



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

by G Dring BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MAUDE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 APRIL 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3336418

4 Roxton Road, Beauchief, Sheffield S8 0BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by T Nash against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02747/FUL.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion including raising ridge by 600mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the Council determined the planning application, the Government has published an updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, as the Framework's policy content insofar as it relates to the main issue has not been significantly changed, albeit that the numbering of paragraphs has changed, there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on this latest version. I am satisfied no party would be prejudiced by determining the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached dwelling with hipped roof, located within a row of similar dwellings in a residential area on a steep road. Directly opposite is a row of single storey garages followed by semi-detached and detached dwellings, with hipped main roofs. The appeal site is not subject to any built environment designations.
5. The appellant asserts that the street scene does not achieve design merit of any particular importance. However, the row of dwellings along this section of Roxton Road, including the appeal property, are all of similar design with bay windows at ground and first floor level and hipped roofs providing for a well-established rhythm which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. A number of dwellings in the surrounding area have been extended previously, nevertheless, the significant majority retain their hipped main roofs, particularly those that are detached.
6. Whilst the features that make up the front wall of the existing dwelling would be retained and materials in keeping with the existing dwelling would be used,

the proposed hip to gable extension and raising of the ridge height would transform the roof shape so that it would appear as an over dominant feature that would be incongruous in the street scene. In the context of the group of houses of which the appeal dwelling forms part, the proposal would severely disrupt the uniformity of roof forms.

7. The proposed rear dormer would extend across the whole width of the dwelling, set only slightly above the eaves level and slightly below the ridge line, meaning that it would appear as a dominant addition to the existing dwelling. Whilst not as prominent as the front elevation, the rear dormer would be visible between existing built form in views from Abbey Lane, particularly given the change in levels. It would also be clearly visible from a number of neighbouring properties and their gardens.
8. I acknowledge the existing hip to gable roof extensions at 16 Roxton Road and 63 Strelley Avenue to which I have been referred. However, these are both semi-detached properties and the adjacent attached dwellings in both cases retain a hipped roof. The overall appearance therefore is different to that of the appeal proposal before me. In addition, neither of the front elevations of these properties are seen in the same view as the appeal dwelling.
9. I also noted the rear dormers present at 29 and 63 Strelley Avenue, which are visible in glimpsed views from Abbey Lane. The appellant also asserts that planning permission has been granted for a rear dormer at 24 Strelley Avenue. Nevertheless, these properties are located further away from Abbey Lane than the appeal site and are therefore less prominent.
10. I therefore find that the proposal, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan Adopted March 1998 (SUDP) and Policy CS 74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted March 2009 (CS). These policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of high quality and that extensions are well-designed, respecting the form and detail of the original building and the character of neighbouring buildings.
11. The proposal would also be contrary to Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions. These guidelines require that proposals reinforce local distinctiveness and that extensions to dwellings do not detract from that dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the Framework which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. There would be a limited economic benefit with the employment of builders and trades people during the construction phase. Whilst the proposal would generate public benefit from improving a dwelling within the housing stock and be of private benefit to the appellant through increased living space, the benefits would inevitably be modest.
13. The appellant asserts that locally sourced materials would be utilised and that there would be no harm in regard to waste, pollution or biodiversity. A lack of harm in these respects is a neutral consideration that weighs neither for, nor

against the proposal. The appellant has suggested that they would be amenable to conditions in relation to landscaping and biodiversity enhancements, however, any such conditions would not mitigate the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

14. Policy BE5 and H14 of the SUDP both refer to extensions as a type of new development where design considerations need to be taken into account, when assessing proposals. Policy CS 74 of the CS discusses design principles in relation to achieving high quality development which enhances the distinctive features of neighbourhoods. These policies are therefore relevant development plan policies.
15. I consider that in line with the case law put before me by the appellant, the three policies identified above, that were cited by the Council in its reason for refusal are the most important in considering this appeal. I find that the policies are in general consistency with chapter 12 of the Framework which relates to achieving well-designed and beautiful places and are therefore up to date. Paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is therefore not engaged.
16. I therefore find that there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

G Dring

INSPECTOR