



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2021

by Nigel Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3282493

47 Vauxhall Road, Sheffield, S9 1LD

- 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 Ms Claire Earnshaw against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/02511/FUL dated 28 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey front extension at 47 Vauxhall Road, Sheffield, S9 1LD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/02511/FUL dated 12 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2105/201 Site Plan as Proposed; 2105/202 Ground Floor Plan as proposed; 2105/203 First Floor Plan as Proposed; 2105/204 Roof Plan as Proposed: and 2105/205-206 Elevations as Proposed.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The Council has raised no objections to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours and I find no reason to disagree. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Amongst other things, saved Policy H14 of the *Sheffield Unitary Development Plan*, adopted 1998 (UDP) requires new buildings and extensions to be well designed and in scale with neighbouring buildings. I have also been referred to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Designing House Extensions* (SPG). Guideline 2 says porches should be constructed in a style which compliments the existing dwellings and shall not normally project more than 1.5m from the elevation. Reflecting UDP Policy H14, the SPG says extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area.

4. There are a wide variety of dwelling types and styles to be found on Vauxhall Road and adjacent streets including detached, semi-detached, and terraced houses of various styles and materials. There is a recently constructed three-storey block of flats opposite the site and some commercial development. Consequently, there is no uniformity within the street scene and overall, the surrounding area exhibits no strong prevailing character or especially local distinctiveness.
5. In this context I consider the proposed extension would not undermine the appearance of the host dwelling and would respect the character of the area to which it relates. Moreover, the front of the extension would align with the building line established by the immediately adjacent terrace, and it would not appear particularly obtrusive or prominent in the street scene. Although it would unbalance the symmetry of the pair of houses, I do not find this factor by itself to be harmful, particularly as the pair of houses have different fenestration and are not identical in appearance.
6. Although the extension would project by 2.3m, which exceeds the 1.5m recommended in the SPG, this is reasonable given that it would abut the side gable elevation of the adjacent property and yet still be set back from the highway edge. In any event, guidance in the SPG should not necessarily be followed prescriptively, and I favour a pragmatic approach which responds to local circumstances.
7. Paragraph 130 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* says planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment. In this case, I am satisfied that the proposal represents an acceptable design solution that would harmonise with the style of the dwelling and respect the character and appearance of the area. As such, I find no conflict with saved UDP Policy H14 or the provisions of the development plan taken as a whole.
8. The imposition of planning conditions relating to implementation of timescales and for the development to take place in accordance with the approved plans are necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area
9. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nigel Harrison

INSPECTOR