

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/C1055/D/22/3310228

99 Sinfin Avenue, Derby, DE24 9EY

- 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 Mrs Sophie Najib against the decision of Derby City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1186/FUL, dated 25 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension and the formation of accommodation in the roof space by increasing the ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Sinfin Avenue and Breydon Close.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal includes two storey side and rear extensions. However, these have been permitted separately from the roof accommodation by the Council and at the time of my site visit were well advanced. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the formation of accommodation in the roof space by increasing the ridge height.
 4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house that stands on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Sinfin Avenue and Breydon Close. It lies within a large estate of dwellings of similar post war age and design. Although some of the dwellings are single storey they all have in common characteristic shallow pitched roofs. In a small number of cases ridge heights have been increased but in only one case did I see a dwelling with accommodation in the roof space.
 5. The current extensions have already necessitated an increase in ridge height at the appeal dwelling from an original 6m to about 7.6m. This is understood to be a similar amount to other dwellings on the estate. The appeal proposal would involve a further increase of 0.7m, resulting in a finished ridge height of some 8.3m. This is a substantial increase over and above the initial height, especially
-

given the low profile of the original roof. The inclusion of roof windows on both the front and rear elevations would only serve to draw the eye, adding to the visually intrusive effect of the roof.

6. On its prominent corner plot the dwelling, which stands out in the street scene due to its position and the existing extensions which bring it noticeably closer to the edge of the highway in Breydon Close, would appear substantially larger, higher and more imposing than other dwellings in the area. As a result the increase in ridge height would stand out as an incongruous and anomolous alteration that would detract from the pleasing consistency of roof form and roof height in the area.
7. It is therefore concluded on the main issue that the proposed roof extension would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Sinfin Avenue and Breydon Close. In consequence, it would conflict with Policy H16 of the City of Derby Local Plan Review, 2006, Policies CP3 and CP4 of the Derby City Local Plan – Part 1: Core Strategy, 2017, and with the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together and amongst other things, these policies expect housing extensions to be of a high quality design such that they make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the neighbourhood through sympathetic massing, visual prominence and scale.
8. The appellant points out other dwellings in the local area where increases in ridge height have been permitted. However, the examples given suggest that these increases are more consistent with the increase already allowed at the appeal dwelling but appear to be noticeably less than the additional increase that is the subject of this appeal. I do not therefore find these examples readily comparable with the appeal proposal. Moreover, each case must be judged on its own merits as I have done.
9. The appellant also points out a need for additional accommodation to enable elderly relatives to live with the family. However, whilst I have sympathy with this need it would not outweigh the material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters, including the representations of a third party, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR