

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/22/3308807

41 Cherry Walk, Chapeltown, Sheffield, S35 1QR

- 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 Russ & Eva Ogden against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00618/FUL, dated 14 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension, single storey front extension and alteration of garden to form off-street parking to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Cherry Walk and California Drive.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached house situated on a large and prominent corner plot on a post-war estate of dwellings of a similar age and architectural style. There are various designs with some other dwellings being detached and others set in short terraces. The appeal dwelling has a mono-pitched roof but this forms an off-set dual pitch with its non-alike semi-detached pair which is set at a slightly lower level and marginally forward of the appeal dwelling. Open frontages and buildings set back from junctions are characteristic of this part of the estate and give it a spacious feel.
 4. The appeal proposal comprises a two-storey side extension that would bring the side elevation of the dwelling significantly closer to California Drive, noticeably reducing the openness on the corner. In addition, a wide but shallow single storey front extension would run across the existing front elevation and part of the side extension. In terms of design the extensions overall would, due to their width, introduce a strong horizontal emphasis.
-

5. Notwithstanding the generous size of the plot, the excessive sideways projection of the two storey extension and consequent loss of openness at the prominent junction of California Drive and Cherry Walk would lead to an incongruous form of development that would be detrimental to the street scene. This would be exacerbated by the extension standing forward of the building line in California Drive, making it unduly obtrusive in the street scene.
6. In terms of design, the single storey extension would appear overly wide due to its overlap with the proposed extension. Whilst this might reduce the appearance of width of the two-storey addition it would nevertheless result in an awkward juxtaposition between the original dwelling and the extension.
7. In terms of roof pitch, I am satisfied that the proposed dual pitched roof would not in itself appear out of place in the street scene or unsympathetic to the host dwelling. However, its overall width in relation to the original main roof would be unsympathetic, making it a dominant, rather than subservient, feature notwithstanding that its ridge height would be lower.
8. With respect to the semi-detached pair, since this is non-identical and set on a different level and on a different building line to the appeal dwelling, I am not persuaded that the proposed extensions would be materially harmful to the character or appearance of the pair.
9. The appellants point out that the design of the extensions would respect the local vernacular in terms of materials and windows and would be compatible with surrounding dwellings. I would not disagree. Nevertheless, the scale of the extension, in particular its width, coupled with the strong and uncharacteristic horizontal emphasis would make it a dominant and discordant addition.
10. It is concluded on the main issue that, owing to the width, design and location on a prominent open corner, the proposed extensions would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Cherry Walk and California Drive. In consequence, they 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 do not result in an overdevelopment of the site and are of a scale and character that complements the original and surrounding buildings.
11. The appellants state that the proposed extensions would provide them with improved accommodation that would meet their needs, that it would be an effective use of land and that the development itself would provide a wider economic benefit. That may be so. However, these matters would not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. The appellants also suggest that the proposed two off-street parking spaces would amount to a positive benefit of the development. However, although 41 Cherry Walk does not currently benefit from off-street parking, I have no evidence of particular parking stress in the area. I therefore consider that the provision of off-street parking would be neutral in the balance and would not provide a justification for allowing the development.

13. 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