



---

## 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/19/3233974**

**3 Haugh Lane, Sheffield S11 9SA**

- 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 Tom Lee against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
  - The application Ref 19/01851/FUL, dated 17 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2019.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey front extension, erection of a single-storey side/rear extension, and alterations to ground floor windows on side elevation to form bay windows (amended description 17/07/2019).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey front extension, erection of a single-storey side/rear extension, and alterations to ground floor windows on side elevation to form bay windows (amended description 17/07/2019) at 3 Haugh Lane, Sheffield S11 9SA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01851/FUL, dated 17 May 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: Plans and Section Drawing No 01 and Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing No 02 Revision D.
  - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

### Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has confirmed that an amended description was agreed with the Council following amendments to the proposals during the application. The description given on the decision notice accurately reflects the plans before me and I have therefore used this description within my decision.
3. It is clear from the Council's decision and officer report that the Council's concerns relate solely to the proposed single-storey side/rear extension. From the evidence I have before me I see no reason to disagree. I have therefore confined my considerations to the proposed single-storey side/rear extension only.

## **Main Issue**

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

## **Reasons**

### *Character and Appearance*

5. The appeal building is a large detached house located within a residential area. It is positioned on a corner and is prominent from both Haugh Lane and Hooper Road. Properties within the area are generally large detached or semi-detached houses with some variation of style.
6. The proposed flat roof single storey extension would replace an existing double garage which has both a flat and a hipped roof section. A wall links the garage to the main house giving the impression of a continuous built form. The proposed extension would create a stronger horizontal emphasis than the existing built form and the flat roof would be visible from Haugh Lane. However, I do not consider that this arrangement would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area.
7. The proposed extension would appear subservient in scale to the host property and would ensure that the vertical emphasis of the original house is maintained. It has been agreed between the appellant and Council that a detached garage and side extension could be erected as permitted development with a gap between the garage and extension. The Council's preference is for such a gap and I do recognise that this would break up the built form. However, the proposed plans before me show that the façade facing Haugh Lane would not contain extensive areas of masonry, due to the garage door and window. Overall, in my view, the proposals would not detract from the character and appearance of the host property.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development 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 and 2 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.

### *Other Matters*

9. Although the proposals would be larger than the existing garage, due to the height of the proposed development and flat roof form, the proposals would not result in any significant loss of light to the windows at No 1 Haugh Lane. Ownership issues, such as any encroachment over a boundary, are a private matter between the relevant parties and not within my jurisdiction. I have no substantive evidence to show that there would be any damage to the neighbouring property, associated infrastructure or the trees, hedge or plants

within its boundary. Moreover, any damage caused to any other property during construction would be a private matter between the parties involved.

10. I saw the 2 mature trees close to the boundary with 18 Hoover Road which did not appear to have been referred to in the application. I have no substantive evidence to suggest that these trees are protected, and no evidence has been put before me either way as to whether the trees would survive the development work or not. In any event, my conclusions on the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area are not dependent on the retention of the trees.

### **Conditions**

11. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Although the application form states the proposed use of matching masonry and render, the plans have been amended since the submission of the original application form and the plans before me state only brick to match. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have therefore imposed a condition requiring the external materials used in the construction of the proposals match those of the existing building.

### **Conclusion**

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

*Robert Walker*

INSPECTOR