
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3297013
42 Westfield Crescent, Sheffield S205AQ

- 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 Lee Bishop against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/03453/FUL (formerly PP-10086442), dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant describes the proposed development as a 'proposed erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension', whereas the local planning authority (LPA) describes it in its decision notice as for the 'erection of two/single-storey side extension with hip to gable roof and integral garden store'.
3. The final plans as submitted by the appellant include a hipped roof rather than a gable and the LPA, in its decision letter, notes that this is based on a plan number showing a hipped roof.¹
4. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that it is for a two-storey side extension with a hipped roof and integral garden store.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the two-storey side extension upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The host property is situated in a residential area consisting mainly of two-storey, brick-built properties with double pitched roofs, many of which are hipped but where there are also those with gables. There is a mix of dwelling

¹ Plan ref. 20/04d

types including terraces and semi-detached dwellings. Properties generally have front amenity spaces, many of which are given over to off-road parking but with others having hedging along their boundaries with the access roads. Properties normally follow clearly defined building lines. Dwellings at corners of road junctions often have side amenity spaces which contribute to the openness of the area and add positively to its character.

7. The proposed house has a side garden to Ash Street which is mirrored by a similar side garden on the opposite side of the access street at this point. Even though the host property is surrounded by hedging and fencing which hides the side garden, the absence of any two-storey development within it is clear and this adds to the character and appearance of the area and the pleasing sense of openness. The building of a two-storey extension on this side garden would erode this character unacceptably.
8. I note that the proposed design incorporates a hipped roof. However, I do not consider that this would sufficiently reduce the loss of openness at the road junction.
9. The proposed extension would use materials to match the host property. This is a matter in favour of the design. In addition, the single storey front extension, by its limited size and height, would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.
10. The overall design would have a similar roof height to the existing ridge and would not be set back from its front elevation such as to make the extension subservient in scale to the existing dwelling and to reduce its bulk and scale. However, even if these matters had been included in the design, they would not overcome the loss of openness provided by the existing amenity space at this road junction.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with policy H14 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 1998, or with its Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 1996, or with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, all of which require development to be compatible with and reflective of the scale, character, and appearance of building in the area.
12. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would not accord with the development plan for the area. There are no identified material planning considerations which outweigh the conflict with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR