
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3283520

11 Heather Lea Place, Sheffield S17 3DN

- 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 Karl Murray against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01469/FUL, dated 29 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side, single storey rear extension with loft dormer extension and rear terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof and a single-storey side extension. Heather Lea Place includes a mix of house types, although it is predominantly comprised of two-storey semis, many of which have side extensions, with either hipped or gable roofs. The Council does not take issue with the porch, dormer roof extension or rear terrace and as such, the focus of my assessment is the two-storey side extension.
4. The proposed extension would sit flush with the ridge and front elevation of the host building. This would add substantial mass and bulk to the dwelling while lacking any subordination to its host and would significantly erode the gap between the appeal property and its neighbour. This would be compounded by the change from a hipped to a gable roof, which would serve to unbalance the adjoining pair while also drawing to the eye to the harmful additional mass. Although there would be some remaining space to the shared boundary and the adjacent property, this would be minimal and do little to offset the mass proposed.
5. My attention is drawn to two other extensions in the street scene. No.5 Heather Lea Place was granted planning permission¹ for a similar two-storey side extension, among other works, and has subsequently been constructed.

¹ 17/02510/FUL

Although I do not have the approved plans before me, I did observe this on the site visit. This extension is not set back from the front elevation or down from the ridge of its host building. Be that as it may, each proposal is assessed on its own merits. In this case, No.5 has a larger gap to its adjacent neighbour, which is located on the corner of Heather Lea Place and Heather Lea Avenue. Moreover, the corner house is a single storey bungalow. As a result, the gap between No.5 and the corner plot is significantly larger, particularly at first floor level.

6. I am also directed to the side extension of No.13 Heather Lea Place. I have no details on whether this was granted planning permission or when, although it appears to be of some age. In any event, that extension is set back from the front elevation and down from the ridge of its host while it also retains the roof form of No.13. As such I do not consider either of these examples are directly comparable to the proposal before me and do not justify the harm I have identified.
7. Based on the above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene, contrary to Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (adopted March 1998). These require, among other things, that extensions are well designed and would be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. The proposal would also be contrary to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks through paragraph 130 to encourage development which will add to the overall quality of the area. Although DN Policy 5 of the Dore Neighbourhood Plan (adopted October 2021) is referenced in the reason for refusal, this appears to relate to infill housing rather than residential extensions. As such I have not considered this policy further.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. As such it would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR