



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/19/3233851

16 Welbeck Road, Sheffield S6 5AY

- 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 Matthew Pennington against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01413/FUL, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with front dormer, new access to garage and steps to main door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application form.
3. It is clear from the Council's Decision and Officer Report that the Council's concern relates solely to the loft conversion with front dormer. From the evidence I have before me I see no reason to disagree. I have therefore confined my considerations to the proposed loft conversion with front dormer only.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene within Welbeck Road.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located within a predominantly residential area where there is a variety in the style and design of houses and roofs. The property and its attached neighbour are built in to the sloping ground so that they appear 3 storeys high when viewed from Welbeck Road and 2 storeys high to the rear.
6. The Council's Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan (SPG) says, in Guideline 2, that dormers should not dominate the roof slope and should not rise above the existing

ridgeline. The proposed dormer would occupy a large proportion of the depth and width of the front roof slope of the property and would rise slightly above the existing ridgeline, conflicting with that part of the Council's SPG.

7. The proposed dormer would have a box like form, giving it a stark and discordant appearance on the roof when viewed from both Fern Road and Welbeck Road. Although the existing property has an architectural simplicity, its scale and three-dimensional roof form relate to the attached neighbour. The proposed dormer would add significant bulk to the building's roof, increasing the overall height, albeit slightly, and would serve to unbalance the pair of dwellings.
8. Overall the dormer would appear as an over-sized, disproportionate and overly prominent feature on the front. The result would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene within Welbeck Road. This harm to the appearance of the host property would be exacerbated by the width and alignment of the windows within the dormer which would not relate well to those below.
9. There are examples of dormers on the front roof slopes within the street. However, they appear to be smaller dormers that occupy less of the roof space than the proposals ensuring that the original sloping three-dimensional roof form is still prevalent.
10. Therefore, the proposed front dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan adopted March 1998 and Guideline 2 of the SPG. Amongst other things these policies aim to ensure that development positively contributes to the character of the area through good design, appropriate siting and scale. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 127, which broadly seeks to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

11. I understand that the appellant was open to amend the proposals during the planning application process. However, this is not a matter for my consideration in this appeal and I am only able to make my decision taking into account the plans that were before the Council when they made their decision.
12. I recognise that extending the property might meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation and would allow views across the valley. I also accept that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties. However, these are not considerations that outweigh the harm that I have identified from the proposed dormer to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene within Welbeck Road.

Conclusion

13. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR