



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2023

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/23/3314953

199 Hall Road, Hull, East Yorkshire HU6 8SG

- 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 Alan Watson against the decision of Kingston-Upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01018/FULL, dated 27 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is off street parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. As part of my assessment of the appeal, I have had regard to the description of the proposal on the Council's decision notice which reflects details on the proposed block plan ('Drawing No 1') and states 'Installation of dropped kerb to the East of the front garden (7.30m maximum length) and hard standing area in the front garden (12.00m maximum width x 12.40m maximum length)'.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area. Dwellings in the area are often served by front gardens that are enclosed by low boundary treatments. Many of dwellings on Hall Road do not have private off-road parking and there is on-street layby parking to either side of this road.
5. Grass verges with mature trees line Hall Road and the other neighbouring roads which lead to a grassed central roundabout. The grass verges on Hall Road widen towards the junction with the roundabout. The semi-detached pair of dwellings at No 199 Hall Road and No 411 Greenwood have front gardens which are grassed and include hedgerows to their boundaries. The prominence of these gardens together with the grass verges in the vicinity of the roundabout help to soften the streetscape and provide for a pleasant suburban character.
6. The vehicle access would dissect the widened section of grass verge close to the junction with the roundabout. In addition, and as a direct consequence of facilitating vehicular access to the front of the host dwelling, the front lawn

would be surfaced with gravel. Vehicles parked within this area would be visible to passers-by over the low boundary treatments and this would draw further attention to this aspect of the proposals. All these factors would combine to unacceptably diminish the soft landscaped attributes of the street scene at this prominent corner location.

7. I conclude, the development would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, the proposal conflicts with the design and character requirements of Policies 14 (Design) and Policy 28 (Classified Road Network) of the Hull Local Plan (2017).

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to other instances in the area where grass verge has been removed to provide access for parking. However, none are identical to the prominent corner position the proposals before me. In any case, where grass verge has been removed to provide vehicular access and parking areas have been provided, this has sometimes resulted in expanses of hard surfacing. This is not necessarily a positive aspect of the street scene which should be repeated. Therefore, having regard to the particular circumstances of the case before me, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be acceptable.
9. The appellant suggests that being able to park within their property would reduce the risk of crime and would reduce congestion. However, there is no objective evidence before me to suggest that there is a significant security risk in the area or that on-street parking in the area is causing highway safety issues. Even if no parking bays would be affected, the proposal was not in any case refused on the basis of an unacceptable impact on parking provision and I find no reason to conclude differently on that particular matter. In the circumstances, I do not find that these matters outweigh the clear harm identified under the main issue.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR