



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2025

By S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/D/25/3363532

78, Wold Road, Kingston Upon Hull, East Yorkshire, HU5 5UW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr. K Koc against the decision of Hull City Council.
 - The application reference is 23/03374/FULL.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing hipped roof on main dwelling with new hipped roof (increase in existing ridge height from max. 7.4m to max. 8.15m high), erection of two storey extension to rear with hipped roof (max 4m long x 6m wide x max 8.15m high) and erection of single storey side extension (2m wide x 6.185m long x max 4.27m high) (Amended plans received).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Amended plans were submitted as part of the planning application submission. In this context, I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's refusal notice, rather than from the planning application form, as it more precisely describes the amended proposals that are before me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development upon i) the character and appearance of the area and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of No.80 Wold Road in respect of outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site falls within an established residential area. It is a corner plot on the junction of Wold Road and County Road South. The dwellinghouses in the area are predominantly two storey and of brick construction and with hipped roofs. The detached appeal property differs in terms of its design to the dwellings on the rest of Wold Road and is lower in height. It is proposed to raise the ridge height of the main roof of the house and to erect a two storey rear extension which would project about 4 metres from the original two storey rear wall of the property. A single storey and contiguous side extension is also proposed to dwelling and near to the existing detached garage.

5. I acknowledge that the existing dwelling is not as high as No. 80, Wold Road or indeed the other properties in this street. However, I do not find that the proposed increase in the ridge height of the appeal property, which incidentally would still be about 200 mm lower than that existing at No. 80 Wold Road would cause material harm to the way that the character and appearance of the street-scene is experienced by passers-by. Therefore, given the differing appearance of the appeal property relative to others in Wold Road including No. 80, I do not find that the taller proposed ridge height of the projecting gable would be unacceptable in overall design terms.
6. Notwithstanding the above, the rear of the property is highly visible from parts of County Road South. From this area, the rear of the dwellings in Wold Road can be seen. There is a design synergy to these properties in terms of mainly single storey rear additions. In this context, and, given the extent, height and massing of the proposed two storey rear extension, I find that it would fail to assimilate appropriately into the surrounding environment. Indeed, it would constitute a dominant and out of proportion addition when seen from County Road South. Its adversely dominant impact would be exacerbated owing to the fact that it would constitute an extension of the new roof which would be raised in height in relative terms.
7. While I find that the single storey side extension element of the proposal would be acceptable, I nonetheless conclude that the two storey rear extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would not constitute good design. In this regard, and when the proposal is considered as a whole, I conclude that it would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies 14 and 22 of the adopted 2017 Hull Local Plan 2016-2032 (LP) or with the Council's SPD 1: Designing a House Extension (SPD).

Living conditions

8. As part of my site visit, I was able to consider the effect of the development upon the occupiers of No. 80, Wold Road. Given the orientation of the two storey rear extension relative to the rear amenity space and windows of No. 80, Wold Road, there would likely be some overshadowing and hence loss of light caused in the early mornings. However, any such adverse impact would be constrained by the proposed limited depth of the proposed extension, and any such adverse effect would not occur throughout the whole of the day. For these reasons, I do not consider that any such loss of light to the occupiers of No. 80, Wold Road would be so significant as to warrant the dismissal of the appeal.
9. The proposed two storey rear extension would have a depth of approximately 4 metres from the rear elevation of the original dwelling and would be comparable in its depth to the single storey extension to the adjoining property. It would not be overlooked by any habitable window in the side elevation of the adjoining property and, by its limited depth, I do not find that its impact upon the outlook from No. 80, Wold Road would be unacceptably overbearing.
10. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that development would accord with the amenity requirements of policy 22 of the LP and the SPD.

Conclusion

While the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of No.80, Wold Road in respect of daylight and outlook, nonetheless, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. This adverse matter is not outweighed by other considerations. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR