



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: 10th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3341857

54 Blair Athol Road, Sheffield S11 7GB

- 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 and Mrs Erica and Rob Snelgrove against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/03548/FUL, dated 8 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is raise the ridge and wall plate to form room in roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the alterations to roof including raised ridge height and erection of dormer extension to rear and planning permission is refused. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to erection of ground floor infill extension to front of dwellinghouse and planning permission is granted for the erection of ground floor infill extension to front of dwellinghouse at 54 Blair Athol Road, Sheffield S11 7GB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/03548/FUL, dated 8 November 2023, and the plans submitted with it, so far 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 erection of ground floor infill extension to front of dwellinghouse: Location Plan, A2.1B Layouts Proposed, A3.1B Proposed Elevations and A.3.3A Streetscene.
 - 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 description of development as "Alterations to roof including raised ridge height and erection of dormer extension to rear and erection of ground floor infill extension to front of dwellinghouse" 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 street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a street which primarily includes terraced dwellings at either side. The Council has raised no objection to the ground floor front infill extension. I see no reason to disagree as, subject to the use of matching materials, it would complement the character and appearance of the building and streetscene.
5. The proposed alterations to the roof and rear dormer would have no harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbours in terms of outlook, loss of privacy or loss of light.
6. The ridge lines of the terraced dwellings in Blair Athol Road are mostly staggered to reflect the slope of the road. The proposal would stagger the ridge line of the pair of semi-detached houses. However, raising the ridge line of the appeal dwelling by around 1 metre would unduly unbalance the symmetry in appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings because of the resultant difference in ridge and eaves heights. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses.
7. The flat roofed rear dormer with two windows would be set down from the ridge of the appeal building by an adequate distance. However, it would only have a marginal set-back from each side of the roof. That would make it appear an overly dominant addition to the rear elevation. The dormer would not be seen from Blair Athol Road and the appellants would be able to construct a rear dormer that met permitted development criteria as a fall-back.
8. The proposed raised ridge height would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the building and street scene. This part of the proposed development 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.

Other Matters

9. The appellants have referred to a government consultation document on various permitted development rights which was published in February 2024. However, little weight may be accorded to the possible changes regarding the ridge height of dwellings as no amendment to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 has been implemented in this respect. For that reason, the consultation proposals cannot be considered as offering the appellants a realistic fall-back position at present.

10. Examples of other extensions to dwellings in the vicinity and a new development are cited by the appellants. However, none of these are identical to the proposal in this appeal. I have determined this appeal based upon the specific circumstances of the proposal having regard to its particular site circumstances, relevant development plan policies and guidance and national planning policy. I acknowledge the appellants' desire to increase accommodation at the dwelling and ensure its longevity as a family home. However, the benefit would be outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached buildings and streetscene.

Conditions

11. In respect of the ground floor front infill extension, conditions are imposed to ensure that the external materials complement the character and appearance of the dwelling. Conditions are also included to confirm the timescale for commencement of development and the approved plans.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed in respect of the erection of ground floor infill extension to front of dwellinghouse, but dismissed regarding the alterations to roof, including raised ridge height and erection of dormer extension to rear.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR