
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP DipERM MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3271832
31 Musgrave Crescent, Sheffield S5 7DQ

- 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 Sam Hague against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04521/FUL, dated 18 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'single storey front and side extensions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council have described the development as 'erection of single-storey front/side extension to dwellinghouse'. I note that the appellant has also utilised this description on their appeal form. I consider that this revision provides an accurate description of the proposal and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace two-storey dwelling situated within a predominately residential area. The surrounding properties are also similar two-storey dwellings that are either semi-detached or terraced. None of these properties have extensions to their front.
5. The proposal would create a new single-storey side and front extension to no. 31 and whilst this would be a relatively modest extension in terms of its overall size, the fact that it would extend outwards past the front building line of the host property and that of its neighbour means that it would represent a discordant addition to the street scene. The insertion of a large patio door in this new front elevation would also be at odds with the prevailing style of the other houses on Musgrave Crescent. Consequently, the proposal would have a significant adverse visual impact.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would fail to meet the requirements of policy H14 of the adopted Sheffield Unitary Development Plan as supported by the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (SPD).

Other Matters

7. I note the appellant's point with regards to a similar development proposal being permitted in the wider Sheffield area at no. 40 Richmond Park Road (Ref. 20/00937/FUL). However, I do not have all the details of this case before me or the circumstances which led to those decisions being taken. In addition, given its location and distance from the appeal property, the circumstances applicable to that scheme are not the same as those presented in this case, which I have determined on its own merits. In any event, the existence of other similar development proposals in the wider area does not outweigh my findings in respect of the character and appearance of the area.
8. I acknowledge the appellant's personal circumstances including the fact that moving to a larger property or building a full side or rear extension would not be affordable. However, while I have given the appellant's personal circumstances careful consideration, I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance¹ that in general planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is also probable that the proposed development would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be relevant. For these reasons, I therefore find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused contrary to the development plan and the SPD.
9. I also note that no objections have been received from interested parties in relation to the appeal scheme, however, this is not of sufficient weight to overcome or outweigh the substantial harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306