The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2023

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3310657
79 Whiteways Road, Sheffield S4 8EW

- 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 Abdul Hasan against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
- The application Ref: 22/01906/FUL, dated 16 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2022.
- The development proposed is two storey side/two storey rear bedroom extensions, single storey front/6 metre rear extension, existing loft conversion with dormer at rear.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:

   a) the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and area;

   b) the living conditions of No.81 Whiteways Road through overbearing and overshadowing; and,

   c) highway safety, through increased on street parking

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey dwellings which are predominantly semi-detached properties. Whiteways Road has two distinct characters in terms of roof form which includes rows of gable roofed properties, which transitions to a rows of hipped roof properties. No.79 Whiteways Road is located amongst the hipped roofed properties. The street is largely uniformed in terms of its pattern and includes regular spacing between semi-detached pairings, which contributes towards the rhythm of development along the street.

4. The proposed two storey side extension would extend up to the side boundary of the plot and does not include any set back or reduction in ridge height. No.77 is undeveloped to its side and as such a visual gap between the two properties would be retained. However, the lack of any set back, along with the design and scale of the extension, would result in an extension which fails to be subordinate to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the absence of any set back

would mean that any mismatch in materials would be more apparent, which would be to the detriment of the character of the host dwelling.

5. The proposed design of the extensions, which includes a hip to gable roof, and full width two storey and dormer extensions to the rear, would appear unduly bulky and amount to disproportionate additions to the dwelling and, as such, would fail to respect the form of the existing dwelling, resulting in an unacceptable loss of its original character.

6. The scale and design of the extensions, and in particular the hip to gable roof design, would significantly unbalance the semi-detached pairing, which would retain a hipped roof. Furthermore, the proposals would result in a roof form which would be at odds with the prevailing hipped roof character of this part of Whiteways Road. This would be further exacerbated by the scale, design and siting of the rear dormer extension which would add further vertical emphasis and prominence to the extension which would be visible from the streetscene.

7. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling, and that of the wider area. Therefore, the proposed development conflicts with Sheffield Unitary Development Plan Policy BE5, which requires for good design in development and that extensions should respect the scale, form, detail and materials of the original building; Policy H14 which requires extensions to be well designed and be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings; and the guidance contained within the Designing House Extensions SPG, with particular regard to Guideline 1 and Guideline 2.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development includes part two storey, part single storey extensions to the rear of the dwelling. The extension would be built to the boundary with No.81 Whiteways Road. No.81 has existing single storey projections to the rear, and includes rear facing habitable room windows at first floor level and also ground floor within the existing extension.

9. The single storey rear extension at No.81 is sited adjacent to the boundary with No.79. The proposed extension would project beyond the rear building line of the neighbouring extension at single storey level. However, the degree of projection would not be so significant to result in an adverse effect on living conditions through overshadowing on the existing ground floor opening. Notwithstanding this, the proposed two storey extension, given its scale and its proximity to the first floor habitable room window, would result in a overshadowing to the nearest window which would be detrimental to neighbouring living conditions. Furthermore, I consider that the visual mass of the extension, along with its siting on the boundary would result in a form of development which would appear overbearing to the occupants of the neighbouring property. I do not consider that this matter would be mitigated by the presence of the existing extension at No.81.

10. On the second main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of No.81 Whiteways Road through overshadowing and overbearing. I find no particular conflict with the wording of Sheffield Unitary Development Plan Policy BE5, which appears to

relate solely to matters of design. However, the proposed development would conflict with Sheffield Unitary Development Plan Policy H14 which requires that development should not deprive residents of light; and the guidance contained within Guideline 5 of the Designing House Extensions SPG.

Highway Safety

11. The proposed development would result in the loss of the existing driveway to the side of the property, and also includes a modest front extension, further reducing existing off street parking. The proposed extension would result in a 4 bedroom property, while the proposed study could also be utilised as a 5th bedroom.

12. There may be scope for some off-street parking to be provided utilising the existing driveway and hardsurfacing the land to the front of the property. However, I have insufficient information to determine whether there would be sufficient space to accommodate the off street parking required to meet the demands of the dwelling as extension.

13. Therefore, the proposed development may lead to an increase in on street parking. During my site visit I observed that on street parking was a frequent occurrence along Whiteways Road, and included parking on the pavement and on both sides of the street. Further demand for on street parking would only add to this existing problem and I considered that this would be to the detriment of highway safety for both vehicle and pedestrian users.

14. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I consider that the proposed lack of off street parking arising from the development would have a detrimental effect on highway safety. Therefore, the proposed development conflicts with Sheffield Unitary Development Plan Policy H14 which requires development to provide appropriate off street parking and not endanger pedestrians; extensions to be well designed and be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings; and the guidance contained at Guideline 8 of the Designing House Extensions SPG.

Other Matters

15. I have had regard to other developments on Whiteways Road, which have been cited by the appellant, including those at No.69, No.83 and No.110, and I made observations of these during my site visit. I do not have full details of the circumstances under which these extensions were carried out, but there would appear to be material differences between those developments and the proposals before me. In any event, I have considered the proposal on its merits and identified that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling, wider streetscene, living conditions of No.81 Whiteways Road, and highway safety.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, the development conflicts with the Development Plan when considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations which outweigh the harm identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR