



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

**Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29 January 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/19/3238411**

**121 Argyle Road, Sheffield S8 9HJ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Imtiaz Ahmed against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
  - The application Ref 19/00906/FUL (Formerly PP-07700232), dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
  - The development proposed is to extend existing attic incorporating new dormer window to front.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a mid-terraced, two-storey, pitched roofed dwelling, located within a predominantly residential area and opposite the listed buildings and boundary wall of Carfield School. Other than the front dormers of two nearby properties, the roof line of this long row of terraced dwellings within which the appeal dwelling stands has a uniform appearance which is a positive feature of the streetscene.
  5. The proposal would provide an additional bedroom, at second floor, which would be served by a window in a flat-roofed dormer on the front roof plane of the host dwelling.
  6. The proposed dormer would be sited below the ridge of the main roof, above its eaves and within a central position. It would have a box-like form with a flat roof that would not reflect the form of the existing roof. In addition, it would be clad in UPVC to the sides and front. Such material would not reflect that of the existing dwelling and its extensive use in the manner proposed would contribute to the discordant appearance of the structure on the front of the property. In addition, whilst I acknowledge that the original plans were
-

amended, the alignment of the structure would not reflect that of the windows below.

7. The dormer would be highly visible due to its siting in relation to the host dwelling and the prominent position of the appeal property within the street scene. A dormer, in the location proposed, would further disrupt the roofscape of this part of the road and would result in an incongruous addition to the street scene. The inappropriateness of the dormer would be accentuated by its visual prominence. Thus, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to two nearby properties that have dormers to the front, which I noted during my site visit. These structures do not, however, reflect the prevailing character of the area and do not provide appropriate justification for the proposal. I acknowledge the appellant's point that insistence on an alternative design could introduce a different element into the street scene which may cause greater harm than the appeal proposal. However, there is no planning permission for an alternative design and moreover, I can only consider the plans before me on their own merit.
9. The Council found that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed buildings opposite the site. Given the siting of the proposal in relation to the listed buildings I am satisfied from all I have seen and read that it would have a neutral impact on the significance of these heritage assets and their setting. Accordingly, it would meet the requirement of S66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
10. Notwithstanding that, I conclude that through a combination of its design, materials and prominent position, the proposed dormer would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies BE5 and H14 of the Unitary Development Plan for Sheffield and Policy CS 74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy, which collectively require, amongst other things, that development respects the form and materials of the original dwelling and integrates well within the surrounding local area.

### **Recommendation**

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Andreea Spataru*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*S Ashworth*

INSPECTOR