



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3355954

80 Richmond Avenue, Sheffield, S13 8TJ

- 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 Akmal against the decision of Sheffield City Council
 - The application Ref is 24/02596/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Two storey side and rear extension to existing dwelling house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. I have noted that the plans also include a single storey rear extension which is included in the Council's description of the proposed development in its decision and have therefore also included that in my consideration of this appeal.

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 82 Richmond Avenue in regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached house within a residential estate of mostly similar dwellings built to a consistent design with hipped roofs. Although of a modest style, the consistency contributes to the identity and character of the street scene. The gaps between each pair are generally narrow but contribute to the spacious character of the area. No 80 is set on a curved section of the street and is set back from the road and a deep grass verge behind a fenced front garden. As the dwellings follow the curve of the road, the adjacent dwelling at no 78 is sited at an angle to the appeal dwelling. Although it widens towards the rear of the plot, the gap between the two dwellings is narrow when seen from the street.
5. The proposed development would comprise three elements. A two-storey extension would extend out from the side elevation following the angled side

boundary before wrapping around and extending across most of the rear elevation. It would have a flat roof on the side elevation with a gabled roof element on the rear elevation. The slightly wider single storey element on the rear elevation would have a shallow hipped roof.

6. Although it would have a very narrow width at the front, when seen from the street, the proposed flat roof would appear odd and out of place with the surrounding hipped roofs of other dwellings in the street. The lack of a set back from the front elevation would worsen its impact. It would detract from the hipped form of the main roof, appearing as a competing element and undermining the consistent style of the other dwellings. I have noted the other examples of flat roofs that the appellant has referred to but have not been made aware of the date or planning status of those and am unable to conclude that they are sufficiently similar in context to provide support for this proposal. I saw no such examples in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
7. On the rear elevation, the width of the proposal, the variety of roof forms and the combined bulk of the three elements would be overly dominant and would not appear as a subservient addition.
8. The proposal would, therefore, 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

9. On the rear elevation, the proposed extension would project forward of the adjoining house at no 82 by some 4.5m at ground floor level and 3m at first floor level. It would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Designing House Extensions' which requires that single storey extensions greater than 3m deep are unacceptable to avoid appearing unduly overbearing from the neighbouring property. Whilst this is for guidance only, I have also assessed the proposal on the basis of what I saw on site.
10. The single storey extension would be in close proximity to the French windows of no 82 and due to its height and projection would be significantly overbearing when seen from there. When seen from the rear garden of no 82, the impact would be worse because the ground level slopes down from the front to the rear of the site. The floor levels of the dwellings are elevated above the ground level of the gardens and the proposed extension therefore has a greater height and bulk than if the site were level.
11. The appellant has said that there are other houses with similar or larger extensions, but I saw no similar ones in the vicinity of the appeal site and have no details of those that the appellant is referring to. Each proposal must be determined on its own merits, and I have no evidence that would lead me to conclude that there are other examples nearby that would provide sufficient justification for this proposal.
12. Although there were no objections from any neighbouring occupiers, that does not necessarily imply support for the proposal. In any case, those occupiers might

change in the future and the Council's policy seeks to protect both existing and future occupiers.

13. The single storey extension, by reason of its siting, projection and height, would therefore cause significant harm to the outlook and living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at no 82. 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

14. I understand that the appellant wishes to increase the size of the dwelling to provide a larger family home but that would be a limited private benefit that does not outweigh the greater public harm that would be caused. In any case, I am not persuaded that there are no other means of extending the property in a more acceptable way.
15. 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