



Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 10 December 2024

by Mrs J A Vyse Dip MRTPI DipPBM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3353253

95 Brooklands Crescent, Sheffield S10 4GF

- 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 Stephen Pope against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application No is 24/02197/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as an attic conversion, including raising roof and dormer to rear and front to form bedroom and en-suite. Associated works.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is proposed to raise the ridge of the roof by 0.7 m, together with hip-to-gable conversions on both sides and the addition of a large dormer across the rear roof slope, together with removal of a small gable feature and the addition of a dormer and a rooflight to the front.
3. The Council takes no issue with the majority of the works proposed largely, it would seem, on the basis that they could be carried out under permitted development rights and/or that there would be no adverse visual impact. I have no reason to disagree for the reasons given in the officer's report. The Council does take issue however, with the proposed front dormer. On that basis, the main issue in this case relates to the effect of the front dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Decision

4. Brooklands Crescent, a long residential cul-de-sac, includes a mix of detached and semi-detached, largely 1930s dwellings built, as noted by the Council, to a few batches of slightly differing original designs. In terms of the streetscene, the front elevations to most properties retain an appearance close to their original design, with front facing dormers being a rare feature on this part of the street.
5. The appeal property, a detached, two-storey dwelling, sits in the middle of a run of properties of similar original design. Whilst a number have been altered to some degree, the overall uniformity of these properties, with their two storey bays and gable feature over, and generally uninterrupted roof slopes, is an attractive and distinctive feature of the street scene here.
6. In accordance with advice in the Council's SPG on Designing House Extensions, the proposed dormer would not breach the proposed ridgeline and would align with the two-storey bay below. Nevertheless, the addition of a dormer here, and the

resultant change to the roofscape, would not be compatible with the designed character and built form of this part of the street. On the contrary, it would be a visually obtrusive and discordant addition to the streetscene.

7. Nos 81 and 83 Brooklands Crescent were drawn to my attention. They comprise a pair of semi-detached dwellings to which front-facing dormers have been added. Also drawn to my attention was a dormer to the front of No 82. I do not know the circumstances that led to those dormers being considered acceptable. However, all three properties appear to be of the same original design, a design that is different from that of the appeal property and its neighbours and thus are not directly comparable to the scheme before me. I am also mindful that those examples all date from more than 17 years ago, prior to adoption of the Core Strategy, policy CS74 of which encourages high quality development that enhances the townscape. They also pre-date the National Planning Policy Framework, which places great emphasis on well-designed places, confirming that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. All told, the presence of those other dormers, which are very much in the minority, does not persuade me that another should be permitted on a house of a different design in a different part of the street.
8. To conclude, the proposed front dormer would comprise an ungainly addition to this otherwise well-proportioned, architecturally balanced property, introducing a visually obtrusive and discordant addition to the streetscene, with consequent harm to the established character and appearance of the area. There would be conflict in this regard with policy CS74 of the Core Strategy, with UDP policies H14 and BE5, with the Council's SPG and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework,¹ which broadly seek to protect and enhance the built environment and secure high quality development of a design which responds appropriately and sympathetically to the character and appearance of the locality.
9. Although a secondary consideration, a successful appeal could also encourage the owners of other properties of the same design in this row (and elsewhere within the street) to pursue a similar proposal, which the Council would then find difficult to resist, exacerbating the harm that I have identified.
10. I have given consideration as to whether a split decision might be appropriate in this case, allowing those elements of the proposal to which the Council has no objection, but refusing the front dormer. However, it is not clear to me that the front dormer is clearly severable from the rest of the scheme. There could be implications, for example, for available headroom in that part of the roof space, which might make the scheme unworkable. Consequently, a split decision is not appropriate in this instance. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Jennifer A Vyse

INSPECTOR

¹ The reason for refusal refers to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Although a revised version of the Framework was issued subsequent to the decision of the Council, the text of the cited paragraph has not changed.