



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3340111

18 The Lawns, Sheffield S11 9FL

- 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 Paul Bestall against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1047/FUL, dated 28 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear and two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the demolition of the detached garage, and erection of two storey side extension with front and rear dormers and planning permission is refused. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single-storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for the single-storey rear extension at 18 The Lawns, Sheffield S11 9FL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/1047/FUL, dated 28 March 2023, and the plans submitted with it, insofar as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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 insofar as they relate to the single-storey rear extension: Site Location Plans, JCA-1403-001 revision P02, Proposed Floor Plans, JCA-1403-012 rev P02 and Proposed Elevations, JCA-1403-013 rev P02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the Council's description of development as "demolition of detached garage, erection of two-storey side extension with front and rear dormers, and single-storey rear extension to dwelling". This is because it is a more accurate specification for the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a two-storey detached dwelling with a detached garage to the side and front gable with a steeply sloping roof. It is part of a row of properties of a similar design which are arranged diagonally in relation to the highway and with a staggered front building line.
5. On the opposite side of The Lawns there are detached dwellings, again of similar appearance to each other but with asymmetric gables at the front elevation and set back from the highway. It is apparent that dwellings at the Lawns have retained their architectural form and style and with space around the buildings. The degree of openness of the layout contributes towards a pleasant residential environment.
6. The proposed single-storey rear extension would not be visible from The Lawns and would not harm the amenity of neighbours in terms of their outlook, privacy, or loss of light. Consequently, I find that this part of the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.
7. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a lower ridge line than that of the front gable and would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling. However, it would reduce the open nature of the frontage because of the increased bulk of development at a higher level than that of the existing detached garage. Dwellings at this side of The Lawns have small side roof dormers. However, despite its dark stained boarding, the proposed front dormer would be out of character in the street scene. I find that the proposed two-storey side extension with front and rear dormers would appear incongruous within this row of dwellings with a similar architectural form.
8. Although the extension has been designed to appear subservient, I consider that it would diminish the dominance of the front gable and detract from its repeating form in the streetscene. The side extension would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. It would therefore conflict with policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan which together seek to ensure that development complements the scale, form, and architectural style of surrounding buildings. It would fail to comply with policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy which indicates that development should respect the distinctive features of neighbourhoods, and with guidelines 1 and 2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions concerning the character and appearance of extensions and their effect on the dwelling and area. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. In relation to the proposed single storey rear extension, conditions are imposed to define the timing for commencement of development, confirmation of the approved plans and requirement for the use of matching external materials in the interest of complementing the appearance of the building.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed in relation to the proposed demolition of detached garage and erection of two-storey side extension with front and rear dormers but allowed in respect of the single-storey rear extension to the dwelling.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR