
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/23/3331833
14 Sherwood Glen, Sheffield, S7 2RB

- 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 Paul Fouad against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00836/FUL, dated 10 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to the roof of the dwellinghouse including raised ridge height, hip to gable extension, dormer window to rear and rooflights to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to the roof of the dwellinghouse including raised ridge height, hip to gable extension, dormer window to rear and rooflights to front at 14 Sherwood Glen, Sheffield, S7 2RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00836/FUL, dated 10 March 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 157.05; 157.06; 157.07 Rev B; 157.08 Rev B; 157.09: 157.10 Rev B
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the roof alterations on the character and appearance of Sherwood Glen.

Reasons

3. No 14 is a detached house situated on the eastern side of Sherwood Glen. It is set well back from the road, and has a hipped roof. At the rear is a large two-storey extension with double gable, with a smaller single-storey extension beyond. The proposed development would involve the creation of accommodation in the roof space, necessitating the raising of the ridge, a conversion of hip to gable, and the insertion of a full width dormer in the new rear roof slope with rooflights in the front roof slope.

4. Policy H14 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) indicates that new buildings and extensions should be well designed and be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. Policy BE5 of the UDP indicates that all extensions should respect the scale, form, detail and materials of the original building, and that designs should meet the needs of users, including people with children.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (SPG) indicates that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area, while extensions to dwellings should not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality.
6. The Council considers that the proposed alterations to the roof are not compatible with the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the wider street scene by virtue of its raised ridge height and gable roof form, resulting in an incongruous and obtrusive appearance in the street-scene.
7. The appellants contend that the form of the pitch of the roof proposed matches that of the surrounding buildings. In addition, there are a variety of ridge heights and a mixture of hipped and gable ended buildings, thus allowing for the proposed building frontage to blend and appear 'in keeping' with the existing street scene. They consider that the proposals are proportionate, maintain the character of the area, and are in keeping with the surrounding pattern of residential design along Sherwood Glen.
8. Sherwood Glen is characterised by a range of detached houses of very similar general design. There is a mix of double-fronted and single-fronted houses, all with large front gable bays. Most of the houses have hipped roofs, although a small number have gable ends. Currently, the gable-ended houses are located on the western side of the road, but they are mixed in with the hipped-roof houses such that the mix is a characteristic feature along the road. Although the proposed gable roof at No 14 would be the only example on the eastern side of the road, there would be similar examples almost opposite at Nos 19 and 21, and I do not consider that it would be out of character in the context of the appearance of the whole road.
9. From the information available to me, it would appear that the original scheme would have involved the raising of the eaves as well as the roof ridge. During the course of the processing of the application, revised drawings were submitted to indicate both that the existing eaves level would be retained, and also that the increase in height of the roof ridge would be reduced. As a result of the amendments, the roof height would be set at a level a little above that of the neighbouring house at No 16 and a little below that of the double-fronted house at No 12, forming an effective 'bridge' between the two.
10. The Council has contended that the series of amendments made is not convincing enough to fully offset and justify the harm since the cumulative effect of increasing the overall height, as well as the gable conversion, would appear out of place, unbalancing the relative symmetry and established uniformity along this row of hipped roofs. However, the gable-ended houses on the opposite side are set within small groups of hipped roof houses with no harm to the character of the road. I consider that the existence of a gable-ended roof at No 14 would, to a large extent, complement the situation on the opposite side of the road. The maintenance of the eaves level and the limited increase in height would result in the house appearing very similar to the houses at Nos 19 and 21 opposite.

11. The appellants have indicated that the additional accommodation in the extended roof is required to enable working from home alongside an increase in family size. I acknowledge their desire for stability within an established community, though I am not convinced that the scale of additional accommodation proposed is necessary. Nevertheless, the proposal would enable them to meet the needs of their family and, as concluded above, the proposal would, in any case, not be harmful to the character or appearance of the road.
12. In the light of the above, I find that the proposal would be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings, and that it would respect the scale, form, detail and materials of the original house. Moreover, it would be compatible with the character and built form of the area, and would not detract from the host property or the general appearance of the road. On this basis, it would not be harmful to the character or appearance of Sherwood Glen, and would not conflict with policies H14 or BE5 of the UDP, or with guidance in the SPG. Accordingly, I allow the appeal.

Conditions

13. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR