



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3289769

101 Norton Park Road, Sheffield S8 8GR

- 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 Darren Buxton against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02774/FUL, dated 20 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two-storey side extension including integral garage, and erection of single storey rear extension (see previous application 20/02029/HPN) to domestic property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey, semi-detached house within a residential estate. In the immediate area there is some consistency to the design of groups of dwellings, and the dominant roof form is a hipped design (including pyramid-hip and half-hip roofs). There are examples of varying degrees of alteration and extension to buildings, including changes to the design of roofs, and some buildings with different roof forms, but the hipped roof has remained a characteristic feature in the surrounding area.
4. The appeal property is part of a pair of semi-detached houses which stand prominently at the junction of Norton Park Road and Norton Park Crescent. Both buildings have retained their original hipped roof form, and clear sense of balance and symmetry, contributing to the character of the area and reinforcing the sense of place. The proposed creation of a gable ended roof to the appeal property would unbalance the appearance of this pair of houses and remove their symmetry. It would also be a discordant form in relation to the adjoining buildings which also have hipped roofs and share similar proportion and rhythm.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Designing House Extensions', 1996, (SPG) advises that extensions should not detract from the character of the building or the general appearance of the locality, and where hipped roofs exist, these should be maintained in any two storey extension to respect the building form.

6. Whilst I note that Guideline 2 in the SPG specifically refers to the addition of two storey flat roofed extensions when discussing setting these back from the front elevation, it is good design practice to normally require that an extension is a distinct and subordinate addition. This allows the original building to still be clearly identified, maintaining the overall design and harmony with adjoining buildings. Despite the appeal proposal using some matching materials, the failure to incorporate any set back from the front elevation or visual break in the roofline has failed to respect the design of the original dwelling, making it an incongruous addition, and further compounding the visual harm caused to the pair of dwellings and to the wider streetscene.
7. The appellant suggests that a change from a hip to a gable roof falls under permitted development rights (PD rights) to dwellings. I have little evidence on this point but note that it is open to the appellant to utilise any PD rights that the property may benefit from. I have dealt with the appeal on its own merits.
8. I note that the Council advised that the proposed photovoltaic panels did not require planning permission and requested that they be removed from the description of development. Consequently, they were not addressed in its planning assessment. However, whilst I have some sympathy that a gabled roof may be able to accommodate more photovoltaic panels than a hipped roof, I have no drawn plans or site-specific evidence to demonstrate this. In my view, given the at best minimal increase in the number of panels which the appeal proposal may be able to accommodate, compared to a hipped roof, this benefit would not be outweighed by the harm I have identified to the appearance of the property and streetscene. Furthermore, whilst achieving sustainable development underpins national planning policy, protecting and enhancing the built environment is also a key objective. The appellant can still improve the energy efficiency of the dwelling by installing photovoltaic panels under PD rights regardless of the outcome of this appeal.
9. The appeal scheme would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy 2009, and the SPG. These policies and the guidance, amongst other things, require that extensions respect the scale, form and detail of the existing building and fit in with the scale and character of neighbouring buildings. It would also be contrary to the high-quality design expectations of Section 12 of the 2021 National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

G Bayliss

INSPECTOR