



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3244139

11 Woodhouse Crescent, Sheffield S20 1AT

- 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 Miss Aldred against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03135/FUL, dated 27 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "two storey side extension with rear dormer."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 11 is a two-storey end of terrace house. The site forms a prominent corner plot at the junction with Woodhouse Crescent and Fern Avenue. The terrace is formed of three properties which are set back from the highway with a private garden to the rear. The appeal property has a front facing gable projection which sits forward of the terrace. Within the local area are a mix of property styles including bungalows, semi-detached and terraced properties.
5. Guideline 2 of the Designing House Extensions: Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan (SPG) provides guidance for extensions. It states that extensions shall not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality. In order to achieve this, the roof design should reflect that of the host property.
6. The existing property has a hipped roof. I note that the proposal has been amended to include a half hip/ half gable roof, however the proposed roof form would not reflect that of the host dwelling. The proposed roof would draw the eye and would contrast awkwardly with the existing roof form and would result in an unsympathetic addition.

7. The extension would also not respect the proportions of the existing house because it would have a width of 5 metres which is slightly less than the width of the existing dwelling. The proposed development would be clearly visible from the highway given the sites corner plot and because of its scale and massing. Accordingly, the design and built form would result in a prominent, unsympathetic addition which would be inconsistent with the simple architectural style of the host building.
8. Within the local area are numerous examples of similar terraces which display a strong character. Terrace No. 11-15 and No. 5-9, on the opposite side of Fern Avenue, are symmetrical. Like the appeal property, No. 9 has a large gap to the side. The gap to the side of these terraces makes a positive contribution to the character of the area as it provides a sense of openness. The erosion of the gap to the side of the appeal property would be harmful because it is a distinctive feature of the surrounding area.
9. Fern Avenue also has a strong pattern of built development; the semi-detached bungalows are equally spaced around a semi-circle. The dominant extension would not reflect the arrangement of the existing dwellings within Fern Avenue as it would sit forward of the building line.
10. Although there are different types of dwellings within Woodhouse Crescent, hipped roofs are a key feature of the surrounding area. The proposed roof form would detract from both the character of the terrace and wider area. As a result, the proposal would compromise the character of both Woodhouse Crescent and Fern Avenue on account of the design, siting, scale and massing of the extension which would appear at odds with the carefully planned established pattern of development.
11. I noted on my site visit that No. 2 Woodhouse Crescent had a recently constructed side extension. Although the extension is wide, a large gap remains to the side of the property. The development also results in the appearance of a terraced row similar to the appeal site. As a result, this extension does not appear dominant within the street scene.
12. The appellant has referred to approved planning applications which they consider are like the scheme proposed and are located on streets similar to Woodhouse Crescent. However, information, such as the addresses or drawings have not been provided, so I cannot make a direct comparison between the appeal scheme and these approvals.
13. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), the SPG and the National Planning Policy Framework. These Policies seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design and to ensure that extensions respond to the original building and local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR