



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/W/22/3294633

239-241 Hessle Road, Kingston Upon Hull HU3 4BB

- 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 Aesthetics4u against the decision of Kingston-Upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01568/FULL, dated 25 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is external alterations to building comprising alteration to shop front at 241, installation of wood effect cladding to front elevation at fascia level at 241, installation of UPVC timber effect cladding to front of 239 and 241, installation of UPVC timber effect cladding to part of side elevation of 239, rendering of remainder of side elevation of 239. (Retrospective application).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development subject of this appeal has been undertaken, with the exception of the rendering of part of the side elevation of No 239 Hessle Road. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hessle Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises part of a small row of three shops on a busy shopping street. It lies within, and near the edge of, the Hessle Road Conservation Area (CA). It appears to me that the CA is characterised by the vibrancy of its retail activities and several buildings with a high level of architectural detailing. Moreover, street trees and the attractive focal junction (Boulevard junction), where there is a monument, all contribute to the quality of the street environment. These elements all contribute to its significance as a CA, despite detractors such as the prevalence of roller shutters.
5. The appeal site is located on a corner and includes an entrance shop doorway which is angled at the corner. This corner position and its location near the edge of the CA means No 239-241 are prominent in the street.
6. The predominant materials within the CA are brickwork. From the evidence before me, even comparing with the previously rendered finish, the UPVC timber effect cladding has a distinctly artificial texture. Although the colour is

not striking, the contrast remains distinct particularly when viewed with the attached unit. Here, the height and depth of the fascia results in a bulky form, which in combination with the appearance of the material finish, results in an overall jarring composition with the adjoining building.

7. On the side of the appeal building at the first-floor level is a tiled street sign and I saw that these are commonly found throughout the CA. Rendering the side elevation would result in the loss of this element, eroding a distinctive historic feature of the host building.
8. Overall, despite the retention of window openings, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The harm would be localised along this part of the street. As such, the effects would be less than substantial in the context of paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In accordance with paragraph 202 I must balance that less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. I accept the investment made in renovating the property, utilising long lasting materials that can be maintained easily. However, despite the appellant aiming to improve the buildings appearance in the street, I have found harm. Heritage assets are irreplaceable, and these matters are not, individually or cumulatively, public benefits that outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of the CA.
10. Accordingly, there are no public benefits that outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA. The proposed development thus, conflicts with the requirements of Policies 14 and 16 of the Hull local Plan (2017) and the Framework. These are concerned with, amongst other things, the character and appearance of developments and, where relevant, developments within CA's.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR