
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3291805
25 Huntley Road, Sheffield S11 7PA

- 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 Tom Wilkins against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04664/FUL, dated 1 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the formation of rooms in roof space including hip to gable extension and raising of ridge line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of rooms in roof space including hip to gable extension and raising of ridge line at 25 Huntley Road, Sheffield S11 7PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04664/FUL, dated 1 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 001, 002 and 003.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Tom Wilkins against Sheffield City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The appellant's name has been adopted from the application form.

Main Issue

4. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an altered 2-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a primarily residential area of similarly designed dwelling. The Council

has already granted planning permission for alterations to the property which includes a roof extension which increases the height but retains the current hipped form above the existing 2-storey side extension (Ref 21/01982/FUL). Significant weight is given to this approved scheme in the determination of this appeal.

6. The proposed development is for a similar form of development, including a large rear dormer and increased ridge height, but with a gabled roof form above the side extension.
7. Along the streetscene, there is a predominance of 2-storey semi-detached dwellings with hipped roof forms. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Designing House Extensions* refers to an expectation that where a property has a hipped roof then any extension would retain this form, especially if it is clearly visible in the street. However, this guidance cannot anticipate all the circumstances associated with a particular proposal.
8. By reason of topography, the ground floor level and ridges of the properties forming a pair of semi-detached dwellings are different. As identified by the appellant and observed during the site visit, there are examples of gable roof extensions above side extensions, including Nos. 6, 19 and 41. Other dwellings have side extensions which retain a hipped roof form, including Nos. 10, 27, 36 and 48 but their detailed planning circumstances have not been provided. However, from what was observed, rather than there being a consistent roofscape there are variations to the roof forms of the dwellings fronting the road.
9. By reason of the stepped siting of the dwellings and the variation in the roof forms of properties along the road, including those which have side extensions, the proposed gable roof would not be a particularly conspicuous nor visually dominant addition to the streetscene. There would be some disruption to the symmetry of Nos 25 and 27 by reason of the proposed gabled roof form. However, any harm to the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings would be mitigated by the side extension of No. 27 and the stepped siting of these adjoining properties. The increase in the ridge height of the property pursuant to the planning permission would also disrupt the symmetry and this fall-back position is given significant weight in the determination of this appeal.
10. The Council has identified that there would be scope for a future terracing effect between the enlarged property and No. 23 which has, to some degree, already occurred because of the existing 2-storey side extension. Although sympathetic to the Council's concerns, there is an ability to control any potential terracing effect by the consideration of a future planning application for alterations to No. 23. The stepped siting between the property and No. 23 would also reduce potential harm associated with a terracing effect. This relationship would be similar to the situation at Nos. 29 and 31.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would not conflict with the high quality design requirements of Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of proper planning and the avoidance of doubt, a condition is necessary for the proposed development to be erected in accordance with the approved drawings. To assist the assimilation of the appeal scheme into the streetscene a condition requiring the use of external materials to match those of the host property is necessary.
13. Accordingly, and for the reasons given, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR