



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22ND June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/22/3297907

77 Salisbury Street, Hull HU5 3DU

- 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 Sewell against the decision of Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01601/FULL dated 15 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed dormer roof conversion.
-

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 conservation area and the host property.

Reasons

3. The site is within a predominantly residential area within the Ella Street Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
4. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
5. Neither party have provided any substantive details relating to the significance of the conservation area however during my site visit I noted that the area was characterised by predominantly traditional terraced two-storey properties, with two storey outriggers to the rear forming a harmonious built form. Each block of terraced properties share similar features and materials.
6. The proposed development located to the rear of the property would be visible to the surrounding properties and those using the access between Ella Street and Victoria Avenue.
7. The Council document SPD1: Designing a House Extension (the SPD1) confirms that dormer extensions should be subordinate to the roof and materials should be harmonised with those of the existing roof.

8. Due to the size, siting and design the proposal would introduce a prominent and unbalanced form of development in the immediate area. The use of PVC cedar effect cladding would also introduce an unsympathetic material to the area. The proposed dormer would be out of proportion with the existing roof, appearing as a dominant and alien feature within the immediate area.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would diminish the character and appearance of the conservation area and the host property. There is conflict with Policies 14, 15, 16 and 22 of the Hull Local Plan 2016 to 2032 (2007) which seek to, amongst other things, support high quality development, preserve or enhance a conservation area and be well related to the main dwelling and respect the context of the area in general. There is also conflict with the SPD1.
10. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR