



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3248093

52 Westwick Crescent, Greenhill, Sheffield S8 7DH

- 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 E Bishop against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03733/FUL, dated 9 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as proposed 2 storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The postcode provided on the application form is incorrect, so I have taken the postcode, in the banner heading above, from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form.
4. The Council raised no objection to the revised single storey rear extension, and I see no reason to take a different view. The appellant has not specifically requested that a split decision is issued granting planning permission for the rear extension in the event that the two-storey side extension is considered unacceptable. Given that, and the fact that it appears these elements are not clearly severable, I have not considered that option and have assessed the appeal based on the main element in dispute which is the proposed two-storey side extension.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey property located in a residential area. The property is set back from the highway behind a low boundary wall and mature hedge. To the side of the property is a driveway.

7. Within the surrounding area are a mix of two-storey properties and bungalows which mainly have hipped roofs. There are land level differences within the street scene with the appeal site sitting lower than the highway. Properties on the opposite side of Westwick Crescent are set much higher than the appeal site and properties to the west sit lower.
8. The Designing House Extensions: Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan (SPG) provides guidance for extensions. It states that extensions to dwellings should not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality. The SPG highlights that two-storey extensions, to hipped roof dwellings, should also have a hipped roof. Whilst the Council has not referred to the SPG in their reason for refusal, it is clear from the Officer's Report that they considered that the proposal would not comply with it.
9. The host property has a hipped roof. The proposed side extension would be the same height as the existing dwelling and would have a gable roof. The appellant asserts that due to the level difference between the appeal property and the adjoining property, No. 54, the existing roofline is split which results in a visually unbalanced roof and a partially exposed gable between the properties. Whilst the step in the roof does result in a slightly disjointed appearance, the dwellings were clearly designed to be symmetrical with hipped roofs to the outer sides. The proposed gable roof would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. As the appeal property sits higher than No. 54, it is naturally more dominant. The land level difference would therefore exacerbate the lack of symmetry.
10. The extension would not be set back from the front elevation and would only be marginally set in from the boundary. The Council highlights that in order to ensure extensions appear subservient, and to prevent terracing, a set back from the front elevation or gap to the side boundary is normally required. The potential for a terracing effect forms part of the assessment and scale and design are also important factors.
11. No. 50 currently has a single storey garage adjacent to the common boundary, therefore the gap between the two properties has already been impacted. However, No. 50's garage is significantly less prominent than the proposed extension. The proposal would fill almost all of the gap to the side of the appeal dwelling. The development would not appear subservient to the appeal property because of a combination of the roof design and lack of step back. Additionally, given the overall size and scale of the proposal, the development would result in a prominent addition. The design and built form would be inconsistent with the simple architectural style of the host building and wider area.
12. Within Westwick Crescent there are variances in terms of roof form and property types. Nevertheless, semi-detached properties were clearly designed to be a symmetrical pair with hipped roofs and gaps to the side, which creates a strong rhythm. Although some of the gaps between properties have been altered over time, gaps to the side boundaries are still a key, and positive, characteristic of the area.
13. Properties within the local area have been extended in various ways and there are examples of similar two-storey side extensions. These examples demonstrate that such prominent extensions do alter the symmetry between

the pair of semi-detached properties and result in a sense of enclosure, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. These examples do not justify a further erosion of the character of the street scene that would arise from the appeal proposal. Accordingly, as a result of its siting, scale and massing the extension would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

14. The appellant has stated that if the appeal is not successful then they would, under permitted development, carry out a hip to gable enlargement in conjunction with converting the existing loft. They would then submit a further application for a two-storey side extension with a gabled roof, as proposed. The permitted development option would be much less intrusive than the proposal, and any further application would require assessment on its merits. I therefore attach limited weight to the fallback position.
15. For these reasons, I find that the proposed two-storey extension would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework: Core Strategy (2009), Policies BE5 and H14 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 which does not detract from the host building or the general appearance of the street or locality.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. 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.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR