



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/W/21/3275701
65 Archer Lane, Sheffield S7 2BW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Fareen Akhtar against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04407/FUL, dated 10 December 2020.
 - The development is proposed two storey side extension and rear extension, single storey front and gable with front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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.
3. The appeal is against the non-determination of an application. The Council highlight that they would have refused planning permission for reasons relating to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, as well as the impact upon the occupiers of 67 Archer Lane.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of 67 Archer Lane, having regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached property with a hipped roof. The eastern side of Archer Lane and the wider surrounding area is primarily characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings. There are also some detached dwellings and properties which vary in design to the host property. I

observed on my site visit that two-storey side extensions and dormer windows were not a common feature within the surrounding area.

6. The proposal would introduce a gable-end roof, dormer windows, rear extension, front extension and two-storey side extension. The proposed development would therefore add a significant amount of bulk to the host dwelling.
7. The two-storey side extension would not read as a subordinate addition. This is because of its siting adjacent to the side boundary, lack of step back from the principal elevation and would not have a lower roofline than the original dwelling. The scheme would also result in a gable-end roof which would not reflect the hipped roofs of the adjoining dwelling and similarly designed semi-detached properties.
8. In addition, the proposal introduces a large dormer to the rear and dormer to the front elevation. I noted on my site visit that some semi-detached dwellings have rear dormers. There were also some front dormers within the locality, for example on Bannerdale Road, however the design of these dwellings differed to the appeal property. The front dormer would be particularly noticeable when viewed from Archer Lane. The rear dormer would not be conspicuous from Archer Lane, nevertheless it would be larger than other rear dormers within the area as it would expand across the width of the extended property.
9. The scheme also includes a front extension which would project beyond the front bay window. The front extension would be a prominent addition due to its projection in front of the principal elevation and width. Thus, it would detract from the principal elevation and architectural feature of the bay window.
10. As a result, the proposed development would not be compatible with the character and built form of the area because it would result in an obtrusive extension which would detract from the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would result in an unsympathetic addition which would not be characteristic of the similarly designed semi-detached dwellings and would imbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. This is because of the combination of the design, scale, massing, lack of set back, siting next to the side boundary, ridge height and roof design of the proposed development.
11. The scheme would also give rise to a terracing effect because of the extension's bulk, mass and location adjacent to the side boundary as well as the proximity to No 67 and its garage.
12. The appellant has provided photographs of extensions within the local area which they consider to be contrary to the Council's guidance and highlight that there are loft extensions in the local area. However, limited information has been submitted with regard to these developments. The properties highlighted are located within an area which has a different character and appearance to the semi-detached properties within the surrounding area of the appeal site. The appeal scheme also contains various elements whereas the developments highlighted generally relate to dormer windows. These extensions do not represent justification for harmful development at the appeal site and each application must be determined on its individual merits.

13. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework: Core Strategy (2009). These policies collectively seek, amongst other matters, to ensure extensions are well designed and in character with the original and surrounding buildings.
14. The scheme would also not comply with the Framework and Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Council's Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The Framework promotes good design and requires development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. The SPG seeks to ensure that extensions are compatible with the character and built form of the area and they should not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality.

Living conditions

15. No 67 sits closer to the road than the appeal property. As a consequence, the rear elevation of the appeal property sits noticeably beyond No 67's and its associated rear windows.
16. The Council highlight that the rear element of the proposed scheme would conflict with the 45 degrees rule. Based on the evidence submitted, the development would have an overbearing impact upon the occupiers of No 67 due to a combination of the siting of No 67 and the appeal property as well as the first-floor element of the proposed extension's height, scale and its proximity to No 67's rear windows. The first-floor extension would have an intrusive and oppressive effect upon the occupiers of No 67. As a result, the outlook from No 67 would be considerably compromised with the effect that the occupiers would feel hemmed in when looking out of their first-floor rear windows.
17. The ground floor element of the extension would be acceptable due to the existing single-storey rear extension at the appeal site, location of No 67's garage and the height of the boundary fence.
18. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 67, having regard to outlook. Accordingly, it would conflict with the SPG which seeks to avoid unreasonable over dominance of neighbouring dwellings. It would also not comply with the Framework which requires new development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Other matters

19. The appellant has highlighted their frustrations with the Council in the time it took them to consider the planning application which has delayed the development. Such concerns would be a matter to take up with the Council and they do not impact the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

20. 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