
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3273278
28 Kingfield Road, Sheffield S11 9AS

- 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 Zahir Ahmed against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04233/FUL (Formerly PP-09300135), dated 30 November 2020 was refused by notice dated 8 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations to change existing hip roof to form gable.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. However, the original description adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Nether Edge Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. The Conservation Area Appraisal¹ describes Nether Edge as a highly attractive residential area. This section of Kingfield Road incorporates such attributes, where well-established residential properties sit back from the western side of Kingfield Road. The form and detailing of these buildings are among the defining features of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.
5. The appeal property itself is of pleasant appearance with arts and craft influence in its design partly as a result of its mock Tudor features primarily on the front elevation. These features are replicated on the adjoining semi-detached property at 30 Kingfield Road (No.30). Both properties have a hipped roof which affords further symmetry to their appearance.
6. I acknowledge that there is variation in design locally and that gable roofs are a common feature within the locality, including the steeply pitched example at the neighbouring 26 Kingfield Road (No.26). However, the design features shared between the adjoining dwellings afford a sense of symmetry which contributes positively to their appearance.

¹ Nether Edge Conservation Area Appraisal Sheffield City Council

7. The proposal would involve altering the hipped roof on the appeal property to a gable. Whilst this would allow for the creation of an enlarged roof space which would facilitate additional accommodation, the resultant roof form would be at odds with the adjoining No.30 which would retain its hipped roof. Even accounting for the set back of the property from the road and the building line of No.26, this would imbalance the existing symmetry of the pair of dwellings.
8. Whilst matching materials could be used (the evidence also indicating that roof tiles could be re-used), the changes proposed would still detract from the appearance of the property. Subsequently, they would detract from the heritage significance of the Conservation Area which lies in part with the form and detailing of its buildings.
9. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
10. The benefits of this scheme would be limited to the provision of increased living space at the appeal property. However, any benefit of increased space would primarily be a personal one for the appellant. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to Conservation Areas, such benefit is not sufficient to outweigh this harm.
11. The development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The extension therefore fails to accord with Policies BE5, BE16 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009). Amongst other things these policies require high quality, well designed extensions which respect the form and detail of the original building, which would at a minimum preserve the appearance of the Conservation Area.

Other Matters

12. My attention has been drawn to an existing planning approval at the site for a two-storey side extension. I acknowledge the support offered, however, limited details relating to that proposal are before me and it seems apparent that the Council deemed the impact of this extension acceptable in terms of the relevant matters. I therefore afford this limited weight.
13. There is nothing within the evidence which indicates that the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling at No.30 are guaranteed to seek to replicate the roof alterations proposed, such that the appearance of that property would match that which is the subject of the appeal. I therefore afford this matter limited weight.

Conclusion

14. The side extension would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and no public benefits would outweigh this harm.
15. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR