



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3338704

11 Carfield Avenue, Sheffield S8 9HY

- 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 Ms Charlotte Walker against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/03011/FUL, dated 22 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of 1st floor side extension over existing porch, and alterations to roof to form bedroom accommodation on 2nd floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. 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

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which is located within a predominantly residential area. Carfield Avenue is varied in character consisting of dwellings of a mix in design and form. The appeal dwelling has been extended previously with a single storey front and side projection. Notwithstanding this, the dwelling and its semi-detached pairing (No.13) are of individual design and, generally, have a well-balanced front façade. This includes a prominent two-storey front gable, and subordinate, recessed two-storey side projections with lower ridge height. Carfield Avenue has a sloping topography resulting in the appeal dwelling positioned at a higher land level than the adjacent detached bungalow (No.9).
5. The proposed side extension includes a side facing gable along with a flat roof element. The height of the extension would exceed that of the existing side gable, resulting in a visually dominant addition to the side. Furthermore, the pitch of the gable would be much steeper than the existing side gable and that

- of the main front gable. This, along with the introduction of a flat roof, would result in a variety of forms which would disrupt the well-balanced roof form of the host dwelling and No.13.
6. Due to the changes in land levels, and the single storey nature of No.9, the side the extension would be prominent when approaching up the hill from Meersbrook Road. From this aspect, the incongruity of the extension, resulting from the variety in roof forms would be most apparent. Furthermore, the height and scale of the extension would appear as a dominant development which would overwhelm the modest scale of No.9.
 7. The height of the extension greatly exceeds that of the existing side projections. Due to this height, when viewed from the front, the extension would result in the semi-detached pairing appearing significantly unbalanced. Furthermore, the lack of any meaningful opening to the front elevation would contrast with the pattern of openings at No.13, resulting in further imbalance to the pairing.
 8. I acknowledge that there are a variety of dwelling designs in the area, and that the appeal dwelling and No.13 are individual in their design. The existing porch appears subservient to the dwelling and do not find that it has unduly eroded the general balance of the pairing. I also note that the topography and context, to a degree, limits the visibility of the pairing. However, as I have identified above, the harmful effect of the extension would be apparent when approaching from Meersbrook Road. In addition, the two properties would be clearly viewed together from the street to the front.
 9. I note the presence of other extensions to semi-detached properties in the area. However, the surrounding area is varied in design, and I do not find these to be directly comparable to the appeal site, its context, or the proposals before me. In any event, I have considered the appeal on its individual merits.
 10. It has been suggested that the construction of a dormer, carried out utilising permitted development rights, would have a more harmful effect than the appeal proposals. I have not been presented with a lawful development certificate which demonstrates what can lawfully be constructed under permitted development rights. As such, I can only attach limited weight to such an argument. In any event, the construction of a dormer is materially different proposal to the appeal development.
 11. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. As such, the development conflicts with Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998); Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009); 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

12. I acknowledge that the development would improve the energy efficiency of the property and the functionality of the dwelling as a family home. The development would therefore help to improve the existing housing stock and would deliver social and environmental benefits in this respect. Nevertheless, it these benefits would be limited when compared to the permanent harm to the host building and streetscene. Therefore, these benefits do not attract such weight which would outweigh the harm that would arise from the development.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR