

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2023

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3308113

20 Smalldale Road, Sheffield, S12 4YB

- 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 & Mrs Jonathan Goude against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02678/FUL, dated 18 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of front and rear two storey extensions and rear single storey extension with velux roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the two storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene of Smalldale Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal includes single and two storey rear extensions. The Council raises no objection to these and I agree they would be acceptable. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the proposed two storey front extension.
 4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house located in a street of similar semi-detached dwellings. Smalldale Road is set on a hill with one side of the street, including the appeal dwelling, being noticeably higher than the other. Owing to its location on higher land and to the small frontages the appeal dwelling and its neighbours are prominent in the street scene.
 5. Although dwellings in the street are similar, mostly of red brick with some pebble dashed or with painted render, there are variations in design. The appeal dwelling and its neighbours have a distinctive shallow two storey front projection. At the appeal dwelling, in common with other nearby dwellings, a single storey porch has been added across part of this forward projection. The proposed development would involve the removal of the porch and construction of a two storey extension across the full width of the front projection to a depth
-

of some 1.5m which is similar to the depth of the existing porch. The extension would be finished in red brick and would have a hipped roof. The original property which is currently pebble dashed would be smooth rendered and painted.

6. Although I find the use of red brick acceptable in a street characterised by red brick dwellings, the proposed extension would project noticeably into the small frontage and forward of the adjoining and other neighbouring dwellings at first floor. Although the roof would be set well down from the main roof the forward projection, coupled with the prominent location in the street, would make the extension a bulky and discordant addition that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the street scene of Smalldale Road.
7. The appellants suggest that sufficient similar extensions to the appeal proposal exist in the area for them to be characteristic. However, I saw very few similar two storey front extensions with only one similar extension in Smalldale Road, on the opposite, lower, side of the street. This to my mind appeared bulky and anomalous. It does not therefore persuade me that the appeal proposal, on its more prominent plot, should be allowed.
8. It is concluded on the main issue that although the proposed rear extensions would be acceptable, the two storey front extension would be materially detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Smalldale Road. In consequence, it would conflict with Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan, 1998, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance, Designing House Extensions. Taken together and amongst other things, these require extensions to be visually attractive, sympathetic to local character and well designed such that they are of a scale and character that complements the original and surrounding buildings.
9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR