



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/22/3298164

53 Southern Drive, Kingston-Upon-Hull HU4 6TS

- 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 Stuart Davill against the decision of Kingston-Upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01755/FULL, dated 28 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extension to provide Kitchen, Dining and Utility on Ground Floor. First Floor bedroom extensions with relocated Bathroom to the front. 2nd Floor Extension within the roof space including 2 dormer windows.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I am obliged to use the description of the proposal that was included on the planning application form, and I have done this above albeit I have also abbreviated terms which do not directly relate to the acts of development applied for.
3. Revised plans were submitted and considered by the Council during the planning application process. As part of this appeal, these have been provided and confirmed to be the latest plans by both parties therefore the appeal has been determined based on the revised plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Anlaby Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a 2-storey traditional semi-detached house, with a hipped roof. The house is located in the southern portion of the CA, and is bounded by playing field to the rear. Viewed from the front, Southern Drive is flanked by relatively well-preserved semi-detached houses of a similar age, size and appearance, with regular spacing and hipped roofs. The uniform alignment of houses and their proximity to the footpath provides an element of enclosure to the wide, tree-lined street however this is moderated by the hipped roof designs that reduce the overall mass of houses and better reveal surrounding trees and the sky. To the rear, there is less consistency in the size and appearance of houses in this area, with some having been extended at ground

- and first floor, including the neighbouring houses either side of the appeal site, though the main original hipped roof form of most houses can still be observed.
6. The significance of this part of the CA therefore, insofar as it relates to this appeal, derives from the consistency in the size, layout and appearance of houses, including the symmetry typically maintained between attached pairs at the front, and the prevailing spacious and 'green' suburban character of the area. The house at the appeal site contributes to the significance of the CA as part of the original pair, with the roofs of both maintaining their original form.
 7. Dormer extensions to the side and rear can be found sparingly in different forms throughout the CA, and the appellant has drawn attention to these in their appeal. Whilst each case must be considered on its own merits, I have had regard to other examples of dormer extensions both presented to me and observed on site when considering the character and appearance of the CA. Dormer extensions are not a defining characteristic of this part of the CA and, of those that do exist, there is little consistency in their positioning, size, design or materials. Notable existing examples typically detract from the prevailing characteristics of the CA as described above and, in this context, the original form of the roof of the dwelling at the appeal site is of greater significance to the CA.
 8. The proposed side dormer would occupy a significant proportion of the side facing roof slope. The side dormer would feature a hipped roof design and materials matching those of the main roof, however its size would not be subordinate to the roof. Viewed from the front, the dormer would add bulk to the roof level of the dwelling and unbalance the pair of houses. In the street scene it would appear as an incongruous feature, eroding the sense of space and rhythm of the roofscape, and so would further detract from the prevailing characteristics of the CA.
 9. Whilst the proposed rear dormer would not be seen from the front, the rear elevations of Southern Drive are still visible in views from the playing fields beyond rear gardens. The rear dormer would introduce a tall gable end at roof level, out of keeping with the largely harmonious roofscape. It would also not be subordinate to the roof and, in combination with the side dormer, would appear over dominant and top heavy, contrary to the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'SPD1: Designing a House Extension'.
 10. In relation to the main issue, and with regard to s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would therefore not comply with policy 16 of the Hull Local Plan 2016 to 2032, adopted November 2017 ('the Local Plan'), which reflects this statutory duty. The proposal would also be contrary to policies 14, 15 and 22 of the Local Plan, which amongst other requirements seek to ensure house extensions are well related to the existing building and developments respect the context of the surrounding area and promote local distinctiveness.
 11. With respect to policy 16 of the Local Plan and paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework, less than substantial harm would be caused to the significance of the CA which is a designated heritage asset. The appellant has drawn attention to the benefits of the scheme to their family in terms of increasing communal and bedroom space. However, these factors have very

limited weight and do not amount to sufficient public benefits necessary to outweigh the identified harm caused to the significance of the CA.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR