



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3357525

155 Bannerdale Road, Sheffield, S7 2DS

- 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 Anthony Bushell against the decision of Sheffield City Council
 - The application Ref is 24/02189/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of existing garage and rear conservatory. Side, rear and attic extension to semi-detached house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council's description of the proposed development in its decision is 'Demolition of garage and rear conservatory, erection of two-storey side and rear extension with Juliet balcony, single-storey rear extension and porch to front, erection of dormer window to rear, render to all elevations of dwellinghouse' and as this describes the proposal more fully, I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene;
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier/s at no 153 Bannerdale Road in regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. 155 Bannerdale Road is a traditional semi-detached house with a hipped roof that is located on a sloping residential street that rises from east to west. The street is long and has developed at different periods between the 1900s and 1970s. Dwellings here are mainly semi-detached and whilst there are variations in style and many have been altered or extended, resulting in some pairs with an asymmetrical appearance (as shown in the appellant's Design and Access Statement), most largely retain their symmetry of form with the original two storey form and main hipped roof as the most dominant element and the majority of extensions as a subservient addition. Within this section of the southern side of the street between nos 127 and 163 between Glenorchy Road and Needham Way, five

of the nine pairs of semis remain unaltered at first floor and roof level on their front elevations. The appeal dwelling lies in the middle of a section of four of those pairs. This creates some balance and rhythm in those pairs of dwellings and contributes to the attractive low density, suburban character of the area.

5. The appeal dwelling has previously been extended with a single storey extension to the front and side, a two-storey extension and rooflights to the rear and a conservatory. However, the original two storey form and main hipped roof remain as the most dominant element. The proposal would replace the existing extensions, by extending to the side and rear with a hipped roof extension with an increased ridge height of the roof to accommodate a third storey, together with a flat roofed rear dormer, a single storey rear extension with a shallow pitched lean-to roof and a flat roofed porch and garage projection on the front elevation.
6. Although the new hipped roof would follow the angle of the main roof, its increased ridge height (despite the reduction from a previously refused application) and the lack of a set back at first floor level would result in an overly dominant extension that would fail to be seen as a subservient addition. It would be seen clearly from the street and its side elevation would be particularly bulky when seen from there. It would detract from the original form and scale of the dwelling and as the adjoining dwelling has not been extended, would severely unbalance the pair, causing harm to its character. It would also be visually intrusive in the street scene, especially when seen in the approach from the west. Furthermore, the proposed siting up to the side boundary and the following of the angle of the main roof has resulted in a proposed half-hip on the front elevation that would appear slightly incongruous and out of character with the original style of the dwelling.
7. Where dwellings in the street have been altered at first floor or roof level, some were justified by the particular circumstances of the site, referred to in the appellant's evidence. At no 141 Bannerdale Road a large extension was approved in 2017 that was justified by 'an enhancement compared to the previous approval'. The extension at no 159 was justified by the hip to gable roof alteration that is allowed as permitted development. That is not the case here and those therefore had a different planning background to this proposal. Elsewhere in the street, the impact on the character of some of the altered pairs and the street scene is not always a positive one. Those examples are not, therefore, acceptable as a precedent.
8. The other examples at Springfield Avenue, Montrose Road, 58 & 60 Archer Lane and 60 Edgedale Road referred to in the appellant's evidence are detached dwellings and therefore have a very different context from this semi-detached property. The extension underway at no 172 on the opposite side of the road appears to be of a different siting, scale and design to this proposal and not directly comparable. Neither am I persuaded that the raised hip roofs of early 20th century domestic architecture or the late C19th houses of Nether Edge are directly comparable with the more modest original designs of houses in this road and those do not provide justification for the inappropriate roof form proposed here.
9. I find then that by reason of its siting, scale and form, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. As such, it would conflict with development plan policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (1998) and policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) which together seek to

ensure that new development is well designed, respects the form and scale of the original building and enhances the character of the area.

Living conditions

10. The proposed single storey rear extension would be slightly higher than the existing conservatory and would project some 2m further than the existing extension and conservatory into the rear garden (a proposed 4.4m projection according to the appellant's statement). As such, it would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Designing House Extensions' (SPG) which requires that single storey extensions greater than 3m deep are unacceptable to avoid appearing unduly overbearing from the neighbouring property. Whilst the SPG constitutes guidance only, I have also assessed the proposal on the basis of what I saw on site.
11. The adjoining dwelling at no 153 has not been extended and has French windows as the main opening to a habitable room at ground floor sited close to the side boundary between the properties and opening onto its rear yard. At the rear of the pair, the ground level rises away from the dwellings and their rear yards with the long, sloping rear lawns sited on higher ground. As such, the outlook from that room and the rear yard is already somewhat restricted by the change in ground levels.
12. The projection and proximity of the proposed single storey extension to the boundary would materially worsen that position and would make it unduly overbearing when seen from the neighbouring ground floor window and rear yard. Although there is a mature holly bush along the side boundary that would not screen the proposal sufficiently and could be removed at some point in the future. The single storey extension would create an oppressive sense of enclosure and a poor outlook when seen from no 153.
13. Although there were no objections from any neighbouring occupiers to the proposal, that does not necessarily imply support. In any case, those occupiers might change in the future and the Council's policy seeks to protect both existing and future occupiers.
14. Although the Council's SPG predates the introduction of the prior approval process for extensions, a 6m prior approval extension would be subject to a different process and subject to consideration of the effect on neighbouring amenity if an objection was raised from adjoining neighbours during that process. Moreover, no such application has been made but even if a prior approval was in place, it would not result in significantly greater harm than would be caused here and would therefore carry only limited weight in support of the proposal. In this case, the fallback position does not outweigh the significant harm I have identified.
15. It may be that there are other extensions in the road and nearby that have rear projections greater than 3m, but I am unaware of the circumstances surrounding all of those approvals and cannot be certain that the impact on neighbouring properties is directly comparable with the situation here. 159 Bannerdale Road has a large rear extension, but it does not appear to project beyond the neighbouring window to the same extent as here. The planning context and justification for the example referred to at 52 Glenorchy Road is unclear to me but in any case, that extension would appear to have a different relationship to its neighbours because

there is a neighbouring rear extension which is not the case here. The example given for 74 Struan Road does not provide details of neighbouring habitable room windows and I cannot be certain that it has a similar relationship to this proposal.

16. I conclude then that by reason of its siting, projection and height, the proposed single storey extension would significantly harm the outlook and living conditions of the neighbouring occupier/s at no 153. It would be contrary to development plan policy H14 in the UDP which also seeks to ensure that sites are not over-developed in regard to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Other matters and conclusion

17. I understand that the appellant wishes to increase the size of the dwelling to provide enlarged accommodation and to improve its energy efficiency, but I am not persuaded that there are no other means of doing that in a more acceptable way.
18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR