



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/23/3327247

64 Sandygate Park, Sheffield S10 5TZ

- 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 Waller against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01308/FUL, dated 20 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is increase ridge height to create habitable room in roofspace and installation of electric sliding gates to front drive.
-

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 appeal property is a detached property in a predominately residential area. It is set back from the highway, and is brick built in construction. The properties in the locality are generally detached, to two storeys, to various designs.
4. The proposal would seek to increase the roof ridge of the property by approximately 1.8m in order to facilitate additional habitable room space and create the equivalent of a window at a third storey in order to facilitate this. In addition to this, gates would be installed onto the front drive at the boundary.
5. A key aspect of the character of this area of Sandygate Park is that the detached dwellings generally have a uniformity of two storeys and the symmetry of height to those properties. This existing uniformity and symmetry would be disrupted by the increase in roof height and then exacerbated by the bulk and mass of what will appear externally to be a three-storey gable.
6. I find that this would lead to harm to the character and appearance of the area by introducing an increase in height to the roof that would be incongruous and out of place in its context.
7. The increase in roof height and the appearance of the gable would be visible from various positions along Sandygate Park. This further emphasises that the appeal proposal would result in development that would not assimilate successfully with the character and appearance of the area.

8. With regard to the proposed gates, as stated previously this is a residential area with a variety of house types and designs, and there are a mix of boundary treatments to the frontages of the properties, but the overriding feature is of low walls and vegetation and open driveways.
9. The design and height of the gates would create a prominent and intrusive feature in the streetscene which would be out of keeping with local character, distinctiveness and sense of place. Whilst the harm caused may be localised, this does not provide a justification for harmful development.
10. I have noted that the appellant has stated that gates of up to 1m in height could be erected under permitted development. From a planning perspective, that is a homeowners right; whether there is a covenant restricting such works to be carried out, that would not be a planning matter.
11. Overall, I find that the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and is contrary to saved policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and saved policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) which, amongst other matters, expect development to provide high quality development, respect the scale, form, details and materials of the original building, and be of an appropriate scale and character. I also find conflict with the design advice given in the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

12. The proposal is not in accordance with the Council's development plan as a whole and there is nothing outlined in the Framework that demonstrates or indicates that I should act other than in accordance with this.
13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR