
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3262082

23 Ringstead Avenue, Sheffield S10 5SL

- 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 Lucy Cherrett against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01904/FUL, dated 9 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of three storey side extension including attic conversion and front and rear dormers.
-

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. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the planning application form, the proposal was amended during the planning application process. It is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the description offered by both the Council and appellant of *"Demolition of single-storey side/rear extension, erection of two-storey side extension including integral front store, single-storey rear extension, alterations and extension to roof to form additional living accommodation, provision of rear dormer window and raised terrace to rear of dwellinghouse"* in the decision notice and respective appeal forms more accurately describes the appeal. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I, given it does not appear to be in dispute between the parties.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof. To the side is an attached, single storey garage which is typical of houses

on Ringstead Avenue. The semi-detached properties in the area are therefore linked at ground floor level, although some have been extended to the side at first-floor level.

6. The Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance document (the SPG) advises that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area and not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality.
7. The side extension would add substantial mass to the dwelling at first floor level. Despite the presence of ground floor garages and alterations to other houses, this would create a terracing effect in the street scene due to the existing first floor extension of No.21. While other properties on Ringstead Avenue have been extended at first floor level, from my observations there did not appear to be any instances of adjoining first floor extensions on this street. I note there are examples of terracing in the submitted photographs from the wider area, but they do not represent the predominant character of the area and are not necessarily examples of good design to follow. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area, despite not being within a Conservation Area.
8. I acknowledge that the amended plans propose a hipped roof, which would conform with part of Guideline 2 of the SPG. This states buildings with hipped roofs should have the roof of any two-storey extension continue this feature. Additionally, the guidance does not require a setback from a front elevation or set down from the main ridge line of a property.
9. However, in this instance, despite being a more complementary roof form to that of the host building than others in the same street, this would not lessen the harm caused by the terracing effect I have identified. While I acknowledge the flat roof of the adjoining dwelling and others in Ringstead Avenue are not consistent with the advice in the SPG, these appear to be of some age. Moreover, while I have been provided with a list of approved extensions which are contrary to guidance in the SPG, none of these are on the same street as the appeal property and I am not aware of circumstances that led to their approval. Regardless, any perceived inconsistency in applying the guidance does not mean harm in this case should be allowed.
10. With this in mind, and to conclude on the main issue, the proposed two-storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. It would therefore be in conflict with Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan, Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy and advice in the SPG. These require that extensions are well designed and would be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings.

Other matters

11. I acknowledge the reason for the extension is to provide additional living space for the appellant's family. However, these are personal circumstances which can change over time. As such, this private benefit carries limited weight.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR