



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3284383

12 Kaye Place, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S10 1DY

- 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 Mrs Linda Tomlinson against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02871/FUL, dated 11 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as an attic extension to enlarge bedroom and form bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and the locality.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is one of three dwellings in Kaye Place, which also provides access to 115 Roebuck Road and a car park for users of nearby shops. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow along with No 10, and the other property at No 8 is a detached one-and-a-half storey dwelling. The three properties have been built with similar design features, such as gable roofs, and matching materials and form a distinct group. Although the properties are tucked away behind the properties on Barber Road, they are readily visible from the pavement along the street and from the adjacent car park. While the surrounding properties are predominantly two-storey terraced properties, many of which have front and/or rear dormers of varying designs and sizes, the cohesive appearance and rhythm of the three properties in Kaye Place creates an attractive and coherent small cul-de-sac.
 5. The proposal would see the erection of front dormer with a sloped tile roof and a rear dormer with an almost flat roof. The rear dormer would be largely screened from public view with only glimpses of the roof available through shrubbery on a small section of Roebuck Road at the rear of the property, and
-

as such the rear dormer would not have a significant impact on the street scene. However, the front dormer would span a considerable width and the entire height of the front roofslope and as such would dominate the roofslope. Furthermore, the scale and design of the dormer would be at odds with the front dormers at No 8, which are small in scale and align with the windows below them. In contrast, the dormer would appear lop-sided, being set to one side of the roof with no obvious connection to the windows or doors below and this would create an unbalanced frontage which would not respect the simple form and proportions of the existing dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would be discordant with the appeal property, the group of properties and the locality and would detract from its character and appearance.

6. For these reasons the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and the locality. As such the proposal 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), which require in various ways that development including house extensions are of good design that respects the scale and form of the original and neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and recommendation

7. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed because of the conflict with the development plan and there being no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

8. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR