
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by S Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/ 3263675

1 Twickenham Glade, Halfway, Sheffield, S20 4HY

- 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 Glenys Torry against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02656/FUL, dated 8 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2020
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension for a porch/w/c.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension for a porch/w/c at 1 Twickenham Glade, Halfway, Sheffield, S20 4HY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02656/FUL, dated 8 August 2020, and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed ground floor- Drg 2; Existing ground floor- Drg 3; Proposed single storey front extension (unnumbered).
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 1 Twickenham Glade is a detached house located at the corner of Twickenham Glade and Twickenham Crescent. The dwelling, which is set back from both roads behind garden areas, has been extended by way of a glazed conservatory to the side elevation. It is bounded to the highway by a high, mature hedge.
4. The site lies within an area where properties appear to have been built at around the same time to a similar design. Twickenham Glade and the neighbouring cul-de-sac are set out in a pattern of predominantly semi-detached properties with detached houses at the end. There is some variation

in the building lines of properties, with some dwellings, including the appeal property, set further back from the road than others. The area has a spacious, well-established residential character.

5. The porch would have a simple pitched roofed design with the entrance door and a window to the side elevation and a window in the gable end to serve a wc. It would be constructed in materials to match those of the existing building.
6. Guideline 2 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Designing House Extensions', states that porches should be constructed in a style that complements the existing dwelling and should not project further forward from the elevation than 1.5m. The proposed porch would extend 3m forward of the front elevation of the house and in this respect would not be in accordance with the Council's guidance.
7. I noted at my site visit that a number of properties in the immediate area have porches to the front, and some, including the house immediately opposite, which is likely to have originally mirrored the design of No.1, have an extension across the entire frontage. Various other alterations to the dwellings have taken place over time such that uniformity is not now as consistent as it once was.
8. The proposed porch is designed to reflect the pitched roofed form of the house and would be of limited height and scale. I acknowledge the Council's concern that the window would be different to others on the front elevation but nevertheless it would reflect the vertical proportions of the existing windows, and in terms of its size, would reflect the scale and function of the porch.
9. The porch would be set back from the road leaving an open area of garden between it and the highway, similar in terms of its depth to the distance between the side of the conservatory and Twickenham Crescent and only 1m less than the depth of the front gardens of the adjacent pair of houses. Moreover, whilst the porch may have a greater projection than other porches in the street, it would not extend significantly further forward than other similar structures given the set back of the dwelling.
10. The porch would be partly screened from view as a result of the boundary hedge but, even if that were removed, the porch would not appear as an incongruous or dominant feature for the reasons set out.
11. For these reasons the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. As such it would accord with Policy H14 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which requires, amongst other things, that extensions are well-designed and in scale and character with neighbouring buildings and, although not referred to in the reason for refusal, Policy BE5 of the UDP which requires that all extensions should respect the scale, form, detail and materials of the original building.
12. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. To provide certainty and in the interests of proper planning I have imposed the time limit condition and specified the approved plans. In order to protect the character of the building and surrounding area, a condition requiring that the materials of the porch match those of the dwelling is necessary.

Conclusion

13. For these reasons and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR