

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/19/3237385

14 Cockshutt Road, Sheffield S8 7DX

- 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 D Last against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01451/FUL, dated 23 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 01 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. No 14 is one of a pair of matching 2 storey semi-detached properties finished in render and stone, with feature bays at ground and first floor levels and hipped roofs. It has a single storey garage side extension set back from the front elevation. It is in a prominent and slightly elevated location opposite Cockshutt Avenue. The area is characterised by semi-detached and detached properties in repeating styles and materials, resulting in a consistent and harmonious street scene.
4. The proposal is a 2 storey side extension with a double dormer roof extension to the rear and a half-hipped roof. The side extension would be flush with the front elevation and it would have the same eaves and ridge height as the host property. The first floor window would not match the existing window openings in the front elevation in terms of size or alignment. The extension would not be subservient to, and it would overwhelm, its host. Consequently, the proposal would not respect the scale or form of the original building.
5. The proposal would not be in proportion with the adjoining semi-detached property, which has not been extended. Moreover, the half-hipped roof would be a bulky form of development that would be conspicuously different from the hipped roof form of the adjoining property. Notwithstanding the use of materials to match, the proposal would detract from the visual coherence and it would disrupt the balance of the pair of semi-detached properties.
6. No 14 is in an elevated position in the street relative to the neighbouring property, No 12. By virtue of its size, height, roof design and proximity, the proposal would appear overly large and dominant when viewed in juxtaposition

with the neighbouring property. Furthermore, it would disrupt the uniformity of the distinctive 2 storey hipped roofscape that provides the visual context for the appeal scheme. The visual impact of the proposal would be exacerbated by its prominent and elevated location adjacent to a road junction. It would appear discordant and visually obtrusive and it would not make a positive contribution to place making.

7. My attention has been drawn to extended properties elsewhere in the area. Although plans have been provided for some of these, and I observed others at the time of my visit, full details are not before me. However, they nevertheless appear to differ from the appeal scheme in a number of ways including in terms of the type of property, its location and surrounding context, the design of the extension and its relationship to the host property. On the basis of the information before me, I cannot be certain that any of them is directly comparable to the appeal proposal or that they would provide a justification for the scheme, which must in any case be considered on its own merits.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. It would conflict with the development plan, including Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan Adopted March 1998 and Policy CS74 of Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted March 2009. These require, among other things, that extensions should be well-designed and respect the original building and distinctive features of the area including townscape character and building styles. It would conflict with the design aims and guidance of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance Adopted July 1996. It would fail to accord with the Framework, including paragraph 127 which requires development to contribute to distinctive places and to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. The appellant's desire to extend his property and enhance the internal living accommodation is understandable. However, there is little before me to demonstrate that there are no alternative schemes that would not deliver similar benefits without conflict with the development plan.
10. I appreciate that there were no objections to the proposal from the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, there were no representations in support of the scheme either. The absence of objections is not therefore a matter which weighs in favour of the proposed development.
11. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers and there would be no impact on highways. However, these are requirements of the development plan and they are not benefits of the scheme.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR