



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/22/3310655
81 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 Ghazanfar Ali against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/01907/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; and,
 - b) the living conditions of No.79 Whiteways Road through overbearing and overshadowing.

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 characterised in terms of roof form which includes rows of gable roofed properties, which transitions to hipped roof properties. No.81 Whiteways Road is located amongst the hipped roofed properties found along the street. The street is largely uniformed in terms of its pattern and includes regular spacing between semi-detached pairings contributing towards the rhythm of development along the street.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would extend to the side boundary of the plot and does not include any set back or reduction in ridge height. No.83 has been extended to its boundary with No.81 and proposed development would result in the gap between the two properties being lost in its entirety, leading to a terracing effect within the streetscene. 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 lack of any set back of the side extension would mean that any mismatch in materials

would be more apparent. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance 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.79 Whiteways Road. Within the rear elevation of No.79 are rear facing habitable room windows at both ground floor and first floor.
9. The appeal dwelling has an existing single storey rear projection with a shallow pitched roof, and which is sited adjacent to the boundary with No.79. The proposed extensions would be of greater projection along the boundary than existing and would also be of considerably greater mass. Given the scale of the proposals and its proximity to habitable windows, it is considered that the extension would result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing to that property 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.
10. On the second main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of No.79 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.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to other developments on Whiteways Road, which have been cited by the appellant, including those at No.69 and No.83, which I observed on 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 and living conditions of No.79 Whiteways Road.
12. With regard to potential for development at No.79 Whiteways Road, I am not aware that the site benefits from an extant planning permission. Even if planning permission had been granted for that site, there is no mechanism before me to provide certainty that the neighbouring development would be carried out simultaneously with the proposed development. In any event, this would not overcome the design harm that I have identified in the first main issue.

Conclusion

13. 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