



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date 12 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3274385

44 Rose Hill Drive, Sheffield S20 5PN

- 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 Mike Downs against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04531/FUL, dated 20 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of detached single-storey garage to front of dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street scene, the effect of the development on the living conditions of the adjacent property and the effect of the development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host property is a detached dwelling in a line of similar, located within a residential area. A surfaced access to properties further on Rose Hill Drive runs to the front of the property, leaving an amenity area to the far side of the access as well as the front garden area. Adjacent properties have the same arrangement.
4. The proposals seek to erect a garage on the smaller area, with external materials to match the main property, indicated to measure 5.5m x 6.5m to approximately 3.6m in height.
5. I find that the garage in that location would look extremely prominent and incongruous within the locality, effectively creating a structure that would look somewhat isolated in the area between two sets of dwellings and would cause harm to the ordered pattern of development, causing material harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
6. As a result, I find the proposal is in conflict with Saved Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) (the UDP) and guidance set out in the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) which, when taken as a whole, expect development to be in

scale and character with neighbouring buildings, be consistent with the residential character of the area and function well adding to the overall quality of the area.

Living conditions of adjacent property

7. The front of the dwelling looks on to the rear of No 4 Rose Hill View. The proposed location of the garage would see it be located the other side of the rear boundary of No4.
8. Whilst the structure would be visible above the boundary, there would be some mitigation at the boundary, so I find that on a fine balance, the harm caused by the presence of the proposal would not be to a level that would materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4 Rose Hill View.
9. On this issue I do not find that the proposal would be contrary to Policy H14 of the UDP, nor the guidance set out in the SPG or the Framework as it relates to protecting the amenities of adjacent residents.

Highways and pedestrian safety

10. The location of the proposal would be just off a spur access road serving properties to the top section of Rose Hill Drive.
11. Whilst there are limited numbers of properties that utilise the spur that would be impacted by the proposals, I find that the manoeuvres required to get access and egress from the garage would cause potential harm to highway and pedestrian safety, compounded by the narrow single lane of the spur. In addition, the remaining area of land would potentially be surfaced to accommodate the garage, and could be used for an additional parking space, causing more difficulties in manoeuvring and possibly causing more harm to highway and pedestrian safety.
12. In summary on this issue, I cannot be convinced that the use of the garage would not cause material harm to highway and pedestrian safety from its use in such an alien environment. As such I find the proposal contrary to Policy H14 of the UDP, and the guidance set out in the SPG and the relevant section of the Framework, which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to provide safe access to the highway network, provide appropriate off-street parking and not endanger pedestrians.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR