



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3262546 808 Ecclesall Road, Sheffield S11 8TD

- 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 Spartak Cullhaj against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02169/FUL, dated 27 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
 - The development is described as a proposed extension and alterations to existing dwelling. Two storey rear extension, rear dormer conversion. Front dormer conversion, reinstatement of bay window and alteration to window opening to form Juliet balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) The effect of the proposed front dormer upon the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area; and
 - ii) The effect of the proposed two-storey rear extension upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 810 Ecclesall Road (No 810), with particular reference to light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No 808 is a two-storey, mid terrace dwelling located within an urban area. The dormer would occupy a large proportion of the roof plane and due to its size and scale would unbalance the proportions of the host building. For these reasons, the front dormer would result in a discordant addition which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
4. The introduction of a front dormer would interrupt the largely unbroken roofscape of the terrace and would be clearly visible from public vantage points. The dormer would be at odds with the predominant architectural style and character of the terrace, and wider area, because it would be visually prominent and occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof. Thus, the introduction of a large front dormer would be harmful to the terrace and surrounding area.

5. Within the local area there are examples of dormer windows. However, in general these are smaller than the dormer proposed and in the main terraces have unbroken rooflines. The Council state that those dormer windows which are present in the vicinity are either historic or unauthorised and the appellant has not submitted any evidence to demonstrate otherwise. In any event, the dormers within the surrounding area demonstrate that dormer extensions alter the nature of roofscapes, to the detriment of the character of the area.
6. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) (UDP) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) which collectively seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design which respects the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would also not comply with the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') which require development to be sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

7. The current single storey rear extension of the appeal property is located close to No 810's rear windows. The proposed rear extension would result in an increase in massing at first floor level which would be adjacent to the common boundary shared with No 810.
8. No 810 has two windows on the original rear elevation and two windows which face the appeal site which would be in close proximity to the extension. No 810 is situated to the south of the appeal site. Given the situation of No 810 relative to the appeal proposal, the existing single storey rear extension and the position of the sun, the proposal would not reduce levels of light to an extent that would materially reduce light reaching habitable rooms of No 810. Consequently, the habitable rooms of No 810 would still receive adequate daylight and sunlight and the scheme would not result in unreasonable overshadowing.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposed two-storey rear extension would not have an unacceptable effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of No 810, with particular reference to light. Accordingly, in this regard, it would not conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the UDP and Policy CS74 of the CS which collectively seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that new development respects neighbouring amenity. It would also comply the SPG and the Framework which requires new development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Other Considerations

10. The appellant has stated that they would accept a split decision. Whilst not stated in the reasons for refusal, it is clear from the Officer's Report that the Council considered that particularly the rear balcony element of the rear extension would overlook 806 Ecclesall Road (No 806), harming occupiers' privacy.
11. Therefore, even though I have not found any harm in respect of occupiers on the other side, I cannot be certain that harmful effects would not arise to the living conditions of occupiers of No 806. On the basis of the evidence before me it is not certain that any such adverse effects could be satisfactorily overcome

by a planning condition, including the Council's suggestion for mitigation in the form of privacy screens. Consequently, it is not appropriate to issue a split decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR