



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2022

by P. D. Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3309399
156 Bevan Way, Sheffield S35 1RJ.

- 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 Joe Brookes against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application 22/01436/FUL, dated 3 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extension and extension of rear decking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original description of development did not include the extension of the decking and the description was amended with the agreement of the appellant. I have therefore used the amended description as it appears on the decision notice and appeal form for the purposes of my decision.
3. In the appellant's statement he appears to indicate a willingness to make further amendments to the roof and eaves design. However, no plans are before me in this respect and I must determine the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans considered by the Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings on Bevan Way.

Reasons

5. The appeal site sits on the south side of Bevan Way which is characterised by mainly semi-detached, two storey dwellings built in light brown brick and tile. The houses westwards from and including the appeal property have a very uniform appearance and style and are all built with gable ended roofs. Only one house in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site appears to have been extended to the side but has retained its gabled roof.
6. I noticed that the house design is different on the section of Bevan Way on its south side and east of the appeal site. Here the semi-detached housing is built with hipped roofs however the houses on the north side of this section of Bevan Way remain gabled. Further east where Bevan Way runs into Birch Avenue styles change again and I noticed that properties are built to a design with a projecting front gable which is either rendered or panelled. Nowhere else, however, on the

two streets is there any evidence of render being used extensively and the principal facing material is brick.

7. No 156 is effectively a corner plot being located just west of a minor access road leading to an area of open space to the rear of Bevan Way. This and the fact the house stands on a slight bend means that both the front and side elevations of the property are prominent in views west up Bevan way.
8. The proposal would create a side and rearward extension under hipped roofs and, in response to earlier discussions with the Council, the appellant has stepped back the first floor of the side extension with the result that the roof would be foreshortened and the eaves line on the frontage would be set higher. Whilst it has been put to me that this was done to ensure the extension was subservient and to create a distinction between the original property and its extension it would achieve little in making the extension subordinate to the main house and it would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the design of the original house. The uniform symmetrical design of the semi-detached pairing would also be lost and the character of Nos 156 and 154 would be eroded as a result. Whilst I accept there are hipped roof designs in the immediate area these are on a different style of house and more importantly there did not appear to be any examples where gabled and hipped roofs are mixed on the same semi-detached pairing.
9. I acknowledge that the rear projecting element of the side extension features a lower ridge level to the main roof but, partly as a result of the falling ground level to the south, the overall effect of the combined side and rear extension would appear overly large and disproportionate to the main house. Moreover, the resulting scale and height would be overbearing on the approach road to the open space.
10. In addition to the fact that the roof, eaves line and overall scale constitutes a poor design solution to the extension, the proposal includes finishing the whole house in render. This would appear completely at odds, not only with the semi-detached neighbour at No 154, but also with the whole street, where as noted above there is no property in the surrounding area that is finished completely in render. Allowing this element of the proposal would simply serve to make the extension even more obtrusive.
11. It has been put to me that the application of render would enable energy efficiency to be improved. Important though this is, as there are other ways of securing higher energy efficiency values I am not persuaded that this would warrant using render as the facing material, particularly on the front and side of the property, when no other house in the immediate vicinity is finished in this way.
12. Paragraph 130 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) requires development to be sympathetic to local character to create high quality buildings and spaces amongst other things and in these respects as a result of the proposed roofing and materials choice the proposal would fail. Policy CS74 of the *Sheffield Core Strategy* (SCS) is consistent with the Framework at a strategic level in seeking high quality development. Although now dated, the *Sheffield Urban Development Plan* (SUDP) at policies BE5 on building design and H14 on development in housing areas are consistent with the design policies of the Framework. Policy BE5 requires extensions to respect the scale, form, detail and materials of the original building whilst Policy H14 requires extensions to be well designed and in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. The Council, to assist in the implementation of these policies, has prepared the *Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance* (SPG) which sets out the principles

for quality extensions. It states that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area, should not detract from the dwelling or the appearance of the locality and should use matching materials and features amongst other things. In particular the SPG advises against the use of render as a facing material where the house, or at least part of the house, is not rendered and in respect of roofs it advises that, both in respect of materials and form, the proposed roof should be carefully related to the existing. The proposal fails to successfully apply these principles.

13. It has been put to me that the Framework does not discourage innovation in design. However both at paragraphs 130c) and 134 where innovation is mentioned the Framework caveats support by making it clear that proposals must still be in sympathy with local character and the overall form and layout of surroundings which the appeal proposal would not achieve.
14. For the reasons above the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings and as such would be in conflict with SCS Policy CS74, SUDP Policies BE5 and H14 and with the SPG guidance.

Other Matters

15. I understand the appellant's wish to achieve additional family accommodation in this large extension and in that way make sustainable and effective use of housing land, an objective which is encouraged by the Framework in Section 11. However, paragraph 124 in the same section of the Framework states that this should not be at the expense of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting.
16. The Council made it clear that it would have accepted an alternative gabled roof design and using different materials and as such I am not persuaded that there would not be an alternative that would be more in keeping with the surrounding character and appearance. Sustainable and effective use of the dwelling would not therefore outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings as a result of the proposal.

Conclusion

17. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the matters before me but, for the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR