require new development to imitate or replicate surrounding development. Nevertheless, the design of the proposed extension would be inharmonious with the characteristics of the existing projections found on the terraces to either side of this part of the avenue. The proposal would be highly visible within the street and would therefore stand out as a discordant feature that would be harmful to the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area.

¹ East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document - Adopted April 2016.

5. I have been referred to a potential alternative design approach to the proposed extension, based on that found at No 1. However, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that I determine this appeal on the basis of what was considered by the Council and on which interested people's views were sought. I also note that the additional accommodation provided would add to and improve the functionality of the appellant's dwelling, but this would not justify the harmful changes that the proposal would make to the character and appearance of this part of the avenue.
6. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Hence, the proposal would be in conflict with the aim of Policy ENV1 of the Council's Local Plan to achieve high quality design, particularly in respect of the specific characteristics of the site's wider context and the character of the surrounding area; and the design aims of paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR