
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2022

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/22/3307091

29 Welton Road, Brough, East Riding of Yorkshire HU15 1DR

- 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 David Skinner against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01722/PLF, dated 20 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey, first floor and single storey extensions to rear and alterations to existing roof including construction of dormer to rear and roof lights to front to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's notice of decision, also referred to by the appellant in the appeal form, as it more accurately describes the proposals than that contained on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and the area, with particular regard to the design of the proposed roof alterations.

Reasons

4. No. 29 Welton Road is a semi-detached dwelling that has already been extended to its side and rear elevations, surrounded by existing residential development. The existing two-storey side extension features a matching hipped roof to the main part of the property, and because of its set back from the rear elevation, it also has a lower ridge height.
5. The adjoining property, No.31, has a similar two storey side extension with a hipped roof, and although there is some tall planting to the front of No.31, the pair of semi-detached properties have a balanced appearance. Both properties are set further forward than the properties to the lefthand side (No.25 and 27 Welton Road) and owing to a curve in Welton Road, the side elevation of No.29 is prominent in the streetscene.

6. Whilst there is some variety in roof styles in the locality, including both hipped and gabled roofs, in this immediate area hipped roofs are more prevalent on this type of semi-detached property.
7. The proposed roof change from hip to gable would increase the mass of the roof, and would fundamentally alter the form and appearance of the property, and significantly increase the length of its roof ridge. This, together with the introduction of the substantially different rendered gabled end, would not respect the appearance of the host property or that of its attached neighbour and would significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, damaging their relative symmetry.
8. The new gable end and roof form would be particularly noticeable from Welton Road, from both front and side viewpoints where it would appear as an incongruous addition in the streetscene.
9. The proposed dormer window by virtue of its bulky size and scale would appear as a top-heavy addition in comparison to the existing hipped roofed property. This, along with its poor fenestration, which does not reflect that on the rear elevation of the property, will be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and the area. Although the proposed dormer window would not be highly visible from Welton Road or from Haven Avenue, this does not justify its poor design.
10. The design of the relatively small flat roofed first floor extension to the rear does not strictly adhere to the pitched roof design of No. 29. However, due to its limited size and location on the rear elevation, I find this aspect of the proposal to be acceptable. Moreover, the rear single storey flat roofed extension would be of a modest scale and would be similar to the extension on the rear of No. 31. It is also noteworthy that the Council raised no concern in respect of this part of the proposal.
11. To conclude, whilst I find part of the proposal to be acceptable, it does not appear to be severable from the parts of the proposal where I have found harm. Taken as a whole, I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and the area, contrary to the requirements of Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012 – 2029, Strategy Document, adopted April 2016, which amongst other things, requires development proposals to safeguard and respect the character and appearance of the area and create a sense of place. For similar reasons I also find the proposal to conflict with paragraphs 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and Policy C1 of the National Design Guide which requires new development to be well-designed and respond to surrounding context, and the Council's Design Guidance for House Extensions - A Guide for Home Owners on How to get Planning Permission, which requires extensions to follow the form of the host property.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to two examples of other gabled extensions to hipped roofed semi-detached properties that have either been built or approved. I do not find these to be directly comparable to this appeal site for varying reasons including; their different size and scale; one example refers to a single storey property with a lower roof height; they have not

already been extended to their side elevations; and their different relationship with the surrounding roads and built form particularly as they are less prominent in the street scene than the appeal site. These examples do not therefore outweigh the harm identified above or the conflict with the development plan and the Framework.

13. The appellant has also indicated No. 24 Welton Road on the opposite side of the road, has a large side extension that is visible from both its front and side elevations, which he considers is comparable to the appeal proposal. Although this property has a wider side extension than that at the appeal site, it features a matching hipped roof form with a lower eaves and ridge height. This extension has unbalanced the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties of which it forms part and does not lead me to reach a different conclusion to that which I have reached. It is thus not comparable to the proposal before me.
14. It is noted that there have been no local objections to the proposal, however, this is a neutral and does not alter my conclusions.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other considerations which indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR