
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/19/3236947
9 Hollow Gate, Sheffield S35 1TZ

- 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 Mrs Hannah Grady against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01455/FUL, dated 24 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 1 storey extension, internal alterations & new dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed 1 storey extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the internal alterations & new dormer window at 9 Hollow Gate, Sheffield S35 1TZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01455/FUL, dated 24 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 insofar as they relate to the internal alterations & new dormer window only: Location Plan, Block Plan, Drawing No. 19.16.01 Existing and Proposed Floor Plans, Drawing No. 19.16.02 Proposed Elevations, Drawing No. 19.16.03 Existing Elevations.

Procedural Matter

3. 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.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene within Hollow Gate.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is a stone built semi-detached property located within a predominantly residential area characterised by a variety in the design of houses. It is located on a relatively busy road and in addition to the residential properties there are some commercial activities. The appeal property has a modest, simple appearance when viewed from Hollow Gate. Moreover, it maintains some balance with the attached neighbouring property, despite differences such as the neighbouring property's front porch.
6. The Council's officer report and decision notice confirms that the dormer window to the rear is not a matter of contention for the main parties. No other party has commented on this aspect of the proposal either. I also consider that it would be an appropriate addition to the house and, located on the rear roof slope, would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It is evident from the plans that are before me that this aspect of the appeal scheme is clearly severable, both physically and functionally from the proposed ground floor extension.
7. Turning to the remainder of the development, the proposed single storey extension would result in a hipped roof form which would project from the side of the property forward of the front building line. Individually, the proposed porch would be similar in appearance to the porch at the attached neighbouring property, although I recognise that there are some differences. However, in tying into the proposed porch, the extension would wrap around the original property and create a somewhat awkward arrangement. The combination of which would fail to harmonise with the simple character of this property.
8. I have been referred to examples of forward projections on other stone-built properties within the area, including one at No 7 Hollow Gate, where the extension is built forward of the building line up to the footway. However, none of the examples of forward projections that I saw wrapped around the original host property to the front and side to the extent demonstrated at the appeal site. It is because of the relatively modest proportions and simple character of the property, when viewed from Hollow Gate, that the proposed single storey extension would, in my view, appear incongruous. This would, ultimately, result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene within Hollow Gate.
9. I note that the appellant has made changes to their scheme following discussions with the Council with the view to finding a solution. I recognise the amendments made improve the appearance of the scheme. However, the projection forward of the front building line and roof form wrapping around the original host property and tying into the proposed porch, is retained. It is this aspect that I consider to be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene within Hollow Gate. As such the amendments made do not alter or outweigh the harm I have identified.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed single storey extension would be contrary to Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted March 1998. This policy, amongst other things, aims to ensure that development positively contributes to the character of the area through good design, appropriate siting and scale. It would also conflict with Guideline 1, 2 and 3 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance which has similar objectives. Policy H14 of the UDP is consistent with the

provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and can therefore be given substantial weight.

Other Matters

11. I recognise that extending the property might meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation, would help renovate the property, create a small private courtyard and allow increased views to the woodland to the rear. 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 single storey extension to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene within Hollow Gate.
12. Concerns regarding the processing of the application, including matters relating to communication and timeframes are not issues that I can assess as part of this appeal. The validity or not of such matters does not affect the planning merits or effects of the proposals before me.

Conclusion and Conditions

13. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the internal alterations and new dormer window, but dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey extension.
14. In respect of the internal alterations and new dormer window I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR