



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/21/3276109

47 Crawshaw Grove, Sheffield, S8 7EA

- 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 G Howson against Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01052/FUL, is dated 2 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear extension including undercroft garden store & front porch
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused insofar as it relates to the single storey side/rear extension including undercroft and garden store. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to the erection of a front porch at 47 Crawshaw Grove, Sheffield S8 7EA in accordance with the terms of the application ref 21/01052/FUL, dated 2 March 2021 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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 plan: A20-197 /L(-0)02 in so far as relevant to those parts of the development hereby permitted.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the appeal form, as this describes the proposals more succinctly, and determined the appeal accordingly.
3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021, and I have had regard to it in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

4. The appeal has been made against the failure of the Council to give notice of its decision within the prescribed time period. The Council has provided a statement with its appeal submission which sets out that, had the Council been in a position to determine the planning application, planning permission would have been refused. Based on the evidence provided in the Council's statement the main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed rear/side extension on the living conditions of No 45 Crawshaw Grove with particular regard to dominance, and
- the effect of the proposed front porch extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

Living conditions

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house adjacent to similarly designed semi-detached houses. Neighbouring properties, No 45 and No 49 Crawshaw Grove, have been extended to the side and rear. The proposed rear/side extension would project 3.6 metres beyond the rear lean-to conservatory of No 45 next to the boundary.
6. The patio area immediately behind the appeal property is level, but the rear garden slopes down with much of the garden considerably. The floor level of the extension would relate to the main house. To achieve this above ground support would be required below the floor of the extension. Therefore, the proposed extension would in part be appreciably above the existing garden level. It would also be notably above the garden of No 45 and the fence line on the boundary between the properties.
7. The proposed extension would be set in from the side boundary by approximately the width of the guttering. It would not project significantly beyond the 3 metres of the neighbouring extension supported in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Designing House Extensions (SPD) and, because of the orientation of the rear gardens, the extension would not result in a loss of daylight or sunlight to No 45. However, because of its height above the fence line the extension would appear as a substantial and conspicuous structure. The use of black bricks would serve to accentuate the structure's prominence and the extension would be overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring garden, it would dominate the garden space and would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 45 when using their garden.
8. The appellant highlights that planning permission has previously been approved for a rear extension to the property. However, I attach limited weight to this previously approved scheme which was for an extension of a different design, and the planning permission for it has expired.
9. Overall, I conclude that the rear extension would harm the living conditions of No 45 Crawshaw Grove in conflict with Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan adopted March 1998 (UDP) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) where these policies require extensions to be well designed and in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. It would also conflict with Guideline 5 of the SPD which requires that extensions avoid over dominance of neighbouring dwellings.
10. I consider the UDP and CS policies are broadly consistent with the Framework where it seeks to ensure that development promotes health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Character and appearance

11. Crawshaw Grove is characterised by semi-detached and detached houses set on a similar building line generally with small enclosed front gardens and driveways to the side. Properties are mostly rendered, or pebble dashed with bay windows to the ground and first floor at the front. There is a wide range of brick, tile and other cladding detailing to the dwellings, and various side and porch extensions, that provide variety to the dwelling designs and the character of the street.
12. The proposed front porch would have a flat parapet roof and would be constructed in black brick. It would be sited close to the bay window, a necessity due to the narrow gap between the bay window and the front door. The proximity to the bay window would not be unusual within the street and would not unduly detract from the bay window as an architectural feature of the front of the property.
13. I appreciate that the use of black brick would be novel in the immediate area and would be noticeable in the street. Even so, the dwellings on the street are linked by other unifying design characteristics and I am satisfied that the proposed brick colour would not disrupt the prevailing character of the area or detract from the appearance of the property in the street scene.
14. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed porch extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area and would accord with Policies BE5 and H14 of the UDP and Policy CS74 of the CS where these policies require extensions to be well designed and in character with neighbouring buildings. It would also accord with Guideline 2 of the SPD which requires that extensions do not detract from the general appearance of the street. I consider UDP and CS policies are broadly consistent with the Framework where it seeks to ensure good design.
15. As the front porch is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed rear/side extension, I propose to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the porch.

Other Matters

16. I appreciate that the rear/side extension would provide increased security to the side of the property and would provide a level access for wheelchair users into the dwelling. However, these matters do not override my concerns with regard to the living conditions of the neighbouring property.
17. Whilst there have been no objections from the occupiers of No 45, this does not mean that the scheme is acceptable and does not remove the requirement for me to assess the effects of the proposals.

Conditions

18. Regarding the front porch, in addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty of the development for which permission is granted.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I conclude the proposed rear/side extension would conflict with the development plan and there are no material

considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed, and planning permission refused insofar as it relates to the proposed rear/side extension. In respect of the front porch, I conclude that there would be no conflict with the development plan, the appeal is therefore allowed, and planning permission granted insofar as it relates to the porch, subject to conditions.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR