
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/17/3175016
333 Psalter Lane, Sheffield S11 8WA

- 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 Kevin Albertson against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04706/FUL, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is conversion and upgrade of existing basement to form new garden rooms and ancillary accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion and upgrade of existing basement to form new garden rooms and ancillary accommodation at 333 Psalter Lane, Sheffield S11 8WA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04706, dated 13 December 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 33PL:01/01, 33PL:01/02 and 33PL:01/04.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. 33PL:01/02 and 33PL:01/04.

Main Issue

2. The Council raises no objection to the principle of the proposed development. From what I have seen and read the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the host property and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The host property is a single bay stone mid terraced property which is located on Psalter Lane which lies within a Housing Area defined by Saved Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan adopted 1998 (UDP) where development should not harm the character of the neighbourhood. In common with the majority of the nearby terraced properties which face onto the busy road close to the intersection with Ecclesall Road South, the property has a

small pocket of land at its front. This is separated from the pavement by a low stone wall, which runs the length of the road, on which it is possible to see the remnants of sawn off metal railings.

4. Whilst the low stone wall provides an element of uniformity to the area, as in most residential areas there is a variety in how residents choose to look after the area of land at the front of the properties. I observed that some houses had established hedges, others railings on the low wall and others, like the host property simply retained a hard surface behind a wall.
5. The proposed development would require the excavation of the area to the front of the property. This would allow a flight of steps to be provided to access a door to be located in the position of the existing light well and to enable the construction of two windows. I have carefully considered the potential impact of the proposed door and two windows on the host property and the street scene by observing the front of the host property from a number of different locations. However, in doing so, I have been aware that the top of the door and windows would be no higher than the top of the existing light well. As a result of which I conclude that due to the narrow pavement and the topography of the area where Psalter Lane slopes towards the junction with Ecclesall Road South, and the houses on the east of the road are higher than those to the west, that the bulk of the proposed alterations would be barely visible, even in close proximity.
6. However, I do note that the proposed railings would be widely visible and that when viewed when walking down Psalter Lane the gated entrance would appear lower than the rest of the railings. Nonetheless, I conclude that this would not significantly harm the appearance of the host property and would have a very limited impact on the street scene which would not be harmful and would respect the existing appearance of the host property. As such, the proposed development would be consistent with Saved Policies H14 and BE5 of the UDP, and the design principles contained within Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy 2009.

Conditions

7. I have imposed the two standard conditions relating to the timing and plans. However, in the interest of maintaining the quality of the appearance of the area I have imposed a condition relating to the materials to be used in the development. Both parties were provided with the opportunity to comment on this condition, as such, no one should be prejudiced by its imposition.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR