



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3274417
15 Binfield Road, Sheffield S8 9FA

- 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 James Pinder against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00518/FUL, dated 2 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is refurbishment of existing attic and the construction of both a front and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, the Council raised no objection to the proposed rear dormer as they considered it to be allowed under permitted development rights subject to matching materials. As a result, the rear dormer was removed from the proposal description and did not form part of the application. I note that the appellant has not requested a split decision and the description of the development in the appeal form only relates to the front dormer. Thus, I have assessed the appeal based on the main issue in dispute which is the front dormer.
3. Since the application was determined, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') has been published. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal and have not therefore been prejudiced. The main parties did not have any comments on this matter.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormer window on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid terrace located within an urban area. The appellant states that the site is not located within a Conservation Area and is not in an area of distinctive character. They also highlight that the size of the dormer has been determined by the internal space available, which is constrained due to the dwelling's plan form, and required layout. The appellant

also asserts that the proposal is based upon good design, the dormer would align with the existing windows and high quality materials are proposed.

6. The proposed front dormer would occupy a large proportion of the roof plane. The terrace has a hierarchy of windows with the ground floor window being the largest and then a narrower first-floor window. The width and scale of the proposed dormer would not reflect the hierarchy and proportions of the existing windows. Accordingly, the front dormer would unbalance the proportions of the appeal property and would result in a discordant addition which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. I observed on my site visit that whilst there are front dormer windows within the surrounding area which vary in design, they are not a common feature. In addition, the existing front dormers were generally smaller than that proposed. The Council also highlight that there is no planning history for the existing dormers within the terrace.
8. Although the ridge levels within the terrace are stepped due to the gradient of the road, the front dormer would be a prominent addition to the terrace due to its scale and massing. It would further erode the largely unbroken roofscape of the terrace. The hierarchy and proportions of the host dwelling's windows is also reflective of the wider terrace. The horizontal form would not reflect the width of the other windows. Therefore, the front dormer would be at odds with the architectural style and character of the terrace, and wider surrounding area, because it would be visually prominent and occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof. Accordingly, the introduction of a front dormer would be harmful to the terrace and surrounding area.
9. Consequently, the proposed front dormer would conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS 74 of the Sheffield Development Framework: Core Strategy (2009). These collectively seek, amongst other matters, to ensure extensions are well designed and in scale and character with both the original and surrounding buildings.
10. The scheme would also not comply with the Framework and Guideline 2 of the Council's Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance. The Framework promotes good design and requires development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. The SPG seeks to ensure that extensions to dwelling's do not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality and that dormer windows should not dominate the roof plane.

Other Matters

11. I note that within the appellant's design and access statement they highlight that the development would provide the current habitants with the necessary space required for their family and would upgrade the existing property. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

L M Wilson INSPECTOR