



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3262442

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 Nick Morris (Smart Property) against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02629/FUL, dated 5 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2020.
 - The development is described as retention and alterations to previously installed front dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the retention and alterations to previously installed front dormer extension at 5 Cemetery Avenue, Sheffield S11 8NT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02629/FUL dated 5 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 018061-AAD-01-ZZ-DR-A-0002-04 Proposed Plans elevation and section.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Nick Morris against Sheffield City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terrace property in a predominately residential area. The properties on Cemetery Avenue are of a similar design and appearance and many have front facing dormers of the roof slope that vary in design and size.
5. The appeal property has a front dormer construction and seeks to modify the design of the front dormer to be more in keeping with a number of dormers on Cemetery Avenue.

6. A previous application (19/03966/FUL) was refused and the subsequent appeal (APP/J4423/W/20/3246509) was dismissed as the design was felt to be bulky and unacceptably harmed the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As a result the design has been amended to widen the window of the dormer and replace the two window pane design with a third window in an attempt to be more consistent with the street scene as a whole and reduce the size of the cheeks of the dormer overall.
7. I find that from the revised plans, the cheeks of the dormer have been significantly reduced by the introduction of the widened window aperture and the introduction of a third window pane, and will appear similar in terms of size and design to a number of front dormers in the immediate area, including the dormer on the adjacent property.
8. The revised design will contribute to a much more sympathetic pattern of extensions to the properties and will harmonise with the window pattern of the existing property.
9. I note the evidence provided by the Council with regard to the design of dormers within the street scene, but I have to assess the appeal based on the merits of the individual scheme, and I do not have the full details of these other schemes, and my observations of the appeal property and surrounding development are taken into consideration.
10. For the above reasons, I consider that the front dormer would be consistent with the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Therefore, it is in keeping with the design, character and appearance aims of Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), 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 and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

11. As the proposal would be part retrospective, I have included conditions in relation to the commencement of development and that the proposal should be constructed in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

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

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR