
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2020

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3256584
37 Empire Road, Sheffield S7 1GJ

- 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 Chris Travis against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01453/FUL, dated 17 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is french doors and balcony to first floor front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The immediate area around the appeal site is characterised by blocks of brick built terraced properties set back from the road, on a similar building line with ground floor bay windows. Upper floors have single windows centrally placed above the bay windows with a vertical emphasis and stone heads and sills. Properties further along the street have a different bay design with extended roof forming an entrance canopy detail.
4. The appeal site is a two storey flat above an entrance in the row of terraced properties. It is an anomaly in the street in so far as the appeal property does not follow the pattern of bay windows on adjacent properties at ground floor. At first floor, however, the rhythm of the terrace is maintained with the window placed centrally within the elevation above the entrance with the proportions seemingly consistent with its neighbours.
5. The proposed first floor double doors would alter the proportions of the opening by removing the lower sill. The balcony would project forward of the first-floor front wall. Its siting and design would break the rhythm of the elevation and would, because of its raised position, forward projection and modern materials, be a particularly prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene.
6. I agree that the balcony would have a similar projection to the ground floor bay windows, its base would be at a similar level to the top of the bay windows and there are various designs of bay window within the street. However, the balcony is at first floor level and its siting and design would be viewed in

conjunction with the upper floors of the adjacent properties where the building line is consistent, and windows do not extend forward of the main elevation.

7. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan March 1998. These policies are supportive of original architecture provided it complements the scale, form and architectural style of surrounding buildings. There would also be conflict with guidelines 1 and 2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance – Designing House Extensions where it aims to ensure compatibility with the character and built form of the area and with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

8. Whilst I agree that it is unfortunate that the Council did not discuss the proposals with the appellant; in my determination of this appeal I must have regard only to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR