



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st February 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3309289

264 Darnall Road, SHEFFIELD, S9 5AN

- 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 Mohammad Naseem Shahid against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02955/FUL, dated 8 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is two front dormers to existing dwelling house.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3313921

264 Darnall Road, SHEFFIELD, S9 5AN

- 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 Mohammad Naseem Shahid against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02958/FUL, dated 8 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is front porch and carport to side of dwellinghouse.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3313919

264 Darnall Road, SHEFFIELD, S9 5AN

- 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 Mohammad Naseem Shahid against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02956/FUL, dated 8 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is alterations to boundary wall (raising height), renewal of front gate (2.2m high), renewal of painted render to boundary wall and dwelling house and renewal of decorative brick piers to either side of front gate.
-

Decision

1. Appeals A and C are dismissed.
 2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for front porch and carport to side of dwellinghouse at 264 Darnall Road, SHEFFIELD, S9 5AN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02958/FUL, dated 8 August 2022, and drawing DRW01 submitted with it, insofar as it is relevant to the porch and carport hereby permitted.
-

Preliminary Matters

3. The three appeals concern development that has already been carried out, so I have treated the proposals as being retrospective. The appeals are linked, and so to avoid repetition, I have dealt with them together where appropriate.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in Appeals A, B and C is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.
5. An additional main issue, which applies to Appeal C only, is the effect of the development on the highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Appeal A

6. The appeal property is a detached house located between an area of open space and a short row of houses, in a predominately residential area. This section of Darnall Road is on a hill which crests just beyond the appeal property. The houses step up the slope, so the appeal property is at a slightly higher level than its immediate neighbour.
7. There are a variety of styles and ages of housing nearby, but the most prevalent dwelling type are traditional detached and semi-detached houses, like the appeal property and its immediate neighbours. Many of the surrounding properties have been altered over time, and now have their own distinguishing features. Nonetheless, front dormers are uncommon along this part of Darnall Road, which is characterised by properties with simple pitched roofs.
8. The two front dormers which are the subject of Appeal A are set within the roof plane, but their considerable height and depth means that they dominate the front roof. Although their materials reflect those of the host property, the large size of the dormers give a top-heavy appearance to the house, with windows of different sizes which do not align with those of the main front elevation.
9. As a result of the changes made by the appellant, the house looks well cared for, in an area where many houses are in need of repair. However, owing to their size and fenestration, the front dormers do not relate well to the original dwelling. Furthermore, their large size means that the front dormers form an overly prominent feature in the streetscene, which is exacerbated by the elevated position of the appeal property.
10. Appeal A therefore fails to comply with guidelines 1 and 2 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), which says that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area, and should not detract from the dwelling or general appearance of the street.
11. I acknowledge that there are other examples of front dormers in the vicinity, including further along Darnall Road and on Barnardiston Road, but these appear much smaller within the roof plane than the appeal dormers, and so are less prominent. Other examples which the appellant has referred to, at Clay Pit Way, Quarryfield Rd, Brindle Mews, are quite a distance away. They are not viewed in the same context as the appeal property, and in any case are located on houses which are very different in style and appearance.

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the front dormers cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore conflicts with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy 2009, and Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 (UDP). Together, these policies require that new development is of a high quality design, in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. Appeal A also conflicts with UDP Policy BE5, which says that extensions should respect the scale, form and detail of the original building.
13. There is further conflict with paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which promote high quality design that is sympathetic to local character,

Appeal B

14. The Council has raised no objection to the porch, and I agree that its scale is proportionate to the main house, and that its design and materials respect the appearance and character of the appeal property. The porch is acceptable.
15. The carport at the side of the appeal property is constructed of a black felt roof with white uPVC cladding. I acknowledge that the materials are not of particularly high quality, but the structure reads as a carport rather than an extension, so the use of lightweight materials is not unexpected. The white uPVC reflects that of the windows and doors, and the black felt roof reflects the dark grey tiles of the main roof.
16. The white uPVC frontage of the carport appears as a subservient feature which is not overly prominent in relation to the main front elevation, and the felt roof has a shallow pitch, which limits its visual impact. Although visible from the street and the adjacent areas of greenspace, the carport is not overly conspicuous in the streetscene, and does not detract from the appearance of the main house to any harmful degree.
17. The effect of porch and car port on the character and appearance of the area is therefore acceptable. Appeal B is consistent with the requirements for good design set out in Core Strategy Policy CS74 and UDP Policies BE5 and H14.
18. In relation to the porch and carport, I have identified no conflict with the requirements for house extensions contained in the SPG. The development also complies with the design requirements contained in paragraphs 130 and 134 of the Framework.

Appeal C

Character and appearance

19. Houses along this section of Darnall Road are generally set back from the street behind small front gardens. Boundary treatments are typically low brick walls.
20. The appeal property forms the end of a row of houses, and the submitted drawing shows that there was already a high boundary wall to the side, adjacent to the area of greenspace. As part of the appeal proposal, the height of the section of this wall closest to the road has been raised, but only by a modest amount. The overall height of the wall has not been increased, and on

its own, this element of the scheme has little impact on the character of the host property or the wider area.

21. The 2.5m high piers were in place prior to the appeal works being carried out, with a metal gate between. The replacement piers and gate are no higher overall, but unlike the previous railing style, the new gate is solid in form. The black coloured gate, which is some 2.2m in height, presents a blank, defensive appearance to the street.
22. Furthermore, the combined effect of the raised side boundary wall, the solid front gate, and the 2.5m internal garden wall has been to completely enclose the space in front of the car port, to a height of well over 2m. The result is a high and solid feature which projects beyond the main building line of the house to the back of the pavement.
23. All of the boundary walls have been finished with a grey colour, which is not unattractive and compliments the colour of the render on the main house. However, the solid gate and high walls surrounding the driveway form an intrusive feature in the streetscene, which fails to respect the open character of the front gardens in this area, with their low boundary walls.
24. The appeal property was previously used as a motorbike repair garage, and I note the appellant's comment that it is still associated with that use, and has been targeted by thieves on several occasions. I appreciate the need for security measures, but this can be achieved in other ways such as CCTV. Furthermore, a less closed aspect to the driveway would make the domestic use of the site more apparent. I am therefore unconvinced that the measures included in Appeal C are necessary for security purposes.
25. I conclude that the replacement solid gate and raised internal garden wall cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. These elements of Appeal C fail to respect the townscape character of this neighbourhood, so conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS74. As the structures do not complement the scale, form and character of surrounding buildings, there is also conflict with UDP Policies BE5 and H14.

Access arrangements

26. Unlike most of its neighbours, the appeal property has a side driveway with off-road parking. Cars emerging from the site will need to cross the pavement and pass any parked cars before turning onto Darnall Road. The changes to the boundary walls included in Appeal C are therefore unlikely to affect visibility along Darnall Road itself, but the raised internal garden wall may well affect the ability of drivers to see people using the pavement.
27. To provide adequate sightlines for pedestrians, the SPG recommends that boundary walls may need to be reduced in the vicinity of an entrance, but in this case they have been increased. I acknowledge that the Council's highways officer has not raised any objection, but no further explanation has been provided as to why the raised wall is acceptable in this case.
28. The pre-existing side wall may have already been too high for drivers to see over, hampering visibility to the east. However, the raised internal garden wall means that, when leaving the property, it will not be possible for a driver to see pedestrians coming along the footpath from the north west either, until their vehicle has emerged beyond the solid gate piers. The ability of

pedestrians to see cars emerging from the site will also be hampered by the presence of the high wall. This lack of intervisibility is a particular concern in this case, as it is very likely that children from the surrounding area will walk or cycle along this stretch of Darnall Road to reach the nearby primary school.

29. As there is no space to turn in the drive, it will be necessary for drivers to reverse either into or out of the parking space. Reversing out of the drive causes particular concerns over visibility, because the car will need to emerge further onto the pavement before the driver can see other road users, increasing safety concerns.
30. I note the appellant's comment that the garden wall has historically been overgrown with vegetation so raising the wall has had no impact on visibility for a driver. However, vegetation can be cut back whereas the wall is a permanent feature.
31. I conclude that, the raised internal garden wall, Appeal C has increased risks to pedestrian safety. As it does not contribute to a safe environment and does not promote all aspects of personal safety, Appeal C fails to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS74 and UDP Policy BE5. The development could endanger pedestrians, so fails to comply with UDP Policy H14d). There is further conflict with paragraph 110b) of the Framework, which requires that a safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users.

Conclusion and conditions

32. For the reasons set out above, Appeal A and C fail to comply with the development plan and the Framework. No other considerations outweigh this finding, so these appeals are both dismissed.
33. I have found that the effect of the porch and carport on the character and appearance of the area is acceptable, so Appeal B is allowed. Because the development has already taken place, it is not necessary to impose any additional conditions.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR