



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3293924

67 South View Road, Sheffield, S7 1DB

- 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 Tab Hussain against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04483/FUL, dated 17 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene; and the effect of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the occupants of number 65 South View Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling, which is situated in a densely built-up area of the city. I noted during my site visit that a number of properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have been extended and altered. These include dormer extensions on the fronts of dwellings and single storey extensions at the rear. The appellant has also drawn my attention to some of these and I have taken them into account in reaching my decision.
4. The proposal has two distinct and separate elements. A single storey rear kitchen and shower room extension would project 4.6m from the main rear wall of the dwelling. In addition, flat-roofed dormers are proposed on the front and rear of the property. These would facilitate the creation of larger bedrooms in the roof area.

Character and Appearance

5. The Council considers that the proposed dormer at the front of the property would be a visually prominent and incongruous feature that would be harmful to both the appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene.
6. Policies BE5 and H14 of the adopted Sheffield Unitary Development Plan and with Policy CS74 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy generally seek to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design and that it complements in terms of its scale and character. In addition, Guideline 1 of

the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance -Designing House Extensions (SPG) advises that dormer extensions should take the same form as those in the local area. Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) also requires new development to be visually attractive and to add to the overall quality of the area.

7. The Council makes no reference to the planning merits of the proposed dormer at the rear of the dwelling and I have assumed that it has no objection to that part of the development. Although it would be a bulky addition, given its position at the rear, I have no reason to consider it to be unacceptable. I also note that the Council states that it may be possible to construct a rear dormer using permitted development rights.
8. I acknowledge that there are a number of front flat-roofed dormers in the locality that are not dissimilar to the appeal proposal. These include a dormer on the adjoining property at number 69 South View Road (the Council states that it has no record of this). However, I am not persuaded that these are particularly attractive features and they are of a form which, if replicated, would further detract from the appearance of the area. During my site visit, I also observed other smaller dormers with gables, which are less intrusive and more in character with the traditional design of the dwellings. I agree with the Council that a similar design may be an acceptable way forward for the appellant.
9. Although the appeal dormer would be lower than the ridge height of the dwelling and it would sit above the existing eaves, it would appear as a bulky and dominant feature that would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene. In that regard, it would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, the Council's SPG and with the Framework, as referred to above.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed single-storey extension with a sloping roof would project 4.6m from the main rear wall of the dwelling. The Council's SPG advises that single storey extensions should not project more than 3m beyond the rear of a neighbouring property. This distance is a guideline and is, therefore, not necessarily determinative. However, in this case the neighbouring dwelling contains ground floor rear and side facing windows that would be enclosed at close proximity by the proposed extension. In that regard, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably overbearing and overshadowing effect on number 65 South View Road, due to a combination of its height, depth and proximity to the boundary.
11. In reaching my conclusion on this issue, I have taken into account the fact that the occupants of number 65 did not object to the proposal. Nevertheless, there can be many reasons why comments were not made and the absence of an objection does not necessarily mean that a development is acceptable.
12. I also recognise that there are other rear extensions in the area, including two nearby on Vincent Road. However, I do not have the full details relating to these and I also noted that they both have a flat roof, which may reduce the impact on neighbouring property.

Other Matter

13. The applicant states that the appeal development would contribute to an improved quality of life. She suffers from a disability and the kitchen/shower extension on the ground floor would assist in terms of accessibility, whilst the additional accommodation on the second floor would provide space for family members who would assist with care. This is a material consideration, which I have weighed in the balancing exercise. However, whilst I have found the proposal to be unacceptable, I consider that possible amendments to the design of the front dormer and the size and form of a single-storey extension could help to address the appellant's needs.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR