



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2023

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/22/3312596

180 Rock Street, Sheffield S3 9HH

- 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 M.Ghazi Saddiq (Diwan Properties Ltd) against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02293/FUL, dated 16 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension. Dormer to existing loft bedroom at front/rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The locality is predominately residential, whilst the row that the appeal site is sat on is terraced in nature, but the properties have dimensions similar to semi-detached dwellings rather than terraced properties.
4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot with visibility from Rock Street, Catherine Street and Nottingham Street and would see the erection of a single storey side extension and dormers located within the roof space to the front and rear of the property.
5. The host property occupies a large and prominent corner plot on the corner of the junction outside of a bend at the junction with a short cul-de-sac. Due to the angle of the existing dwelling, the extension would run parallel to Catherine Street along the width of the property. As a result, in this highly visible location in the street scene, close to the boundary, it would significantly dominate the locality in this sensitive location. The surrounding houses are set further back from the highway than this house would be.
6. The proposed extension in this case would be single storey and be of mono-pitch design. However, whilst the existing dwelling has a dual-pitched roof with a prominent gable end the extension would not reflect the design of the host dwelling and would not integrate effectively with it. Moreover, due to the relative width of the extension and consequential shallow pitch of the roof would further draw attention to its incongruous appearance against the host dwelling.

7. The extension would be prominent in the street scene due to its position next to the footpath and road frontage. From these views the contrast between the two roof forms would be particularly apparent. Furthermore, as the extension would project into the open space adjacent to Catherine Street, it would reduce the openness to the side of the dwelling and have harmful effects with regard to the street scene as it would look at odds with local building layouts.
8. Turning to the proposed dormers, the front dormer would occupy much of the appeal property's front roof plane. It would be set in from the sides of the roof. Despite its set up and down, it would be a considerable structure that would dominate the property's front roof.
9. The two proposed windows would relate poorly to the existing fenestration of the host property and fail to align with the existing pattern of openings at ground or first floor level. This being so the proposal would sit uncomfortably on the host property and appear discordant there.
10. In this context, the proposed dormer would stand out as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would fail to respect the appearance of the appeal property and its immediate neighbours. Given its prominent position to the front of the appeal property it would be highly visible in close range views and on approach from all directions.
11. I appreciate that there are existing front dormers on nearby properties but these dormers are smaller than the proposal before me and do not form part of the row of properties in which the appeal building sits. They relate to a different and distinct context thus they are well separated from the appeal property and are appreciated in a different context and not as part of the immediate section of the street scene which includes the appeal property.
12. Bringing matters together, for the reasons given, the proposed front dormer would detract from the appearance of the host property to the detriment of the character and appearance of the terrace and the street scene.
13. I have noted the Council's position regarding the rear dormer and permitted development and will not deal with that matter any further. I have identified harm with regard to other aspects of the development in any event.
14. In summary, I find conflict with policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy which, amongst other matters, expect development to follow a number of common design principles. I also find conflict with the design aspirations of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR