



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 June 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3269663

34 Littledale Road, Sheffield S9 4GB

- 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 Karim against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03893/FUL, dated 5 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with half hip, rear dormer and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a two storey side extension with half hip and rear dormer extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey rear extension and a front porch at 34 Littledale Road, Sheffield, S9 4GB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/03893/FUL, dated 5 November 2020, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The front porch and single storey rear extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan and Location Plan; Drawing 2 of 2 'Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans' (Amended 4 December 2020).
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form; however, the submitted plans included additional proposed development, namely a single storey rear extension. The Council duly considered all of the elements shown on the plans, and I have done the same. The formal decision above reflects these additional elements.
3. A previous appeal¹ for a similar form of development at this site was subject to a split decision with the Inspector allowing a single storey rear extension and porch but dismissing a two storey side extension. The main difference with regard to the current proposal is that a half hip is proposed to the roof rather

¹ APP/J4423/D/20/3253468

than a hip to gable arrangement which has also resulted in a reduction in width of the proposed rear dormer window.

4. I saw on site that a single storey wall had been constructed to the side elevation of the dwelling in the approximate position of the proposed side extension. For the avoidance of any doubt I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Littleddale Road is a suburban street consisting of a uniform arrangement of semi-detached dwellings with regular and demonstrable gaps between them. The road is straight and slopes reasonably consistently from south to the north which accentuates the presence of the hipped roofs as each pair of dwellings on both sides of the road are higher than their neighbour to the south. In views from the junction with Mather Road they can be seen gradually stepping up the slope which is a distinctive feature of the street and a key component of the character of the area. As was considered by the Inspector in the previous appeal decision, the spacing between the dwellings 'adds a sense of openness and provides glimpses through to the tree line at the rear of the properties'.
7. Whilst I saw that several of the properties on Littleddale Road have been extended to the side, the majority of these had flat roofs rising to eaves level to leave the hipped roof intact. I noticed that there were also limited examples in the area where the roof had been extended but the hipped form had been maintained, as highlighted by the Inspector at the previous appeal. Though the appellant argues that half hips are present in the area, this was not my impression on viewing the properties on Littleddale Road or those within sight of the appeal property.
8. Guideline 1 of the Sheffield City Council Supplementary Planning Guidance, Designing House Extensions (1996), (the 'SPG') states that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area whilst Guideline 2 advises that they should not detract from the host dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality. The document goes on to advise that buildings with hipped roofs should have the roof of any two storey extension continue this feature, particularly if the extension is clearly visible in the street.
9. The proposed side extension would still partly propose a gable in the manner of the previous appeal decision, although the uppermost section of this would be provided with a hip. This 'half hip' would be markedly smaller than those that exist on the surrounding properties and the appeal dwelling. This contrast with the surrounding roof designs would be highly visible in views when travelling towards the appeal site from Mather Road. As a result of this roof arrangement, the proposed extension would appear discordant in these views and would disrupt the prevailing roofscape at odds with the consistency referred to above, resulting in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, given the extension's proximity to the boundary, it would be likely to contribute to a terracing effect, should No 36 be extended in the future. This would exacerbate the effect of the proposal on the streetscene.

Given the undue prominence of the proposal, for the above reasons I have found that it would conflict with Guidelines 1 and 2 of the SPG.

10. Whilst the rear dormer has been slightly reduced from that considered at the previous appeal, it would still span most of the rear roof and as such would form a substantial and conspicuous addition to it. I saw no similar dormer windows present on neighbouring properties. Due to its scale and position in the roof, I share the views of the previous Inspector that the dormer would be dominant and imposing in views from neighbouring gardens.
11. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed side extension and rear dormer would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area. These elements would therefore conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy (adopted 2009) and Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (adopted originally in 1998) which seek to provide high standards of design and preserve character and appearance. There would also be conflict with the guidance contained within the SPG and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework'), which seeks to ensure new developments are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.
12. A single storey rear extension and porch, broadly similar to those forming part of the current appeal proposal have already been approved by the previous appeal decision. I concur with the previous Inspector's view that porches are a feature of the area and the proposed porch would be reflective of this character. Likewise, the scale of the single storey rear extension would be reflective of other similar extensions present in the immediate area. I conclude that for these reasons, both the porch and rear extension would preserve the character and appearance of the area and as such would comply with the policies outlined in paragraph 11 above. These two elements would be clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed two storey side extension and the rear dormer. It follows that I shall issue a split decision to reflect these findings so that the appeal succeeds in part and fails in part.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the tests and advice within the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended the conditions as necessary.
14. A condition to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. Details of external materials are required in the interests of ensuring the porch and rear extension are well related to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant considerations I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it related to the two storey side extension with a half hip and rear dormer, but allowed insofar as it relates otherwise to the single storey rear extension and front porch only.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR