

Case Number	22/03144/FUL (Formerly PP-11493732)
Application Type	Full Planning Application
Proposal	Alterations and extension to roof to form front and rear gables and a side dormer extension to form additional living accommodation at first floor level, and a flat roof single storey extension to the rear (amended description)
Location	27 Blackbrook Drive Sheffield S10 4LS
Date Received	24/08/2022
Team	North
Applicant/Agent	Right Property Design Ltd
Recommendation	Grant Conditionally

Time limit for Commencement of Development

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act.

Approved/Refused Plan(s)

2. The development must be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved documents:

Drg No: 005 (Rev 1) 'Proposed Ground and Loft Floor Plans' (Published 29.09.2022)

Drg No: 006 (Rev 1) 'Proposed Roof Plan' (Published 29.09.2022)

Drg No: 007 (Rev 1) 'Proposed Elevations' (Published 29.09.2022)

Reason: In order to define the permission.

Pre Commencement Condition(s) – ('true conditions precedent' – see notes for definition)

Other Pre-Commencement, Pre-Occupancy and other Stage of Development Condition(s)

3. The materials to be used externally shall match those of the existing building in colour, shape, size and texture.

Reason: In order to ensure an appropriate quality of development.

4. The windows of the dormer extension hereby approved on the east side roof plane facing 25 Blackbrook Drive shall be fully glazed with obscure glass to a minimum privacy standard of Level 4 Obscurity and no part of the windows shall at any time be glazed with clear glass.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining property.

Other Compliance Conditions

Attention is Drawn to the Following Directives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has dealt with the planning application in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems where necessary in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Site Location



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 10018816

LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

The property the subject of this application is a hipped roof detached bungalow located on the south side of Blackbrook Drive, in the Fulwood area of the city. Blackbrook Drive is a residential cul-de-sac comprising other bungalows, with primarily unaltered single storey hipped roof examples toward the eastern entrance of the cul-de-sac, but with more variety in built form evident toward the hammerhead, where several properties have been extended in various ways to create accommodation at first-floor level.

This application seeks planning permission for a hip to gable roof extension in order to create accommodation at first-floor level, including a flat roof dormer to the east side roof plane.

The description of the proposal also includes a large flat roof single storey extension to the south rear elevation of the host which has previously been approved under a prior notification application for a larger home extension (see 'RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY' below). This extension is under construction at the time of writing.

All measurements can be scaled from the submitted drawings.

Following concerns raised by the case officer regarding the first-floor fenestration, the 'flat' appearance of the front gable as originally proposed, and the size of the side dormer, amended drawings have been received showing smaller and more symmetrical first-floor windows in the front elevation, a canopy roof along the front elevation above the entrance and bay windows, and the side dormer reduced in size.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

21/02128/HPN - Single-storey rear extension - the extension will be 8m from the rear of the original dwellinghouse, ridge height no more than 3.23m and height to the eaves of 2.93m - Prior notification granted 16.06.2021.

21/02141/ASPN - Enlargement of dwellinghouse by construction of an additional storey (total height 9.33m) - Prior notification refused due to the proposal not meeting the requirements of a Class AA development 06.07.2021.

21/03062/ASPN – Enlargement of dwellinghouse by construction of an additional storey (total height 9.33m) - Prior notification refused, as the planning authority considered that the addition of an additional storey on an existing bungalow, together with the raised ridge height, would create a conspicuous and incongruous building that would be at odds with the established and repeated built form of bungalows and dormer bungalows in the street-scene 30.09.2021.

A subsequent appeal against the above decision was dismissed, with the Planning Inspector stating that the proposal would be “clearly distinguished from the other dwellings on the street, failing to integrate within the surrounds or to visually relate to the predominant form of neighbouring development. Comparatively, it would be of a greater scale than is common on the street, in a prominent location close to the turning point of the cul-de-sac such that it would appear unduly dominant. Overall, it would be read as incongruous within the surrounding context”.

REPRESENTATIONS

Immediate neighbours were notified of the application as originally submitted and were given the deadline of 27 September to comment. Objections were received from occupiers of 23 properties (including properties on Blackbrook Avenue and Brooklands Avenue as well as Blackbrook Drive). These objections are summarised as follows:

- The proposal is a much larger / oversized, 2 storey dwelling which is overdevelopment that would dominate its neighbours and the street-scene
- The proposed gable roof 'A Frame' house is not a bungalow, is out of character with the existing pyramid roof single-storey dwellings in the cul-de-sac, and would erode the consistency / uniformity of the street-scene
- The proposal is contrary to the previous refusal and the subsequent appeal decision
- The large single storey rear extension is out of proportion to the existing bungalow
- The red brick front boundary wall and gate pillars that have been erected are unsightly and not in keeping with other front boundary walls in the street
- The large flat roof dormer is not consistent with others in the street which have pitched roofs and are set back from the side walls of the houses
- The flat roof dormer proposed is contrary to previous planning decisions in the cul-de-sac where pitched roof dormers were described as appropriate and flat roof dormers to the rear were approved because they would not be prominently visible in the street-scene
- The side dormer proposed would significantly impact the light and privacy of near neighbours
- The ground and first-floor extensions proposed would dominate and shadow neighbours
- Allowing the proposal would set a dangerous precedent for future development in the area
- The applicant is not going to live at the property and is maximising its size in order to sell

Immediate neighbours and objectors were re-notified following receipt of the amended scheme described at the beginning of this report and were given the deadline of 14 October to comment. In response, letters of objection were received from occupiers of 15 properties, primarily reporting that the amendments proposed are small and do not address the concerns previously raised / summarised above.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Policy context

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that developments need to contribute towards creating visually attractive, distinctive places to live, work and visit, whilst also being sympathetic to local character. Innovation should not be prevented but developments should add to the quality of an area whilst providing a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This assessment will have regard to this overarching principle.

The site is identified on the Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map as being within a Housing Area. The assessment takes account of Policies BE5 (Building Design & Siting) and H14 (Conditions on Development in Housing Areas) from the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP); Core Strategy Policy CS74 (Design Principles) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Designing House Extensions. All of

these policies require new extensions to be well designed and to be in scale and character with surrounding buildings. This is consistent with National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 130 which seeks to ensure that developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. The local policies can therefore be afforded substantial weight in this case.

Design / visual amenity (SPG guidelines 1-3)

SPG Guidelines 1 and 2 advise that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area and should not detract from the host dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality. Guideline 3 advises that the use of matching materials and features will normally be required for extensions.

The extension the subject of the previously refused prior notification (see under 'RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY' above) was to form a full 2 storey house and the reason for refusal specified that it was the proposed additional storey, together with raised ridge height, that was considered conspicuous and incongruous. In dismissing the subsequent appeal, the Planning Inspector also stated that "...the proposal would be clearly distinguished from the other dwellings on the street, failing to integrate within the surrounds...".

Rather than a full 2 storey house, the amended scheme as now proposed is considered more akin to a bungalow with accommodation in the roof-space, and the apex of the proposed roof is no higher than the existing situation. This is markedly different to the refused proposal.

Although it is accepted that, as originally constructed, Blackbrook Drive was characterised by single storey hipped roof bungalows, as described at the beginning of this report, especially toward the hammerhead, there are several examples of dwellings which have been extended in order to create accommodation in the roof space. These examples include front, side, and rear dormer extensions as well as hip to gable type extensions, such as those at Numbers 31 and 38.

Indeed, in the officer report recommending refusal of the previous prior notification the case officer noted that while "...bungalows and dormer bungalows is a dominant and defining characteristic..." the Planning Authority "...accepts that there is now some disparity in the appearance of nearby houses..." and "...various extensions and alterations to the dwellings have diluted the street's consistency".

As amended, the development now proposed is very similar to the built form of Number 31 which was approved in 2017 (application reference 17/01288/FUL) and in recommending approval at that time the officer report stated that "it is considered that the proposed hip-to-gable enlargements would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the street, with examples on the street of dwellinghouses that have had hip-to-gable enlargements to the front as proposed and the use of side dormer windows".

Although it is acknowledged that the development now proposed would result in further erosion of the original character of the cul-de-sac; in the context of the above it is considered that the resulting gable roof form would not appear unacceptably incongruous or obtrusive in this part of the cul-de-sac.

The application form submitted confirms that it is proposed to use bricks and tiles

matching those of the host dwelling in the construction of the extensions proposed. It is considered that the use of acceptable materials could be ensured by appropriate conditions attached to any approval.

In respect of the side dormer proposed, the amended drawings submitted show this significantly reduced in size and set well back from the side elevation of the host property. It is proposed to utilise hanging tiles matching those of the roof of the host property for the external finish of the dormer. Whilst a narrower pitched roof dormer would be preferred, given that the proposed dormer is well set back from the front elevation of the dwelling it is considered that it would not appear prominent in the street-scene and no significant or unacceptable harm to visual amenity is envisaged.

In respect of the single storey rear extension, while this is of significant size in relation to the host property and the flat roof design does not reflect the existing built form, as mentioned at the beginning of this report this was approved under a previous prior notification application for a larger home extension. In addition, as it is to the rear it is considered that it would not be prominently visible from the street.

In respect of the red brick boundary wall and gate pillars erected along the north front boundary of the property, this was not included in this application. Further to the case officer's visit to the site the applicant was notified that the wall and pillars that had been erected were considered unacceptable. As a result, the applicant has provided photographic evidence showing that the wall and pillars have been reduced in height so that no part is now over 1.0m tall and as such this structure is now considered to constitute permitted development under Part 2, Class A of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended).

Amenity / Impact on neighbours (SPG guidelines 4-6)

SPG Guideline 4 advises against overdevelopment and that an adequate amount of garden space should be retained.

SPG Guideline 5 advises that extensions should result in no unreasonable overshadowing and over dominance of neighbouring dwellings and no serious reductions in the light and outlook of the dwelling to be extended. Guideline 6 advises that extensions should protect and maintain minimum levels of privacy.

The property includes a long rear garden which, were the extensions the subject of this application to be constructed, is still considered sufficient to provide outdoor amenity space to serve the needs of the enlarged dwelling as proposed. No overdevelopment of the plot is envisaged.

Regarding concerns expressed by objectors that the first floor / roof extension proposed would dominate and shadow neighbours, some additional impact on the amenity of Numbers 25 and 29 to the east and west sides respectively is envisaged as a result of the gable roof proposed. However, as the first floor proposed would not be larger than the original footprint of the host and, as the driveways alongside the dwellings provide a degree of separation, the level of harm envisaged is considered not to be unreasonable or unacceptable.

Regarding concerns expressed by objectors that the side dormer proposed would impact the light and privacy of neighbours, as previously described the amended drawings submitted show the dormer significantly reduced in size and no significant

additional loss of light or overshadowing to neighbours is envisaged as a result of this element of the scheme. In addition, the windows of the dormer are shown serving a bathroom and an en-suite and the application form states that frosted glazing is proposed for these windows. It is considered that the privacy of neighbouring occupiers could be adequately protected via a condition attached to any approval requiring that appropriate obscure glazing is installed and maintained in these windows.

Regarding concerns expressed by objectors that the single storey rear extension proposed would dominate and shadow neighbours; as previously mentioned this extension was approved under a previous prior notification application for a larger home extension. In addition, as a result of its flat roof form, the separation between dwellings previously described, and the partial screening that would be provided by respective detached garages, no unreasonable or unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is envisaged.

Regarding neighbours fronting Lodge Moor Road to the south rear of the site; due to the separation provided by the long rear garden at the site no significant or unacceptable impact on the amenity of these neighbours is envisaged as a result of the development proposed.

Impact on landscape and wildlife (SPG guideline 7)

Guideline 7 of the SPG advises that all developments should minimise adverse effects on the landscape and wildlife in the area, and UDP Policy GE11 requires all development to respect and promote nature conservation.

The site is not within or adjacent to any applicable designated areas.

Due to the type of development proposed, and the suburban nature of the site / its immediate environs, it is considered that the development proposed would not have any adverse impact on the landscape or wildlife of the area.

Highway impact (SPG guideline 8)

Guideline 8 of the SPG reflects UDP Policy H14 (Criterion 'd') which states that development will be permitted provided that it would provide safe access to the highway network and appropriate off-street parking and not endanger pedestrians.

There is an existing detached single garage at the property in question as well as a long driveway alongside the dwelling. The application form submitted confirms that no alterations are proposed to the existing access or off-street parking arrangements at the site and the existing provisions are considered sufficient to serve the enlarged dwelling as proposed.

No adverse highway impact is envisaged as a result of the development proposed.

Other matters

Precedent:

Regarding concerns raised that the approval of this application would set a precedent for future development in the area, each application must be considered on its own merits.

The intentions of the applicant:

Regarding concern that the applicant is not intending to live at the property and is seeking to enlarge the dwelling in order to sell it, the future intentions of the applicant are not a material planning concern.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

It is concluded that the proposed alterations to the dwellinghouse are in line with the provisions of the adopted plan, namely UDP Policies H14 and BE5; Core Strategy Policy CS74; and the Council's SPG on Designing House Extensions. Furthermore, these policies are in line with National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 130.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the listed conditions.

This page is intentionally left blank