



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2022

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/22/3299556

28 Riversdale Road, HULL, HU6 7EZ

- 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 and Mrs Ben Walton against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01661/FULL, dated 29 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Riversdale Road.

Reasons

3. No 28 is a semi-detached house situated on the southern side of Riversdale Road. There is a wide driveway to the side of the house and the proposed side extension would extend a little over 4 metres across the driveway to the boundary with No 26. The extension would continue the front elevation of the existing house and would be set approximately 1 metre back from the main rear elevation. It would have a hipped roof to match that of the existing building, which would be set down from the main ridge by a small amount. At ground-floor level it would be a drive-through with open ends, while at first-floor level it would accommodate an additional bedroom.
4. Policy 14 of the Hull Local Plan (LP) indicates that development should demonstrate how its design supports the delivery of a high quality environment, particularly with regard to the relationship between the development and the surrounding built form in terms of character, scale, massing, grain, architectural structure and enclosure, and detailing and materials. Policy 22 indicates that house extensions should be designed to minimise their impact on the surrounding area. The design should not over-dominate or unduly enclose the property itself; should be subordinate to the main dwelling; should be well related to the existing building in terms of size, siting, materials and detailing; and should respect the context of the surrounding area.

5. The Council's SPD 1 on Designing a House Extension (SPD) indicates that an extension should be of a size and design respecting the existing building and the surrounding street scene. It should be subordinate in size to the existing building, and should respect the character of the street by maintaining regular spacing between buildings. Side extensions should be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling and have a ridge level lower than the main ridge to prevent a terracing effect and protect the character of the existing street.
6. The Council contends that the proposed two storey side extension, due to its width, scale and siting would form an over dominant addition and would not be subordinate to the host dwelling. On this basis, the proposal would be out of context with its surroundings.
7. The appellants contend that the proposal has been designed to harmonise with the original property and to respect the character of the surrounding area. Moreover, it is contended that the extension sits comfortably on the property. The appellants also note the existence of other two-storey side extensions at properties along the road.
8. The proposed extension would represent around a 70% increase in width over that of the existing house. It would not be set back from the main front elevation. Whilst it would largely match the design and materials of the current house, and the roof would be set down from the main ridge by a small amount, by virtue of its overall scale and prominence in the street-scene, it would appear dominant in the context of the existing dwelling, and would not appear subordinate to it. Furthermore, by extending to the boundary with the neighbouring No 26, it would open up the possibility of a terracing effect should No 26 wish to construct a similar extension. On this basis, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property itself and its immediate surroundings.
9. The appellant makes note of similar side extensions at Nos 4, 10 and 12 Riversdale Road. I note these examples and a small number of other examples along the road. I have no background details of these, but it would seem that most were constructed well in the past. Moreover, these are not so numerous as to affect the main character of the road, which is of largely semi-detached houses having spaces between the pairs. From my visit, I consider that the limited number of other examples of two-storey side extensions along the road are generally unattractive and/or unsympathetic in design, and harmful to the character and appearance of the street. On this basis, I find that such cases should not be seen as acceptable precedents for the current proposal at No 28.
10. Finally, I note that the proposed window in the front elevation of the side extension would not reflect the design and proportion of the existing windows in the house, and this would add to the harm to the appearance of the host property and the street scene, albeit by a small amount.
11. In conclusion, I find that the proposal, by virtue of its scale and appearance in the context of the host property and the street scene, would be harmful to the character and appearance of Riversdale Road. It would, therefore conflict with Policies 14 and 22 of the LP, and with guidance in the SPD.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR