



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 August 2021

by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/W/21/3275694

36 Anson Road, Kingston Upon Hull HU9 4SN

- 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 Steve Pickering of Steve Pickering Ltd against the decision of Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00173/FULL, dated 30 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey dwelling with single storey element to the rear. Dwelling stepped back from the existing dwelling by 100mm to the front with the eaves and ridgeline running through.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the planning application, amended plans were submitted. The Council has confirmed that it determined the application on these revised plans and these are also what I have based my decision on.
3. Following the submission of the appeal a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. The main parties have been given the opportunity to comment. I have taken the new Framework and any comments thereon into account in my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on highway safety with particular regard to parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is the side garden of 36 Anson Road, a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The appeal site lies within a residential area of mainly semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings. The dwellings have a relatively consistent design, plot size and general alignment within the street scene, resulting in a strong visual rhythm and a homogenous appearance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. A grassed verge interspersed with trees lies in between the road and pavement and this also contributes positively to the area's character and appearance.

6. The size and design of the proposed dwelling would be generally consistent with those in the surrounding area, in particular having observed that 34 and 36 Anson Road now have two windows at first floor level, which is different to what is shown on the submitted plans, similar to the proposed development. The proposed development would reduce the gap between numbers 36 and 38. However, the remaining gap would not be significantly different when compared to other properties in the area.
7. The proposed development would result in a terrace of three properties. The resulting building would be inconsistent with the prevailing appearance of the surrounding area, which is characterised by pairs of semi-detached properties and terraces comprising four and six dwellings. The proposed dwelling would therefore disrupt the symmetry and visual rhythm of the area and as a result would appear as an incongruous feature that would not relate well to, or integrate with, its surroundings.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy 14 of the Local Plan¹, which requires the design of development to support the delivery of a high quality environment with regard to the relationship between the development and the surrounding built form. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the Framework and the advice in the Hull Residential Design Guide (the Design Guide) relating to context and character.
9. The Council has referred to a conflict with Policy 21 of the Local Plan in its first reason for refusal on its decision notice. This policy sets out the expectations regarding Building for Life principles, density and accessible and adaptable dwellings. It is not clear from the evidence before me as to why the Council considers there to be a conflict with this policy. Based on the evidence presented, I am not in a position to conclude whether the proposed development would represent a conflict with Policy 21 of the Local Plan.
10. Refusal reason number two of the Council's decision notice makes reference to a conflict with Policy 14 of the Local Plan due to the increased pressure for on-street parking, to the detriment of the amenity of the area. Although there is some use made of on-street parking in the area, the potential increase in demand that may be generated by the proposed development would not materially alter this to the extent that it would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such I find no conflict with Policy 14 of the Local Plan in this regard.

Highway Safety

11. Anson Road is a circular road serving a residential development. There does not appear to be any parking restrictions in the vicinity of the appeal site. The dwellings on Anson Road in the vicinity of the appeal site have a mix of on-street and on-site parking provision. The Council states that two on-site parking spaces would be required. One on-site parking space is proposed.
12. The development plan allows for some flexibility in the number of parking spaces in certain circumstances. Policy 32 of the Local Plan makes reference to the standards being applied flexibly to take account of matters such as the

¹ Hull Local Plan 2016 to 2032, adopted 2017

accessibility of the development and the availability of, and opportunities for, public transport.

13. I observed the parking situation on Anson Road and other streets in the vicinity of the appeal site on a weekday morning. Whilst this was only a snapshot in time, there is no evidence to suggest that it was not representative of the general parking situation in the area. From my observations and the evidence before me there is some reliance on on-street parking. Although there were a number of cars parked on Anson Road and in the nearby Leander Road there remained unused on-street parking capacity. Whilst there is demand for on-street parking within the vicinity of the appeal site, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that existing on-street parking causes significant harm to highway safety.
14. The appeal site is located within a reasonable walking distance of a small parade of shops and hot food takeaways on Barham Road/Marfleet Lane to the north. There are also a number of bus stops within reasonable walking distance. Occupiers of the proposed development would have transport modes available to them other than the private car and would not necessarily have to rely on a car for day to day requirements.
15. Consequently, I conclude that, even if there were to be some increase in traffic arising from the proposed development, this would not exacerbate on-street parking to the extent that there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. I therefore find no conflict with Policy 32 of the Local Plan in terms of parking provision.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy 14 of the Local Plan, the design objectives of the Framework and the advice in the Design Guide in this respect.
17. I have found that the proposed development would not cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety due to a lack of parking provision, nor would it cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area due to increased pressure for on-street parking. These are neutral factors and do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
18. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, and for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR