



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2023

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/22/3309291

9 Albermarle Road, Keyingham HU12 9TE

- 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 Wilkinson against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02492/PLF, dated 28 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey rear extension and dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description above has been taken from the application form. During the consideration of the application, it is clear from both parties, the notice of decision and from the appeal form that the description was changed to omit the dormer window proposal. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host property, with particular regard to its design.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located within an established residential area containing both detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying sizes and styles, including single and two storey dwellings. The area is strongly characterised by pitched roof properties, including many dormer bungalows.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located next to a pair of semi-detached bungalows. It has already been extended on its rear side at two-storey level, with a flat roofed extension that extends across just less than half of the property's rear elevation and features an eaves height above that of the host property.
6. This extension is clearly part of the host property's appearance, but its limited size ensures that it is subservient to, and does not compete with the pitched roof characteristics of the host property or the semi of which it forms part. Moreover, its window designs are sympathetic to both the host property and its attached neighbour.

7. The appeal proposal would extend across the remainder of the rear elevation of the property and would be a similar height to the existing rear extension. Its design, with poor articulation of fenestration and the resultant solid to void ratio would not respect the appearance of the host property and would significantly unbalance the pair of properties when viewed from the rear. Furthermore, the proposed extension would more than double the size of an already discordant design element that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property.
8. Whilst there would be limited public views of the new extension, this is not a reason to justify poor design. Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is very clear that development, which is not well designed should be refused. Furthermore, the extension would be noticeable between buildings from St Philips Road and its bulky side elevation would be noticeable from Albermarle Road, from where its appearance would be in stark contrast to No.9's pitched roof and side gable. For these reasons, the design of the proposed extension would also be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. My attention has been drawn to the existence of flat roofs on properties nearby, including a car port and dormer window at the neighbouring property, No. 11 Albermarle Road. I acknowledge these flat roofs and those others on the front, sides and rear of properties in the surrounding area, and also on some single storey extensions. Many of these flat roofs appear part of the original design on some of the dormer bungalows, with other flat roofs being later additions to other properties. Apart from the appeal property, such flat roofs above single storey level are contained within existing roof slopes, and not as two storey extensions that project beyond the elevations of the surrounding properties. For these reasons, I find the other flat roofs in the surrounding area to be different to this appeal proposal and they do not justify the design in this case.
10. The appellant has stated that a pitched roof extension to the proposal alongside the existing flat roof would not appear sympathetic. I do not have any evidence before me to justify this including drawings but note that the Council in their report indicate that they would be supportive of a pitched roof design. Accordingly, I do not find this argument to change my findings.
11. To conclude, the flat roofed design of the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012 – 2029, Strategy Document, adopted April 2016, which amongst other things, requires extensions to be high quality and respect the character and appearance of the area. There would also be conflict with the design objectives of paragraph 130 of the Framework and Section C1 of the National Design Guide (NDG), which requires development to positively respond to the character of the surrounding built form.
12. The Council have referred to the proposal being contrary to Section C2 of the NDG, however I found that this part of the NDG is focussed upon heritage, culture and local history, and is not directly relevant to the determination of this appeal.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has stated that an extension of the existing flat roof will be cost effective and beneficial from a future maintenance perspective and have less impact than a pitched roof upon neighbouring occupiers. I have not been provided with evidence to substantiate these matters and therefore attach limited weight to them in my overall assessment.
14. The appellant has advised that the original submission was for a three-storey extension to the rear of the property, which was subsequently altered to this two-storey proposal. Whilst that may be the case, I have determined the appeal proposal on its merits and this matter also 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