



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by B J Sims BSc (Hons) MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3286681

45 Thorpe House Avenue, Sheffield S8 9NH

- 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 N Russell against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01963/FUL, dated 28 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

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 area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area. The street is comprised of semi-detached properties built to a similar design which includes double-storey bay windows and hipped roofs. While some of the properties in the street and the wider area have replaced the hipped roofs with gables, the street is predominantly characterised by the original design features of the properties.
 5. The dwellings in the street have a consistent amount of separation from the adjacent property. The exceptions to this are dwellings on corner plots or situated on a bend in the road, as well as the property at No 54, opposite the appeal site, which has a two-storey side extension which is similar to the that proposed in this appeal.
 6. The proposed two-storey extension would be built up to the boundary with the adjacent property at No 43, with no gap between the extension and the boundary remaining. The introduction of a two-storey side extension in this location would add substantial mass to the dwelling. That massing would be set only a limited distance back from the main front elevation of the dwelling and the ridge of the extension would be the same height as the ridge of the main
-

roof. As a consequence, the apparent bulk of the building would be substantially increased. While a gap would remain between the proposed extension and the side elevation of No 43, the space between the appeal property and the boundary with No 43 would be eroded. The proposed gable roof would add to the bulk and massing of the extension and would further reduce the gap to the side of the property.

7. Furthermore, should a two-storey extension be constructed at No 43 then the space between the two properties would be substantially reduced or even completely eradicated. Although the appeal property is at a lower level than No 43, the reduction or the total filling in of the gap between the properties would lead to a terracing effect. The similar two-storey side extension at No 54 demonstrates the lack of a gap to the side boundary and how a two-storey gable end in such a position has the potential to cause a terracing effect. Overall, the potential for a terracing effect at the appeal property would detract from the character and appearance of the area and the extension at No 54 does not justify the proposal before me.
8. My attention has been drawn to other two-storey side extensions at 32 Thorpe House Avenue and at properties in Thorpe House Road, Thorpe House Rise, Lees Hall Road and Hollythorpe Road. No details of any planning permissions for these extensions have been provided so I am unable to compare the reasons for granting permission for these existing extensions to the reasons for refusing the proposal before me. Nevertheless, many of these extensions are at some distance and not visible from the appeal site and therefore have no bearing on the street scene or the potential for a terracing effect at the appeal site. Some of the extensions, such as at 35 Hollythorpe Road, are on corner plots and maintain a significant gap to the adjacent property so there is no potential for a terracing effect. Consequently, these existing extensions are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. I acknowledge that a hip-to-gable conversion could potentially be constructed under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). However, such a scheme would not include a two-storey side extension, so the gap between the side elevation and the boundary would be retained and consequently there would be no risk of a terracing effect.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed two-storey side extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore 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. The proposal would also fail to comply with Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan, which seek to ensure that extensions are compatible with the character and built form of the area and do not detract from the dwelling or the general appearance of the street.

Other Matters

11. I understand the appellant's desire to provide additional habitable accommodation and that any reduction in the proposed roof height would diminish the useable space in the extension. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning considerations and I attach moderate weight to this matter which would not override the significant harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal 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

13. 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.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR