



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3302973

59 Wadsley Lane, Sheffield S6 4EA

- 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 Kristina and Wayne Himmler and Dale against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00861/FUL, dated 2 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of lower-ground floor extension to basement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above was changed by the Council from the original application form with the agreement of the appellant during the application process.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terraced dwelling located within a residential area the wider area is allocated as a Housing Area in the local plan. The properties in the immediate vicinity are located at a higher level than the highway, and typically have a low front boundary wall enclosing a small sloping front amenity space.
5. The appeal proposal would create a single-storey front extension at lower ground floor to fill the space between the boundary wall and the front elevation, effectively creating additional basement storage. It would have a front projection of approximately 2.8m and a width of 4m. It would be 2m in height, built in stone with a "green" flat roof. To facilitate this, the existing front amenity space would be excavated.
6. Part of the intrinsic character of the terraced properties is the small amenity gap between the highway and the front elevations of the properties on this section of the Wadsley Lane properties at this side of the highway. Many of the properties have introduced planting in this area and it gives a pleasant aesthetic in terms of the locality.

7. Due to the scale and forward projection, I find that the appeal proposal would appear incongruous in the context of both the host property and the street scene. I consider that such a departure from the established built form would appear inconsistent and unsightly, unbalancing the host property, be uncharacteristic and cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to saved policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009) which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings and respect their form and architectural style.
9. I also find conflict with the guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR