
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: 29 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3308380

29 Worcester Road, Sheffield S10 4JH

- 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 Kangasabapathy against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01898/FUL, dated 11 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2022.
 - The development is a proposed roof lift and construction of rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council raises no concerns with the rear dormer element of the scheme, or the materials proposed. Therefore, I have focused my consideration solely on the outcome of the proposed increase in the property's ridge height.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development:
 - on the character and appearance of the streetscene; and
 - on highway safety, regarding provision of off-street parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a detached 2-storey property in a suburban street, which contains a variety of house styles and sizes.
5. A raise to the property's ridge height would not unduly affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling in itself. This is because the height increase would not be overbearing in scale, and from the front the dwelling would retain its 2-storey character.
6. However, it is very apparent in the streetscene that there is a cohesive row of 4 detached dwellings in terms of size and design at numbers 23, 25, 27, and 29 Worcester Road. Intrinsic to this is that their ridge levels maintain a marked step down along the row due to the topography, with No. 29 being the lowest. The proposal would raise the roof height of No. 29 up to at least that of No. 25, which would thus appear as a clear interruption to this arrangement. It would also introduce a different roof pitch compared to the other 3 dwellings.

Together this would cause undue prominence in the streetscene and be an incongruous feature.

7. The prominence of this proposal would be particularly marked because the built form drops beyond No. 29 to only single storey garages, so that there is no surrounding backdrop of other 2-storey dwellings. I note the appellant's examples of approved applications in other streets which contain dwellings with stepped roofs. However, they are not directly comparable streetscene contexts, and therefore do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
8. In conclusion therefore, the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (1998) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009). These policies seek for extensions to be well designed, and that they should respect the distinctive features of neighbouring buildings and the neighbourhood, including through scale, layout and built form.
9. The proposal would also be contrary to guidelines 1 and 2 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), and guidance within paragraph 130 the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') (2021). These aim for schemes to contribute to visually attractive places sympathetic to the local character and built form of the area.

Parking

10. The Council considers that an additional parking space is required as part of the proposed scheme, due to the enlarged dwelling size and because of high demand for parking locally. No changes are proposed to the existing car parking arrangements for the property, which comprises hardstanding within its frontage.
11. The House Extensions SPG Guideline 8 identifies that a driveway for a single vehicle should be at least 5m long and 2.75m wide, or at least 3.2m wide if it is also the only pedestrian access to the dwelling, as in this case. The SPG does not specify widths for a 2 car driveway, but I would expect this to be less than double these figures.
12. The appellant identifies that the driveway is 5.25m long and 5.25m wide, which would broadly meet these width requirements. I am also satisfied from my site visit and from the photomontage evidence, that 2 cars could acceptably be accommodated. This includes because one could be positioned close to the lawn with its doors partially opening over the grass if necessary.
13. In conclusion therefore, the development would not result in harm to highway safety regarding provision of off-street parking. This would comply with policy H14 of the UDP, Guideline 8 of the House Extensions SPG, and guidance within paragraph 111 of the Framework. Together these aim for proposals to provide appropriate off-street parking, and for development to only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge that the proposed development would provide a benefit for present and future occupants by creating additional space in the home. However, this is a minor private benefit which does not mitigate the harm which would be caused as outlined above.
15. I note the appellant's suggestions that the proposal aligns with the Framework's requirement to achieve sustainable development, including the contribution to the local economy, and in making the dwelling more energy efficient. However, these are only minor benefits which also do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

16. I have found that the proposal would provide satisfactory parking, however, it would harm the character and appearance of the streetscene. This harm would not be outweighed by the minor benefits of the scheme. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

L Hughes

INSPECTOR