



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/17/3180832
198 Gleadless Road, Sheffield, S2 3AF

- 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 Miss Petra Joy against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01104/FUL, dated 14 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey side/front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey side/front extension at 198 Gleadless Road, Sheffield, S2 3AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/01104/FUL, dated 14 March 2017, 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: Drawing 1 of 1, dated February 2017.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of Gleadless Road.

Reasons

3. No 198 is an end terraced property in a short block of four modern houses on the south side of Gleadless Road. The property has a stone finish, in common with other properties within the immediate area. The Council notes that Gleadless Road has no one overriding character as it is a major road into and out of the city, and as a result the properties differ significantly in size and architectural style. It has a mix of semi-detached and terraced dwellings, as have the surrounding streets. The appeal property has mainly two-storey dwellings around it, with some bungalows to the east and south. The terrace of which it is a part is split into two pairs of houses with a slight drop in height between the two, reflecting the sloping nature of the topography.

4. No 198 has a front porch and a lean-to shed to the side. Nos 196 and 194, the neighbouring semi-detached houses, are set parallel to the road whereas the terrace containing the appeal property is set at a slight angle. For this reason, the plot at No 198 narrows from the north to the south such that there is a large gap between the house and its boundary with No 196 at the front of the plot, but a narrower gap to the rear. Nos 196 and 194 are also set at a slightly lower level than the appeal property.
5. The proposed extension would be constructed to the side of the house, adjacent to the boundary with No 196. Because of the narrowing plot, the extension would have a stepped-in design to follow the boundary, and it would extend forward of the existing front elevation by the same amount as the porch, which is around 1.4 metres. There would be a wrap-around hipped roof to the front of the extension.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (SPG) indicates that extensions to the front of a house, other than porches, should be designed in such a way that they continue any tradition of building types or features that are heavily characteristic of an area. However, they may still be unacceptable if they are out of character with other houses in the street, destroy the rhythm of a row or group of houses, or project so far that they become overbearing.
7. In the context of the wider area, there are no building types or features that are heavily characteristic. The appeal property is an end-terraced house which appears effectively as two pairs of houses with a break in levels between. Moreover, there is a break in the building line between the terrace and the neighbouring semi-detached houses to the west, by virtue of the change in angle of construction. Finally, whilst there are few porches in the vicinity, it is not an uncommon feature, and the proposed extension at No 198 would mirror its porch in terms of scale, general design and materials.
8. The Council contends that the extension would result in a multi-staggered front elevation which is considered to lead to a disjointed and awkward design that would exacerbate harm caused by the existing porch and, in combination, unreasonably detract from the character and rhythm of the row of dwellings, and the street's built form. Whilst there are no other examples of dwellings with such an extension in the vicinity, equally there are no other dwellings with the same combination of slope, building line, and relationship to neighbouring dwellings. In this case, chiefly by virtue of the effects of the slope and breaks in building line, I do not consider that there is a clearly established rhythm to the dwellings in the row or in the wider vicinity, nor an established character to the street's built form. Moreover, the extension would arguably be more in keeping with the host property than the existing lean-to shed at the side, and it would reflect the design, scale and materials of the existing porch.
9. For the above reasons and on balance, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of Gleadless Road where there is no established tradition of building types or features, and where there is no clear rhythm to the character or appearance of the area around the appeal property. It would not, therefore, conflict with Policy H14 of the City's Unitary Development Plan, which requires that new buildings and extensions are well designed and in scale and character with neighbouring buildings, nor with guidance in the SPG.

Conditions

10. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR