

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3287281

65 Stubbin Lane, Sheffield, South Yorks S5 6QJ

- 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 Abdul Ghaffar against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01628/FUL dated 31 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the street scene along with the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 67 Stubbin Lane with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an end of terrace dwelling which sits on the corner of Stubbin Lane and Tideswell Road. The proposal seeks to add a first floor to an existing single storey extension which sits at the side of the host dwelling, along with the erection of a single storey addition to the rear.

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property sits on the western side of the junction with Tideswell Road. Although a single storey extension has been added to the side, at first floor level, the dwelling is set a comfortable distance from the back edge of the pavement. Whilst there is some variety in the style of the dwellings within the immediate locality, the dwelling on the opposite side of the junction with Tideswell Road is also set comfortably off the boundary. So too are the dwellings to the south along Tideswell Road itself. This established pattern of development contributes to a spacious and open feel at and around the junction.
-

5. As explained, a single storey extension with a mono-pitch roof runs along the side of the appeal dwelling. This connects with a two storey extension which has been added to the rear. This side addition already has some impact on the feeling of spaciousness at the junction, but the effect is limited, to a degree, by its single storey nature. The proposal seeks to add a second storey above this extension. As with the existing addition, the enlarged structure would be recessed slightly from the main front elevation of the host dwelling and would be less than half its original width. The eaves and ridge would be continued and the extension would be finished in matching external materials.
6. Nevertheless, I consider that adding a second storey in the manner proposed would increase the overall massing of the existing side extension considerably. It would breach the established building line of the main two storey bodies of the dwellings located along this side of Tideswell Road and it would serve to increase the prominence of the appeal dwelling. The effect would reduce the feeling of spaciousness at the junction.
7. For these reasons, I find that the proposed first floor side extension would harm the character and appearance of the street scene. In such terms, it conflicts with policy H14(a) of the adopted Sheffield Unitary Development Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance titled '*Designing House Extensions*' (SPG), which promote high quality design that is in scale and character with its surroundings.

Living conditions

8. The appeal property has already been the subject of a part single storey and part two storey extension to the rear. The single storey section runs along the common boundary shared with No. 67 Stubbin Lane. This attached dwelling has not been extended to the rear.
9. The proposed single storey rear extension would be added to the existing addition. It too would project along the boundary with No. 67. When added to the existing extension, the level of projection from the main rear elevation of the host dwelling and that of No. 67 would be 6 meters according to the proposed floorplan. This extent of rearward projection would be considerable. However, given the presence of the existing part single storey and part two storey extension at the rear of the appeal property, combined with the south facing nature of the rear gardens, I am satisfied that the additional projection arising from the proposed single storey addition would not result in a significant reduction in the levels of natural light available to No. 67. Notwithstanding this, I consider that the extent of additional rearward projection would have a much more dominant impact and an unduly oppressive effect when viewed from the nearest rooms at the rear of this attached property and from the nearest point of its rear garden.
10. Despite an absence of a formal objection from the occupiers of No. 67 Stubbin Lane, I find that the proposed single storey rear extension would be unduly imposing and would unacceptably harm the outlook from the rear of this dwelling. In this regard, the scheme conflicts with policy H14 (c) of the UDP and the SPG, which seek to safeguard appropriate levels of residential amenity.

Other considerations

11. The Appellant argues that the proposal amounts to the efficient use of land and that the enlarged accommodation would assist in meeting his family's domestic needs. Whilst these positive aspects of the scheme are not disputed, they can be applied to many proposals for domestic extensions and I do not find them to be compelling arguments in this particular case.

Overall Conclusions

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the street scene and it would unacceptably harm the outlook for the occupiers of No. 67 Stubbin Lane. In these terms, it conflicts with the development plan policies and design guidance outlined above.
13. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and the associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR