



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019 by S Witherley BA, PGDiP, PGDiP, Cert CIH, Assoc RTPI

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/19/3225858

62 Linaker Road, Sheffield, S6 5DT

- 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 and Mrs Loftus against the decision of the Sheffield City Council.
 - The application, Ref 18/04718/FUL¹, dated 13 December 2018, was refused by notice 13 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the removal of existing lean-to extension, construction of two storey side and single storey rear extension with associated landscape works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 62 is located on the north side of Linaker Road at the junction with Robertson Road. As a result of the streets topography along with the property locating a corner plot, the dwelling sits proud and appears prominent from various locations in the streetscape. The property is set opposite and perpendicular to other corner properties, all of which are set back at the front and side from the highway providing a spacious feeling between the properties and the highway at this junction.
5. No. 62 is two-storey, semi-detached, rendered with partial brick detailing and hipped roof. Upon the front elevation are distinctive floor to eaves bay windows. There is currently a single storey porch to the flank wall which is set back from the front elevation. It is proposed to demolish this and erect a two-storey side extension across the flank wall and out beyond the rear elevation with a single storey rear extension. An existing brick wall with hedging surrounds the property to the front and side.

¹ Formerly PP-07490285.

6. The proposal would be set back slightly from the main elevation and down from the ridge of the original hipped roof. It would fill the majority of the gap between the existing dwelling and the side boundary adjacent to the highway. The design of the proposal shows a dual pitched roof with a prominent gable end overlooking the side with a water table detailing constructed from the same bricks used throughout the main construction. Upon the front elevation there would be two long narrow windows inserted at ground floor level and a similar one inserted at first floor. The two-storey side extension would, however, have a roof profile resulting in a dual-pitch roof with an end gable that would not harmonise with the original hipped as a result of its style and form. Given the properties prominent location the roof would appear as a dominant and incongruous addition to no. 62. The roof form along with the window profile on the front elevation and proposed materials used thought-out would not relate well to the original property.
7. The appellant considers that the extension would not be prominent as a result of the area's topography and boundary treatments within the street scene. However, due to the corner location and the prominence in the streetscape this presents, the proposal, as a result of its design, bulk and form, would appear as a highly prominent and incongruous addition. Alongside this, the loss of the existing open area between the side wall of the property and the highway would have an equally unacceptable effect on the appearance of the street scene. The proposal would be at odds with design guidance found in the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance - *Designing House Extensions Guidelines 1,2 and 3*.
8. Reference has been made to several other developments in the area although the Council considers some of these are historic or not best practice. Whilst other developments exist, this is not a strong enough justification to permit visually harmful development in this location.
9. The proposed extension, due to its incongruous roof profile, general prominence, window profile and use of materials would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, the scheme would conflict with Policy CS74 within the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), and saved Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), and design guidance found in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR