
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: 23rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3291716
315 Sharrow Lane, Sheffield S11 8AP

- 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 Akash Munir against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04510/FUL, dated 18 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension at 315 Sharrow Lane, Sheffield S11 8AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04510/FUL, dated 18 October 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: 0243-01; 0243-02; 0243-5b; 0243-06b; 0243-07; 0243-08 and 0243-09.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. 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

3. The proposed development includes a 2-storey extension to the side of a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated at the junction of Sharrow Lane and Huntingdon Crescent. The appeal scheme would be erected on garden land and the footprint of a single storey addition. Along the boundary with Huntingdon Crescent is a substantial hedge which would visually screen the proposed extension from several locations but, as the Council has identified, there is no certainty that this vegetation would be retained at a future date.
4. By reason of siting, the side wall of the proposed extension would be closer to the shared boundary and would be elevated above the footway of Huntingdon

Crescent. There would remain some side garden between the appeal scheme and the footway.

5. As was observed during the site visit, at other nearby junctions there are examples of the side walls of buildings being sited close to footways, including at 331 Sharrow Lane. The siting of these properties, or extended properties, does not materially alter the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and the streetscenes. Any spacious and open appearance of the streetscenes within the surrounding area is principally associated with dwellings being set back to the rear of landscaped front gardens, which are also used for parking, and an area open space on the north side of Sharrow Lane.
6. The proposed side elevation would be sited forward of the front elevation of the dwellings fronting Huntingdon Crescent. However, although the resulting property would be wider, the appeal scheme would not result in an enlarged dwelling which was so conspicuous so as to significantly detract from the general character and appearance of the streetscene along Huntingdon Crescent. This assessment applies even if the boundary vegetation was removed.
7. From Sharrow Lane, because of its lower ridge height and being set back from the front elevation of the host property, the proposed extension would appear a subservient addition to the property. The design approach echoes the guidance contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Designing House Extensions*. 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 could be imposed.
8. 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

9. 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. For the reason already given, a condition requiring the use of external materials to match those of the host property is necessary.
10. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR