The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2022

by L Hughes BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3303947
9 Norton Lees Square, Sheffield S8 8SP

- 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 P Johnson against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
- The application Ref 21/05105/FUL, dated 6 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2022.
- The development proposed is a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer - Juliet balcony arrangement to dormer fenestration.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer - Juliet balcony arrangement to dormer fenestration, at 9 Norton Lees Square, Sheffield, S8 8SP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/05105/FUL, dated 6 December 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved drawing 'Proposed Plans and Elevations' A21-170/L(0-)02B.

    3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original application included raising the ridge line of the property's roof. This element was subsequently removed from the scheme, with amended plans submitted during the application determination period then being the basis of the Council's decision. I have therefore reflected this in the banner heading above and assessed the proposal on this basis.

3. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the rear dormer or front roof lights, and therefore I have only considered the impact of the hip to gable changes to the roof.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene, with specific regard to its potential to create a terracing effect.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling, on a suburban street of similar properties which include some extensions and alterations. The dwelling incorporates a 2-storey side extension built across its original driveway and up to the boundary with No. 7 Norton Lees Square. No. 7 also incorporates a 2-storey side extension with a gable roof, such that there is only a very small gap remaining along the boundary line at ground and first floor levels.

6. The proposal would include amending the existing hipped roof of the side extension to a gable end form. A gable roof would not intrinsically harm the character of the property, which would remain as a 2-storey dwelling. Further, its conjoined neighbour also has a 2-storey extension, albeit with a retention of its original roof form, such that the symmetry of the pair has already been significantly altered. A gable roof form would not unbalance the pair to the extent to cause harm. While the general streetscene is predominantly hipped roofs, No. 7 provides a strong precedent for a gable end as it is so close to the appeal dwelling, notwithstanding that I have no information before me as to when it was erected.

7. A strong terracing effect has already been created by the extensions at No. 9 and No. 7. The hip to gable conversion would remove the slight 'V' gap between the pair at roof level, but this gap is not especially prominent and does not have such significance in the streetscene that its removal would create an additional impression of terracing. In addition, a sense of the properties being separate would still be apparent because No. 9 is situated on a slightly higher ground level.

8. In conclusion therefore, the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene. Accordingly, I find no conflict with policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and guidance within paragraph 130 the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These policies seek, amongst other things, to achieve well-designed places and buildings which are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment, and that extensions are in scale and character with neighbouring buildings.

Other Matters

9. The Council raised no concerns relating to overlooking from the rear elements of the scheme. I note the objections from neighbours in this regard, however, I agree that the proposal would not cause any undue or unreasonable additional overlooking compared to that which currently exists.

10. With regards to other matters raised by objectors, I find that the front rooflights are modest and subordinate, and any light from them would only be similar to that from the dwelling's existing first floor windows. I also find the rear dormer to be subordinate within the rear elevation. Concerns regarding the raising of the ridge line have already been addressed through the removal of this aspect of the proposal.

11. The Council's approach to consultation during the application process is a procedural matter and does not affect my findings on the main issues.

Conditions

12. I have attached the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and which specify the approved plan, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have also attached a condition requiring matching materials in order to maintain cohesion of the dwelling's appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the development accords with the development plan taken as a whole, and therefore that the appeal is allowed

L Hughes

INSPECTOR