



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 February 2021

by Robert Walker BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3264373

25 Highfield Lane, Sheffield S13 9NA

- 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 Mark Buckley against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02828/FUL, dated 20 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear/side extension to dwelling house and a single-storey front extension to the garage (Resubmission of planning application number 20/00963/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of the development has not changed. However, the wording from the Council's decision notice has been entered rather than that from the application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the Council's decision notice which more accurately describes the full extent of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension to the garage on the street scene within Highfield Lane.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling in a row of houses in a mixed residential and commercial area. Although there is some variation in the design of houses, there is a strongly defined front building line, broken occasionally by porches and canopies.
5. The existing garage at the appeal property is single storey with a pitched roof and positioned such that it aligns with the front building line of the row of houses. The proposed extension to the garage would breach this building line and, due to its close proximity, would be a prominent feature from the footway despite the fencing.
6. Although small in scale and with matching materials, the flat roof form would appear a discordant feature, extending from the pitched roof garage with the single large door opening below both elements. This juxtaposition between the

- contrasting roof forms would result in an incongruous addition to the street scene.
7. Whilst the area is a busy area with a mixed character including large commercial premises and the harm would be small, due to the scale of development, this does not set a precedent for a proposal that would, in itself, be detrimental to the street scene.
 8. The Council have previously granted consent for the extension to the dwelling referred to in the description of development. I too consider it to be an appropriate addition to the property. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified from the proposed garage extension to the street scene within this part of Highfield Lane.
 9. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension to the garage would have a harmful effect on the street scene within this part of Highfield Lane. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), Guideline 1 and 2 of the Council's Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Amongst other things, these aim to ensure that development positively contributes to the character of the area through good design, appropriate siting and scale.
 10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR