



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 November 2020

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3258759

26 Logan Road, Sheffield S9 4PF

- 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 Mohammad against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00948/FUL, dated 10 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is front dormer and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The rear dormer did not feature in the refusal reasons. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the front dormer window on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons

3. The front dormer would not be overly dominant, but it would be notably offset from the windows below. This would be disruptive to the symmetrical window composition of the host building, to the detriment of its appearance. The other front dormer windows in the locality are mostly aligned with the windows below, as required by the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). There are no good reasons before me to warrant putting the SPG guidance aside in this case. Moreover, Logan Road and the surrounding streets are characterised by terraced properties of similar appearance. Thus, if I were to allow the appeal it would make it more difficult to resist similar proposals, which would cumulatively erode the character of the area over time.
4. I therefore conclude that the front dormer window would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area. This would be contrary to the good design requirements of Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy, saved Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998, Guidelines 1 and 2 of the SPG, and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. For the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR