

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATION OFFICER REPORT

**APPLICATION:** 20/04496/FUL

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of two-storey side extension (Re-submission of planning application number 20/02468/FUL)

**ADDRESS:** 82 Ridgeway Drive  
Sheffield  
S12 2TF

## LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

The application site is a two storey hipped roof dwellinghouse which lies on a corner plot between Ridgeway Crescent and Ridgeway Drive. The entrance to the site is on Ridgeway Drive. The nature of the plot is that it is a prominent site with a degree of openness formed by the set back of the house from both front and side road frontages.

The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by similar two storey semi-detached properties and single storey bungalows.

The application site is located within a Housing Area as defined in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

Planning permission is sought for a substantial two storey side extension with a dutch hip rather than a full hipped roof, with new openings to the front and rear elevations. The application has been amended through the course of the application to remove a rear dormer and alter the fenestration and materials features to match the existing dwelling.

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

A previous planning permission for a two storey side extension with full gable was refused due to the prominence of the gable feature. (reference 20/02468/FUL - refused 30.10.20)

## REPRESENTATIONS

None

## PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Policy context

The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127) 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.

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

The site is identified on the Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map as being within a Housing Area. The assessment takes account of policies BE5 and H14 from the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Designing House Extensions is also relevant. Attention is given to the provisions of policy CS74 from the Core Strategy regarding design.

UDP Policy H14 (a) requires development to be well designed and reflect the scale and character of the original building. SPG guidelines 1 – 3 reinforce the aims of this policy and provide additional details.

It is considered that the sections of these local plan policies being relied on below remain in accordance with the NPPF and can be afforded substantial weight.

#### Design (SPG guidelines 1-3)

The two storey side extension, whilst large, can be accommodated on this site given its rather unique position.

The new fenestration would be in keeping with existing openings, as would the half pebble dash / half brick appearance and the feature brick band.

Whilst there would be some unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached properties with the introduction of the dutch hip, it should be recognised that the original dwelling could be converted to a gable end without the need for planning permission and this extension is needed to meet the needs of a growing family.

Whilst the extension will extend forward of the existing building line of properties which front onto Ridgeway Drive it is far enough away from these properties to not cause undue harm to the character of the street because of the extensive rear garden so it is not a typical scenario that you might find elsewhere.

Policy BE5(e) of the UDP states whilst corner plots do present opportunities for special architectural treatment, this must be balanced with the impact on the character of the area and depends on the nature of the streetscene. The

design presented is now considered to be an appropriate response in this context.

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

- No overdevelopment of house plot with extension/s that leaves little garden space.
- The development protects and maintains minimum levels of privacy
- No unreasonable overshadowing and over dominance of neighbouring dwelling and no serious reductions in the light and outlook of the dwelling to be extended.

The proposal is to extend further towards the highway of Ridgeway Drive, closer to the first and ground floor front facing habitable windows of No.75 Ridgeway Drive, opposite the road. These windows will still to retain sufficient outlook and daylight levels, in line with requirements within Guideline 5 of the SPG Designing House Extensions. No other amenity impacts are envisioned for the occupants of the adjoining neighbouring property (No.37) as there are no extensions to the front or back of the dwelling proposed.

#### Impact on landscape (SPG guideline 7)

The development will not have any adverse effect on the landscape of wildlife in the area.

#### Highway impact (SPG guideline 8)

The development does not adversely affect highway safety or car parking arrangements.

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed side extension, as amended is in line with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Unitary Development Plan; the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 127. For this reason, approval is recommended.

