



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/22/3294409

46 Westwick, Hedon HU12 8HQ

- 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 Hurd against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03282/PLF, dated 27 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey extension to rear and construction of dormer window to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the Council's decision notice and as entered on the appeal form. This more accurately describes the proposal than that given in the application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No 44 Westwick (No 44) with particular reference to outlook and shadowing effects.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Many properties in the street have an additional floor in the roofspace. These are mostly served by rear dormers and front rooflights, with front roofslopes remaining unbroken. The appeal property is positioned in a prominent position at the end of the street and is a small semi-detached bungalow with a pitched roof and a gable end that has a balanced symmetry with the attached neighbouring bungalow. The pair's pitched roof creates a very distinctive three-dimensional form which is an important component of the building's character.
5. The proposed dormer would occupy a large proportion of the depth and width of the front roof slope of the appeal property, unbalancing the pair of bungalows. It would have a box like form, giving it a stark and discordant appearance on the front roof slope where such features are not a characteristic feature of the street.

6. The proposed rear extension would create a two-storey addition that would erode the distinctive gable. This would add significant bulk to the building's roof and rear elevation which would fail to harmonise with the distinctive simple and modest three-dimensional shape of the pair of bungalows. The symmetry of the roof pitch of the bungalow is an important feature and this would be visibly lost when viewed from the end of the street as well as from the rear in private views. The result would be an incongruous addition to the property.
7. There are a variety of scales of houses, extensions, and dormers within the street. However, none share the same combination of design features before me of a large front dormer and a two-storey addition to the rear of a semi-detached bungalow. As such, none are directly comparable to the proposal before me.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy ENV1 of the Council's Local Plan Strategy Document (2016) (LPSD), paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) and the provisions of the National Design Guide. These seek, amongst other things, design that has regard to the specific characteristics of the site's wider context and the character of the surrounding area.

Living conditions

9. As the extension would be to the east of No 44 there may be a small degree of shadowing from morning sunshine. However, the extension only projects out beyond the rear wall by 1.8m and subsequently for most of the day there would not be significant shadowing effects.
10. The extension would be prominent from the rear windows and the garden of No 44. However, it is a corner property with a long garden with trees to the rear and a park to the west. This combination results in a pleasant open aspect. In this context and given it would not project out significantly beyond the rear wall, the proposed extension would not unacceptably enclose this property.
11. The proposal would be a dominant addition that harmfully disrupts the character of the pair of bungalows altering the outlook from No 44. However, it would not appear oppressive in scale from No 44 and would not, overall, unacceptably harm the living conditions of its occupiers.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 44 with particular reference to outlook and shadowing effects. As such, I find no conflict with the requirements of Policy ENV1 of the LPSD or paragraph 130 of the Framework, insofar as they relate to this matter. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure good standards of living conditions for existing occupants.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR