

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2024

by G Dring BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MAUDE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/24/3340072

6 Parkland Crescent, Kingston Upon Hull HU7 3AR

- 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 Kristopher Larsen against the decision of Kingston-Upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03378/FULL.
 - The development proposed is new entrance to existing residential dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. This appeal relates to a development that is identified in the evidence as being retrospective. I did note that there was a porch structure at the appeal site during my site visit. However, works to reduce the depth of the porch following the Council's decision are referred to in the appellant's statement along with a discussion about a change to the materials proposed. Nevertheless, for the avoidance of doubt, the Council determined the application based on the submitted drawings and consequently so shall I.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the porch extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a modern two storey mid terrace property formed of buff brick walls. The terrace is simple in design but provides a uniformity that is coherent visually. In the surrounding area there are a mix of dwelling types including terraced properties of different designs, semi-detached and detached dwellings. The established palette of external wall materials in the vicinity of the appeal site includes buff brick, red brick and render.
5. Existing porches within the surrounding area include mainly flat, curved or pitched roof canopy style porches which are open at the sides and front. A flat roofed porch canopy is located above each neighbouring property within the host terrace. I noted enclosed porch structures in the surrounding area at 26/26A and 28 Woodheys Park and next door to the host terrace at 10 and 12 Parkland Crescent. These existing porches have limited separation to the front boundary but were all constructed in materials to match the host buildings to which they are attached. The consistency of design features and external materials contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. An enclosed porch formed of dark grey timber look horizontal cladding has been constructed at the appeal site. Whilst the development is single storey and set back from the edge of the road, its presence disrupts the existing pattern of built form and appears at odds with the uniformity of the host terrace. The dark grey timber look cladding does not reflect the materials used on the host dwelling or other dwellings within the surrounding area, resulting in a dominant feature which is out of keeping with the established built form. Whilst not located on a main through route, it is clearly visible to those travelling along Parkland Crescent.
7. It is not clear where the examples provided in the appellant's statement are located and how they relate to the context of the appeal site. Nevertheless, in the significant majority of those cases, the enclosed porches are constructed of materials which match that of the host building that they are attached to, or they appear to reflect the established palette of materials around them. In the case of the nearby example identified in photographs 54, 55, 56 and 57 where a grey porch is constructed in front of part of the existing garage door, I did not witness this in the surrounding area when I carried out my site visit. I am also not aware of the planning history of this particular site. I therefore attribute limited weight to this consideration.
8. Even if the porch was to be reduced in depth to 975mm, the materials on site, or as identified on the drawings, mean that it would appear as an incongruous feature that is harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. I note that revised materials are mentioned, however, the details of these are not before me. The development is therefore contrary to Policy 22 of the Hull Local Plan 2016 to 2032 Adopted November 2017 which seeks, amongst other things, that house extensions should be well related to the existing building in terms of size, siting, materials and detailing and to respect the context of the surrounding area.
9. The development is contrary to SPD1: Designing a House Extension (SPD1) which provides advice in relation to Policy 22 and states, amongst other things, that proposals for front extensions should use materials matching the existing building as closely as possible. Whilst SPD1 is not part of the development plan, it is a material consideration.

Other Matter

10. It is not disputed that the development does not benefit from permitted development rights due to its proximity to the road. The appellant states that the porch has been designed to ensure that part of the front garden area is retained, whilst providing the internal space required to meet their needs. However, such personal circumstances carry very little weight.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

G Dring
INSPECTOR