
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/17/3170924

71 Dalewood Road, Beauchief, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S8 0EE

- 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 Basharat Khan against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04021/FUL, dated 25 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area, and on the users of the footway (public footpath) next to the appeal site.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located in a prominent position at the junction of Dalewood Road and Folds Lane. The appeal property itself is located towards the rear of the site, with its side elevation nearest Dalewood Road, where it has a long site frontage. This boundary is defined by a hedgerow of a height of around 3 metres. Whilst the property is orientated at right angles to other properties on the same side as Dalewood Road, it does maintain a similar building line. The property is at a higher land level compared to the properties on the opposite side of the road.
 4. The property is also one of a pair of semi-detached properties with No 108 Folds Lane. No 108 has been extended with a two storey hipped roof side extension which projects to the front elevation and to the roof pitch of the original house.
 5. The proposal seeks to broadly follow the scale of the two storey extension on No 108. However, it would be considerably more prominent because of the closer proximity of the massing and height of its side elevation to the site frontage, and its higher land level compared to the properties on the opposite side of Dalewood Road. The prominence and scale of the proposal would also be emphasised because it would noticeably project in front of the building line,
-

and would be sited only approximately 1.5 m back from the hedge. Even when in leaf, the hedge would not provide adequate screening given the proposal's height. The proposal would therefore be overly prominent and appear out of keeping in the streetscene.

6. In contrast, the positioning of No 108 in relation to Folds Lane results in its extension projecting back from the site frontage along its side elevation. No 108 is also at lower land levels compared to the properties on the opposite side of Folds Lane. The appeal property and No 108 are viewed in streets which have a differing character and appearance, and therefore the proposal and No 108's extension would not result in the same effects.
7. The proposed 'juliet' balcony would be located in a prominent position at first floor level on the front elevation of the proposal nearest Dalewood Road. This is not a feature of other residential properties in the area and would add to the discordant effect of the proposal on the building and the area.
8. I conclude the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area, and would not comply with 'Saved' Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) (UDP) which requires that extensions are well designed, in scale and character with neighbouring buildings, and do not harm the character of the neighbourhood.
9. The proposal would also not comply with paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) because, whilst the planning system should not attempt to impose unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles, it would not promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposal would also not comply with the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance from the UDP because it would detract from the dwelling and the general appearance of the street and locality.

Users of the Footway

10. The footway on Dalewood Road is located directly adjacent to the hedgerow which forms the boundary with the appeal site. The proposal would clearly be noticeable to the users of the footway due to its proximity. However, this would be of limited duration due to the transient nature of the use of the footway and once the proposal is passed, it would not be apparent.
11. I therefore conclude the proposal would not be unduly overbearing in relation to users of the footway and in this regard would comply with 'Saved' Policy H14 of the UDP in respect of the effects on residents, and paragraph 17 of the Framework which seeks to maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. This does not though effect my conclusions that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Other Matters

12. I have taken into account that the proposal relates to a need for family accommodation, although such a benefit would be personal to the Appellant and I do not consider this justifies the proposal in light of the harm identified.
13. I also note comments made about the Council's approach to its planning advice, including in relation to an amended scheme, although this is not a

matter for me to comment on in the context of this appeal which I have determined on the basis of the proposal before me.

Conclusion

14. I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR