



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/20/3251486
18 Fentonville Street, Sheffield S11 8BB

- 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 S Mughal against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04599/FUL, dated 31 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and the effect of the development on the living conditions of the existing occupiers of the appeal dwelling with regard to private amenity space and neighbouring properties with regard to overshadowing.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a traditional two storey end of terrace dwelling located in an area generally characterised by traditional properties of a similar style and design. The existing dwelling has a pitched roof.
4. The proposed two storey rear extension would have a flat roof. Whilst it would be positioned at the rear of the existing dwelling, the location of the host dwelling means that views of it would be prominent from Fentonville Street. I do not consider that the design and appearance of the extension would be sympathetic to or in keeping with the traditional character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The scale of the proposed extension serves to emphasise the incongruous nature of the flat roofed design proposed. The proposal would appear as a dominant and obtrusive form of development in relation to the existing dwelling.
5. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, it would also adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building. It is therefore contrary to policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield UDP (1998) (the UDP), policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and the guidance given in the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and the National Planning Policy

Framework (the Framework) which collectively, amongst other matters seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design and materials, and the scale and form of extensions should respect or complement those of the host dwelling.

Effect on living conditions

6. The proposal would be located to the rear of the property, in what is effectively a rear yard area. It would leave approximately 15 sqm of garden area, which is considerably below the requirements of the SPG and would leave an unacceptable level of private garden space, leading to poor living conditions for the occupants of the existing property contrary to Guideline 4 of the SPG.
7. In addition, the projection of the proposed extension would lead to an unacceptable loss of light to the rear elevation of Number 21 Croydon Street, given the passage of the sun throughout the day. The relationship between Numbers 8 and 10 Fentonville Street and Number 21 means that natural light to the rear elevation of that property is at a premium, and the erection of the proposed extension would undoubtedly lead to a loss of light to Number 21, creating an overbearing impact on the living conditions of the occupiers.
8. As a result, I find that the proposals are contrary to Policy H14 of the UDP, Guideline 5 of the SPG and Paragraph 127 of the Framework, which, amongst other matters, expect that development shall not deprive residents of light or cause a serious loss of garden space.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the appellant's desire to extend the house to better meet their future needs as a family, including the potential for accommodating additional family members. However, personal circumstances such as these rarely outweigh general planning matters because the effect of the development would remain long after the personal circumstances no longer apply. I have therefore given these matters only limited weight.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions nearby and the inconsistency of the Council in making their planning decision. I have not been provided with any evidence relating to the circumstances in which these extensions were permitted. As such, I cannot conclude with any certainty on the age of the extensions, whether or not the same policies were in place or whether the Council has been inconsistent in its approach. This factor therefore carries limited weight in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR