



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/20/3246649

108 Hangingwater Road, Sheffield, Yorkshire S11 7ES

- 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 Richard O'Jany against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03078/FUL, dated 16 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as removal of existing dormer and construction of new dormers to front and rear of property and fitting of new windows as shown on plans.
-

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 Council raised no objection to the proposed rear dormer and new windows. They considered that the rear dormer would be acceptable as it is located to the rear and less prominent than the front dormer, additionally there are other existing dormers to the rear of the terrace. The new windows would have a similar appearance to those existing and the proposed light well would also be acceptable in principle subject to imposition of a condition. The appellant has not specifically requested that a split decision is issued granting planning permission for those elements in the event that the front dormer 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 front dormer window.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 108 is a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling located within an urban area. Hangingwater Road is a tree lined street characterised by primarily terraced

properties. The properties are marginally set back from the highway behind low stone and brick walls. There are land level differences within Hangingwater Road with the appeal site sitting lower than properties to the south which results in the roof tops stepping down.

6. Guideline 2 of the Designing House Extensions: Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan (SPG) provides guidance for dormer windows. It states that dormer windows should not rise above the existing ridge line of a roof, nor dominate the roof plane on which they sit.
7. The proposed front dormer would not rise above the ridge line of the roof. However, it would be a prominent addition to the principal elevation because the dormer would occupy a large proportion of the roof plane. Due to its size and scale it would dominate the existing roof. The proposed dormer would therefore unbalance the proportions of the dwelling and would erode the character of No. 108. For these reasons, the front dormer would result in a discordant addition which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
8. In support of the appeal, the appellant has highlighted that there are examples of dormer windows within the vicinity of the site. Whilst I did see these dormers on my site visit, there are no front dormers within this terrace. Thus, dormer windows are not characteristic of the terrace. Within the terrace there are rooflights, but these are significantly more discreet than the proposed dormer. The introduction of a front dormer would interrupt the largely unbroken roofscape of the terrace. In any event, the dormers within the surrounding area demonstrate that dormer extensions alter the nature of roofscapes, to the detriment of the character of the area. Thus, the introduction of a large front dormer would be harmful to the terrace and surrounding area.
9. I note that the dormer window would create an additional bedroom and en suite. Similarly, the development would also involve repairing and insulating the roof. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified above.
10. For these reasons, I find that the proposed front dormer would harm 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

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

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. 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