



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3264848
62 Linaker Road, Sheffield S6 5DT

- 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 and Mrs Loftus against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01503/FUL, dated 12 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension to dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Linaker Road and Robertson Road. There are a variety of architectural styles in the area, although the houses generally feature a generous set back from both the highway and other properties, resulting in a spacious and open character in the street scene.
4. The Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (the SPG) advises extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area and shall not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality.
5. Due to its corner plot and the steep topography of Linaker Road, the appeal property is prominent in the local area, in particular from both Linaker Road and Robertson Road. Although the hedge screens some of the ground floor, the space to the side, which mirrors that of the corner property facing the appeal site, contributes positively to the openness of the area. The proposal would see this space largely eroded by the extension as it would extend close to the boundary of the host property. The proposal would extend further beyond the building line on this section of Robertson Road which although it is not strongly defined is, nonetheless, clearly apparent. Moreover, the bulk and massing of the proposal would erode the spaciousness of the corner plot and reduce the perceived width of Robertson Road, harming the open character of the area.

6. I acknowledge that the scheme has been revised since application Ref. 18/04718/FUL was refused and the subsequent appeal was dismissed. As a result, the set back from the front and set down from the ridge does appear more subordinate to the host building, while the hipped roof proposed is more complementary to the host than the previous proposal. The side elevation would also be slightly further set in from the boundary, therefore reducing the width of the resulting frontage while the use of matching materials is appropriate in and of itself. However, this does not mean that the proposal as a whole is acceptable, and the extension would nevertheless be incongruous relative to the street scene due to its prominence and impact on the open character of the area.
7. My attention is drawn to several two-storey side extensions approved by the Council. I observed 2 Robertson Drive on my site visit. However, this property differs from that of the appeal before me given that it appears as single-storey from the front and two-storey only from the rear. No.2 is also of a differing design generally in terms of materials and appearance. As such it is not as prominent in the street scene and its approval does not justify allowing the harm I have identified that would be caused by the proposal before me.
8. Other examples of similar developments on Studfield Drive, Delph House Road and Stephen Hill Road are some distance from the appeal site and would have had their own site-specific circumstances which led to their approval. Regardless, their existence is not a strong enough justification to permit harmful development in this location and I must determine the appeal based on its own merits.
9. To conclude on the main issue, the proposed two-storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore be in conflict with Policies BE5 and 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. The proposal would also be contrary to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to encourage development which will add to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR