



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2021

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PGCERT (Arch con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3283585

8 Plumbley Lane, Sheffield S20 5BJ

- 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 M Parsons against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02225/FUL, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of single storey detached outbuilding to be used as garage to side of dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey detached outbuilding to be used as garage to side of dwellinghouse at 8 Plumbley Lane, Sheffield S20 5BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02225/FUL, dated 12 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 plans:

Location plan, site layout and street elevation as proposed – 021005-AAD-01-XX-DR-A-002-P02

New garage structure – 021005-AAD-01-XX-DR-A-003-P02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately defines the development proposed. The appellant states the outbuilding is to be used as a home office and a fence is to be erected on the front boundary wall. The planning application, appeal form and the decision notice state the proposed use as a garage and the plans do not include the erection of a fence. For clarity, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans and the use of the outbuilding as a garage.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of a modern, 2 storey detached dwelling that forms part of a small development of houses which extend around the corner of Plumbley Lane and Plumbley Hall Road. The houses follow the gradient of the land and are sited close to the road. A village green lies to the east, a housing estate to the south and community allotments exist to the west along a single-track road. The character of the surrounding area is of a pleasant, suburban nature.
5. A detached garage would be erected on a triangular parcel of land to the front and side of the dwelling. When travelling down Plumbley Lane, the garage would be partially screened from view by the close boarded fence to the side of 6 Plumbley Lane. Only the narrow rear gable of the garage would then be visible from the corner of the lane, set against the backdrop of the host dwelling and the raised land and fence bounding the allotments. Although positioned forward of the dwelling, the garage would be set back behind the low front boundary wall.
6. In views from the track to the west, the garage would be seen against the backdrop of No 6 and the fence. It would not unduly protrude into the street scene or hinder the views of the village green and its associated mature trees, which would remain visible from this vantage point. The side of the garage would be viewed from the Marsh Close junction with Plumbley Lane with its eaves at a similar height to the adjoining fence. Again, the garage would be observed against the background of No 6, the fence and the houses directly behind, which are sited at a higher land level. Given the prevailing character, I find that the garage would not be prominent or visually obtrusive as a result.
7. The design of the garage including roof pitch, replicates that found at 19b Plumbley Hall Road which is part of the same development. Accordingly, it would complement the host dwelling. Furthermore, the area in which the garage is to be sited is an irregular shape and location that contributes little to the character of the area and has limited value as useable garden space for the dwelling, as acknowledged by the Council. Approximately one third of the triangular parcel of land would endure post-development and the driveway would provide a visual break between the garage and the dwelling. A good-sized rear garden would also remain. Consequently, I find that the garage would neither result in the overdevelopment of the site, nor affect the spaciousness of the housing development.
8. It has been suggested that the development would not be fit for purpose and that an extension has taken up space originally intended for a garage. Being at a right angle to the driveway, it may be difficult for vehicles to access the garage. However, the drive is reasonably wide allowing 2 vehicles to park side by side which would provide a sufficient level of space to manoeuvre a small car into the garage. Irrespective of this, a garage can be used for the parking of other vehicles including motorcycles and bicycles, along with general domestic storage, providing it is done so in connection with the occupation of the dwelling. It is also suggested that the garage would touch neighbouring boundaries in certain parts. However, the plans indicate that there would be space between the garage and the neighbouring fence at No 6. These matters do not affect my overall findings.

9. I conclude that the garage would not harm the character and appearance of the area as described above. As such, it would accord with Policy H14(c) of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) which seeks to avoid the overdevelopment of sites or serious loss of existing garden space which would harm the character of the neighbourhood. It would further accord with Policy CS74(h) of the Sheffield Development Framework: Core Strategy (2009) which requires amongst other things, new buildings to be of a high quality and in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. The development would also comply with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to the local area.

Conditions

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance and paragraph 56 of the Framework. Along with the standard time limit, conditions are imposed to require the use of matching materials in the interests of consistency of appearance and to list the plans in the interest of certainty.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons identified above, there are no conflicts with the Development Plan when taken as a whole and I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR