



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3339070

28 Bignor Road, Wadsley Bridge, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S6 1JD

- 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 Mrs Elizabeth Buckley against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/03150/FUL, dated 02 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the provision of pitched roof over existing first floor bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the banner above I have used the description of development as described on the decision notice instead of the planning application form, as this describes the proposed development more concisely.
3. Since the decision was made by the Council, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published (19 December 2023). This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which is located at the head of Bignor Road, a cul-de-sac, which lies within a predominantly residential area. Dwellings along Bignor Road are semi-detached with either hipped or gable roofs. While some dwellings have been extended and altered, two-storey flat roof bay windows to the front elevation, which sit below the eaves of the roof, are a prevailing characteristic of the street. The front roof slopes of dwellings along Bignor Road are generally unaltered which provide a sense of visual uniformity.
6. The appeal dwelling has been extended with a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension. Those extensions appear visually subservient. The original front elevation of the dwelling and its semi-detached pairing

remain well-balanced, largely due to the design and symmetry of the front bay windows and unaltered roof form.

7. The proposal includes a pitch above the existing flat roof bay. While modest in scale, the addition would project above the eaves of the existing roof, projecting from the roof slope. This would disrupt the unbroken roof design of the dwelling, resulting in the semi-detached pairing having two bays of varying design. This would visually imbalance the original front façade of these properties. Furthermore, the development would introduce a roof feature which is not characteristic to Bignor Road, breaking the uniformity of unaltered roofslopes. The development would therefore result in a standalone feature which would appear alien within its surroundings.
8. I acknowledge that some bays along Bignor Road have been altered, however they all remain below the eaves and do not affect the main roof slope. Therefore, I do not find any variety in the street to be directly comparable to the appeal development. The appellant has cited a development on Lymminster Road, however I have not been provided with any details of this scheme to draw any comparisons to the appeal development. In any event, I have considered the appeal on its individual merits.
9. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the development conflicts with Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998); the guidance contained within the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance, with particular regard to Guideline 1 and Guideline 2; and, the Framework. Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver extensions that are of high-quality design which reflect the character of the original building and appearance of the street.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the development would help to improve the existing housing stock through a small increase in headroom in one room. Nevertheless, it is likely that these benefits to the appellant would be short term when compared to the permanent harm to the design of the host building and streetscene. This is therefore not a significant factor in my overall assessment.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR