
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2020

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/19/3243935

Aldersyde, 317 Psalter Lane, Sheffield S11 8WA

- 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 Ms Lisa Lambert against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03054/FUL, dated 16 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to end terrace house.
-

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 surrounding area, with particular regard to the proportions of the first floor.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a triangular area of ground to the side of a two-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling with extended dual-pitched roof and dormer windows. The host dwelling, whilst altered, is characterised by vertical fenestration alignment on each of the three bays, with two protruding bay windows at ground level. Similar arrangements are replicated along the wider terrace, albeit of differing form and designs. These elements combine to create a strong rhythm, with elements of visual uniformity, along this section of Psalter Lane.
4. The proposal would result in a flat-roofed, first-floor extension with carport below. The proposed car port would create a void in the building frontage at ground floor level which, along with the absence of form at roof level, would contrast with the existing bay windows and traditional roof forms. When seen as a whole, these elements would have the effect of highlighting the horizontal proportions of the proposed first floor, significantly disrupting the existing vertical rhythms of the street frontage, despite the separation provided by the recessed stairwell. As a consequence, the proposal would create a discordant and disproportionate relationship with the host dwelling and the wider street scene, notwithstanding that the proposal contains appropriately proportioned windows, complementary materials and follows the existing building line.
5. Whilst the proposed extension has been designed to address the physical constraints of the appeal site and meet the appellants space requirements, I

find that the proposal would nonetheless cause harm. The appellant also considers the proposed extension is a contemporary and innovative design solution. I saw a number of contemporary built forms in the surrounding area, but the appeal site is visually distinct from these and instead relates directly to the existing terrace. The modern block of flats to the north is physically separated from the appeal site by a wooded embankment, and the functional design of the vacant car showroom to the south more readily relates to the adjacent neighbourhood centre and road junction. From the evidence provided to me, the appeal site lies outside the identified area of special character, such that the proposal does not conflict with policies BE17 and BE18 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Even so, this does not outweigh my above findings of harm.

6. I conclude that the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, with particular regard to the proportions of the first floor. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies BE5 and H14 of the UDP, policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy, guidelines 1 and 2 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance, and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together, these require high quality development that respects the distinctive features of the neighbourhood.

Other matters

7. I have not been provided with the full details of the previous permissions and refusals for extensions at the appeal site. In any case, I am required to assess the appeal on its merits. Although the proposal may improve housing stock in a sustainable urban location, this does not outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR