
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 for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3292112
380 Gleadless Road, Sheffield S2 3AJ

- 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 Mrs Shkira Zahid against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04677/FUL, dated 2 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey rear and side extensions, new dormers to front and rear roof pitches.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. When viewed from the road, the property is an end of terrace 2-storey dwelling situated within a primarily residential area. Although of a lower ridge height, the property shares the simple sloped gable roof form of the other dwellings within the terrace. Unlike other terraces, the roofscape of this terrace is not disrupted by the construction of dormers within the front roofslopes.
4. The proposed development includes the erection of a dormer window within the front roofslope. Other elements of the proposed development are not objectionable to the Council.
5. The guidance contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Designing House Extensions* refers to dormer windows not rising above the existing ridge line of a roof, nor dominating the roof plane on which they sit. Such extensions will also need to align with, and have similar proportions to, other windows in the dwelling as far as possible.
6. The proposed dormer's siting within the roofslope would be aligned with ground and first floor windows. However, although the glazed opening itself would be of a similar width to these windows and its height would be less, the overall width of the proposed dormer would be wider than the openings below.
7. There would remain views of the original roofslope around the proposed dormer and use of matching external materials could be secured by condition. However, the Planning Officer's concern associated with the absence of a

vertical hierarchy of openings is well founded and the proposed dormer would be an incongruous and prominent addition to the roofslope. By reason of width and the absence of a clear vertical hierarchy, this element of the appeal scheme would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the roofscape of the terrace within which it is located. This unacceptable harm would be visible from the road.

8. Dormers within the front roofslopes of other properties fronting Gleadless Road were observed during the site visit. However, the planning circumstances of these other dormers have not been provided and they are not part of the same terrace as the appeal property. Accordingly, limited weight is given to these other dormers in the determination of this appeal.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would 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. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR