



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 July 2021

by Mark Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3275124

37 Helliwell Lane, Sheffield S36 2NH

- 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 Jonas against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00551/FUL, dated 6 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed front/side extension to dwelling house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. However, it does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the issues raised in this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling situated in a row of similar link detached dwellings on the eastern side of Helliwell Lane. The property is set back from the road and includes a driveway to the front and a private garden to the rear. Helliwell Lane rises steeply which means that the neighbouring property on the south-western side, No 39 is on higher ground than the host property. The host property includes a front porch and canopy and a single garage extension which is attached to the side of No 39.
5. The wider area is of established residential character with a mix of mainly detached and link detached dwellings. Although the appeal property and its immediate neighbours are linked via single storey side extensions, the properties retain separate identities because of the spacious gaps between them at upper floor level. This contributes to a harmonious and ordered character to the area which, in my view, it is reasonable to accord appropriate protection to.
6. The proposed development would comprise a two-storey extension to the south-western side with a single storey front extension. I note that the appellants amended the proposal during the course of the application so that

the first-floor part of the extension would be flush with the front elevation of the property and the roof design has been simplified. The proposal would have a hipped roof which would be set slightly below the existing ridge. The side wall of the extension would be set about 200mm from the side boundary with No 39.

7. Due to its close proximity to the side boundary, the proposed extension would effectively infill the existing gap at upper floor level between the host property and No. 39, which would result in a terracing effect and a cramped form of development. I acknowledge that No 39 is on higher ground and set slightly back from the host property, and that the roof of the extension would be set below the existing ridge. However, this would not mitigate the loss of the gap between the two properties at first floor level. The loss of openness between the side of the property and No 39 would erode the separate identities of the properties and would not reflect the pattern of development on this part of the road.
8. The appellants argue that there is already a terracing effect to this row of properties due to the linked garages. However, the gaps between the properties at the upper level means that there is currently a sense of openness between them. The appellants also note that the proposal would create some separation between the host property and No 39. However, that separation would be very minor and would not reduce the terracing effect identified.
9. The Council and the appellants have referred to examples of similar extensions in the local area. I have not been provided with details of any of these. Accordingly, I cannot draw any direct comparison between these developments and the proposal before me and so cannot be sure they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to the relevant provisions of saved Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), Policy CS 74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and the advice contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions. In summary, and amongst other things, these require development to achieve a high standard of design and to be sympathetic to the character of its surroundings, including neighbouring buildings. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework, which, amongst other things, requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. I note the appellants' desire to create an additional bedroom. However, in the form proposed this would be at the expense of the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. Therefore, this consideration would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
12. I also note the appellants' concerns with the way the Council handled the planning application. However, that is a procedural matter which does not impact on my assessment of the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR