The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/16/3157207
21 Glenorchy Road, Sheffield, S7 2EL

- 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 Abdul Raheem against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
- The application Ref 16/01695/FUL, dated 1 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2016.
- The development proposed is a two storey side / single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The dwelling is one of a pair of very symmetrical semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs. It is situated on the corner of Glenorchy and Bannerdale Road which gives it a prominent position in the street-scene. The side extension would be wide and flush with the original front elevation. In addition, the roof would be a gable instead of a hip. The combination of these factors would result in an extension which would look too big and disproportionate to the original building and it would spoil the existing symmetry of the pair. The resultant building would thereby look incongruous and obtrusive within the street-scene. I note that there are some other similar extensions nearby but they do not justify further harm.

4. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan, 1998, and Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): *Designing House Extensions*, which, in combination, indicate that extensions should be in scale and character with existing and neighbouring dwellings and should not detract from the general appearance of the street. It would also conflict with Paragraph 60 the National Planning Policy Framework which says that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Living Conditions

5. The two storey extension would project a very small amount beyond the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling on Glenorchy Road and therefore it would not be overbearing or enclosing on the outlook from this property. The 2-storey element would also be set away from the adjoining semi, 123 Bannerdale Road and therefore I consider that it would have no significant detrimental effect upon it.

6. However, the property is at an angle to the adjacent house on Glenorchy Road. This orientation would result in the proposed rear bedroom window facing the rear garden only a very short distance from the side boundary. This would result in an unacceptable degree of close and direct overlooking of the neighbouring back garden.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed 2-storey extension would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling. Consequently, I find conflict with UDP Policy H14 and the Council's SPD which seek to protect privacy.

Other Matters

8. I appreciate that the appellant has a family of 5 and that medical issues require one of his children to have his own room. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR