



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2024

by L N Hughes BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/24/3336364

45 Ark Royal, Bilton, Kingston Upon Hull, HU11 4BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Procter against the decision of Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02749/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of dormer window extension to the front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached bungalow, with hardstanding to the front and side, and a rear detached garage and garden. It lies within a suburban residential estate of almost entirely semi-detached bungalows and 2 storey dwellings. Opposite the site there is also a short cul-de-sac of terraced bungalow blocks, and a retirement housing complex in linked single and 2 storey blocks.
4. The area's overall character is cohesive and uniform, primarily due to the limited colour variation of the bricks and tiles, the dwelling forms, and the layout and building line set back. Front boundaries are low level, and with very limited vegetation of a height to interrupt this built form.
5. The proposal is for front and rear dormer windows, clad in white uPVC horizontal board cladding, with white uPVC windows and a flat GRP roof. To the rear, this would match the materials and height of the conjoined property's rear dormer. The existing and proposed dormers would meet along the party line, but with the appeal dormer being slightly less deep.
6. The front roofscapes along Ark Royal are consistent and unbroken. Several incorporate front solar panels, including the conjoined dwelling, but these are flat to the roof pitch and so are relatively unobtrusive. The proposed front dormer would project outwards and therefore would be out of character and unduly prominent within the streetscene.

7. Moreover, the existing roof materials within the street are brown interlocking concrete tiles. The proposed white cladding would be particularly untoward and jarring within this cohesive context.
8. The appellant identifies a few other front dormers nearby, but none are present along Ark Royal within the same streetscene. Furthermore, the Council identifies that these either did not gain permission, or were consented under a different policy regime over 20 years ago, and I therefore find that they do not set a strong precedent. The housing complex opposite does have a dormer projection, but this is set within a very different overall building form.
9. Similarly, the rear dormer on the conjoined dwelling is also over 20 years old and did not originally gain consent. Its large size and white cladding does not blend well with the host roofscape, creating a dominant appearance. Its presence therefore does not justify creating an additionally dominant matching dormer.
10. The plans identify that 'planning is not required for rear dormer', an inference that it could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, the Council identifies that the proposed materials would not meet permitted development requirements. The proposal before me is for planning permission for the front and rear as a package of works, and the evidence does not identify what would be achievable as permitted development. I therefore give this potential fallback only very minimal weight in favour of the proposal, and so this does not outweigh the harm.
11. Overall therefore, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies 14 and 22 of the Hull Local Plan 2016 to 2032 (2017), which together and amongst matters, require development to support a high quality environment with regard to the relationship with its surrounding built form, and for extensions to not over-dominate the property, be well related in terms of size, siting, materials, and detailing, and to respect the context of the surrounding area.
12. It would also conflict with the SPD1: Designing a House Extension (2016), which requires that dormers should be subordinate to the roof, with a height and length kept to a minimum including not exceeding more than one third of the roof's face area, and with harmonising materials. It would additionally conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) paragraph 135, which requires developments to be visually attractive, and sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

L N Hughes

INSPECTOR