



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/19/3233828

14 Atlantic Walk, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S8 7FY

- 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 Jim Woodhead against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01478/FUL, dated 16 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the alterations and extension to front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alterations and extension to front porch at 14 Atlantic Walk, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S8 7FY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01478/FUL, dated 16 April 2019, 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: Location Plans (Blackwell's), Ground Floor Existing, Ground Floor Proposed, Proposed Porch (Existing Elevations), Proposed Porch (Proposed Elevations) and Proposed Extension to Porch (Further Elevations).

Procedural Matter

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of the development has not changed. However, the wording from the Council's decision notice has been entered rather than that from the application form. 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 Council's decision notice for completeness because this description better describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a 2-storey house located within a row of terrace properties in a residential area. The house contains an existing lean-to porch with the roof extending to form a canopy over a second door. The adjacent property also contains a porch but with a hipped roof. Other houses within the terrace have mostly flat roof canopies above the entrance door. There is also a degree of variety within the terrace with some properties having a single door and others having a second door to the front. The terrace group faces towards an area of green open space where the group and the varying porches and canopies can all be clearly seen.
5. The proposed alterations would result in an increased size of porch to the front of the appeal building extending across most of the frontage. However, the roof structure exists already as a canopy and the gap under the bottom of the first-floor windows to the porch would remain. Moreover, the use of glazing as proposed would ensure that the porch does not dominate on the property or within the group. Overall the proposal would not appear as a significant increase in scale and massing from the existing porch and canopy structure.
6. I recognise that the resulting porch would appear different to other entrances within the terrace group. However, there is already variety within the group, and within the wider residential area, where porches of varying shapes and sizes exist. This variety is part of the character of the street scene, and the proposed porch would therefore not appear out of context.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed alterations and extension to the front porch would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan adopted March 1998 or Policy CS 74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy adopted March 2009. 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. I also find no conflict with Guidelines 1, 2 and 3 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions which has similar objectives and indicates that porches should complement the design of the house. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and, in particular, at paragraph 127, which broadly seeks to secure high quality design.

Conditions

8. The Council has not requested that any planning conditions be imposed. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR