The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2023

**by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13th November 2023**

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/23/3328745**
**41 Cherry Walk, Chapeltown, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S35 1QR**

- 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 and Mrs Russ and Eva Ogden against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
- The application Ref 23/00082/EH, dated 21 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2023.
- The development proposed is two-storey side extension and single-storey front extension.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Cherry Walk and California Drive.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 41) is a two-storey semi-detached house with a mono-pitched roof. Its attached neighbour has a different elevational design and is set at a slightly lower level, just forward of No 41. Together, the pair forms an off-set dual pitch roof. The appeal property stands on a prominent corner plot in an estate of similar dwellings which are detached, in pairs, or arranged in short terraces. The part of the estate around the appeal site has a spacious feel because of the open frontages and buildings set back from junctions.

4. It is proposed to erect a two-storey side extension with a single storey front porch extension across part of it. The scheme has been revised following a dismissed appeal (reference APP/J4423/D/22/3308807) in which the Inspector concluded that the width of the two-storey extension and consequent loss of openness would lead to incongruous and harmful development exacerbated by the extension standing forward of the building line in California Drive, making it unduly obtrusive in the street scene.

5. The height and width of the two-storey extension have been reduced. The design of the now smaller porch extension would be acceptable. I agree with the previous Inspector that a dual pitched roof would not in itself appear out of

place in the street scene or unsympathetic to the host dwelling. However, even though its ridge height would be lower than shown previously and it would be set back, the overall width of the side extension would still appear unsympathetic to the original property, including the main roof. This would result in a dominant extension. The flank elevation of the resulting building would remain significantly closer to California Drive, reducing the openness at the corner to an unacceptable degree, even when the front extension of 15 California Drive is taken into account.

6. The design of the extensions would respect the local vernacular in terms of the proposed materials and windows design. There would be no harm to the appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses or to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Nevertheless, the overall scale of the extension, resulting particularly from its width, would result in a dominant and visually jarring addition, notwithstanding the generous size of the plot.

7. I conclude that the width, design and location of the two-storey extension on this prominent, open corner would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Cherry Walk and California Drive. For these reasons there would be conflict with Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan; the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and with the guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance, Designing House Extensions. In summary, and amongst other things, they require extensions to be sympathetic to local character and designed with a scale and character that complements the original and surrounding buildings.

8. The proposed extensions would provide the appellants with improved accommodation that would meet their particular needs, would be an effective use of land and the construction of the development would provide a wider economic benefit. Whilst these matters are important, they do not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*Elaine Benson*

INSPECTOR