



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3345108

7 Laverdene Way, Sheffield S17 4HL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Mobbs against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00669/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "converting the roof form from hip to gable, and forming a principal bedroom + ensuite bathroom, including a rear dormer which would incorporate a 'juliet balcony' flush with wall and inward opening doors, and internal alterations at first floor level".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The reason for refusal on the Council's decision notice does not relate to the proposed rear dormer window extension or juliet balcony. I have taken this into account in defining the main issue.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the hip to gable extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 7 Laverdene Way (No 7) is located in a predominantly residential area. Laverdene Way links between Laverdene Drive and Laverdene Road. These streets are predominantly characterised by semi-detached houses of similar design with a prevalence of hipped roof forms. No 7 forms part of a semi-detached pair with a hipped roof. It has a two-storey side extension built flush with the original front elevation, whereas the attached dwelling at 5 Laverdene Way (No 5) does not. While the semi-detached pair are therefore not symmetrical in terms of their respective widths, their cohesive roof form retains a suitably balanced composition. As a result, the semi-detached pair positively reflect the overriding order and consistency of the built form on the identified streets.

-
6. The hip to gable extension would not reflect the predominant roof forms of the immediate area. It would also emphasise the greater width and bulk of the host dwelling when compared with its attached counterpart at No 5 and they would no longer read as a suitably balanced pair. As a result, the extended dwelling would significantly detract from the cohesiveness of the wider street scene.
 7. The appellant has drawn my attention to numerous examples of extensions in the wider area including several that are some distance from the appeal site, such as those on Laverdene Avenue which is more mixed in character. In terms of those closest to the appeal site, I saw for myself the hip to gable extensions at No 12 Laverdene Road and at No 14 Laverdene Way, the latter of which sits opposite the site. However, those dwellings remain of a comparable width to their respective attached neighbours. From what I saw this is also more commonly the case where hip to gable extensions have occurred in the wider area including examples provided by the appellant. In contrast, it is the combined effects of the previous side extension and the proposed gable which contributes to the harm identified in this instance.
 8. In terms of the side dormers at Nos 6, 12 and 14 Laverdene Drive, the widths of the respective pairs are largely consistent and while their side dormers have to some extent unbalanced their roofscapes, the original main hipped roof forms are still legible. Again, this is generally the case where dormers have been provided on surrounding streets. Finally, the two-storey side extension at No 3 Laverdene Way has provided an uncharacteristic double side gable, albeit they are stepped down from the main hipped roof. I am not aware of the planning history of that particular site. In any case, from what I saw two-storey side extensions in the area more typically incorporate hipped side roof forms in views from the street, including several of the examples provided on Mickley Lane and similar to the present situation at the appeal site and at No 1 Laverdene Way.
 9. Overall, from my own observations on site, the examples provided do not justify the proposal which, for the reasons set out, would not be reflective of the prevailing character of hipped roof forms in the area and the predominance of well-balanced, semi-detached pairs on Laverdene Way and adjoining streets.
 10. I conclude, the hip to gable extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard it would conflict with Saved Policies BE5 (Building Design and Siting) and H14 (Conditions on Development in Housing Areas) of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), as well as Policy CS74 (Design Principles) of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009). These policies expect high-quality development and require that extensions are well designed and that they are in keeping with the scale and character of the original and neighbouring building.
 11. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that developments should be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment. The proposal would also conflict with the guidance within Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Sheffield City Council Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance, which states that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has a desire for more living space for their family. They suggest that larger properties in the area are not affordable to them and that a rear extension would be problematic due to mains sewer access. Whether or not that be the case, these matters do not justify the harm that would arise from the hip to gable extension to the character and appearance of the area.
13. The appellant has referred me to aspects of 'The Sheffield Plan' which I understand is an emerging document, 'Sheffield City Goals' and the 'Sheffield City Council Local Plan'. However, the aspects referred to are strategic and do not alter my conclusions in respect of the site-specific harm identified and the conflict with the design and character requirements of the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed since it would conflict with the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR