



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2020

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3259837

27 Sandygate Park Road, Sandygate, Sheffield S10 5TX

- 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 Mrs Rosemary Thomson against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01647/FUL, dated 20 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is car port to front of existing garage and new flat sedum roof over both structures. New front boundary wall. Repositioning of drive access point and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a car port to front of existing garage and new flat sedum roof over both structures. New front boundary wall. Repositioning of drive access point and associated works at 27 Sandygate Park Road, Sheffield S10 5TX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/01647/FUL, dated 20 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 446 - 01.

Main Issue

2. The alterations to the garage roof, vehicular access and new boundary wall did not feature in the reason for refusal, but as they are present on the proposal drawings, they form part of the application for which planning permission is sought. However, as there appears to be no dispute between the parties over those works and it also appears that planning permission has previously been granted for them (ref 20/00166/FUL), I shall confine my considerations to the proposed car port.
3. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the car port on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. Sandygate Park Road is characterised by detached houses set back from the street behind front gardens/forecourts. Whilst there is consistency in the depth of the front gardens/forecourts, there is variety in house types, size and design, including numerous projecting elements at the front such as gables,

porches, bay windows and garages, such that the houses do not share uniform frontages.

5. No 27 is typical of this character, comprising a two storey detached house with a prominent central gable feature and porch. A single garage is located to the side of the house, and as indicated, it appears that there is an extant planning permission to alter its form to a flat roof with a forward extension in line with the front porch.
6. The car port now proposed would project beyond the front porch, but not to any significant extent, particularly so given its modest footprint and the separation distance that would be maintained to the street. Moreover, owing to its low profile, open-fronted form and limited width, the car port would be a modest addition comparative to the two-storey host building. Overall, and mindful of the extant permission, the car port would not be an incongruous or unduly prominent feature and would have limited impact on the character of the host dwelling and the street scene.
7. I therefore conclude that the car port would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. Thus, it would not be contrary to the good design requirements of Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy 2009, and saved Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998. The proposal would also comply with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard.

Conditions

8. As suggested by the Council in the appeal Questionnaire, I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. There is no need for a materials condition as they are specified on the plans.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR