



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/20/3246509

5 Cemetery Avenue, Sheffield S11 8NT

- 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 Andrew Graham of Smart Property against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03966/FUL, dated 29 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development is described as: 'Demolition of existing front dormer window and replacement with new pitched dormer window, plus new internal partitions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I had the benefit of seeing the scheme in place, as the front dormer was substantially complete. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Andrew Graham against Sheffield City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The host property is a mid-terraced house on a residential tree lined street. The houses along Cemetery Avenue are generally of similar design and appearance with the majority of properties having brick elevations, slate roofs, stone cills and lintels, set behind low brick walls with stone coping forming modest front gardens. Currently a high proportion of properties on Cemetery Avenue have dormer windows on the front roof slopes, varying in design and size. This makes for a distinctive feature of the street scene, as they are in a location and of sufficient number to have a material effect on the character and appearance of the street on which the appeal property is located.
6. In contrast to the existing distinctive pattern of other dormers in the street, the front dormer subject of this appeal at No 5 appears excessive in its bulk and massing. The opening in the front of the dormer is modest when compared to

the entire structure, thus resulting in the formation of excessive cheeks either side of the window, with a notable gable above. It is noted that the adjoining house to the right of the appeal site when viewing No 5 from the street does not have a front dormer, which I consider accentuates the misgivings in the appearance of the appeal scheme.

7. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to other dormers in the street in his submission. I acknowledge the list of 13no. approved applications in Appendix B of the submission. However, whilst noting the presence of the front dormers at these properties, relatively little detail, has been provided regarding the particular planning background to these schemes. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between this development and the case before me cannot be drawn except insofar as I was able to observe and assess the sites at my visit.
8. I note that majority of the dormers present in the street do not appear as bulky as the appeal scheme, and so contribute to a much more sympathetic pattern of extensions to the houses. In any event, the fact that apparently similar dormers may exist is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own particular merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the front dormer unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. This is contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 (UDP), Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy 2009, Guidelines 1, 2 and 3 of the Council's Designing House Extensions UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance. As a result, the proposal would also be contrary to the requirements of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. There is reference in the Officer Report to a Grade II* Listed historic park and garden in the vicinity of the site. The Council has not cited this as part of its reason for refusal and have not indicated any harm to its setting in its Officer Report or Questionnaire. I have little reason to disagree with the Council's observations on this matter. However, as I am dismissing the appeal in any event, I have not needed to consider this matter further.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the development is contrary to the development plan when taken as a whole, and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. It is also at odds with the requirements of the Framework.
12. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR