
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3289811

84 Skelwith Road, Sheffield S4 8AY

- 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 Saqib Qamar against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04378/FUL, dated 7 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of detached garage and store room to side of dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No.84 Skelwith Road (No.84) is a detached two-storey dwelling on the south side of Skelwith Road that forms part of a small recently built housing development. No.84 fronts Skelwith Road with two car parking spaces to the east side and a parcel of land that extends along the frontage up to the access road to Nos. 86 to 92 Skelwith Road. It is proposed to construct a detached garage on this land, with a covered link to a separate store room.
4. Together, the proposed garage and store room would extend over 10m in length along the Skelwith Road frontage and because of the requirement to accommodate a van, the height of the garage would be around 3m. I acknowledge that the appellant has proposed to reduce the ground level and has designed the scheme with a flat roof to minimise the height. However, the boundary is currently formed by a relatively low brick wall and timber fencing and both the garage and store room would sit well above this presenting a blank elevation to Skelwith Road. This, in combination with its length, means the garage and store room together would appear unduly prominent in the street scene.
5. The prominence of the proposal would be exacerbated because of its siting forward of the building line of No.84 and at a location where there is a bend in the road as you travel uphill from Holywell Road. Despite the use of matching

materials, it would appear an incongruous addition to the street scene to the detriment of its character and appearance.

6. I note that the garden for No.84 is located to the other side and rear of the dwelling and that the area of land proposed for the garage and store room serves no real purpose for the appellant. Nos. 86 to 92 Skelwith Road are set off the Skelwith Road frontage, broadly at right angles to No.84 but at a lower level (with a retaining wall between). The land does therefore serve a purpose in terms of the outlook from these houses (notably No.86 Skelwith Road) and it provides an attractive frontage to Skelwith Road, retaining openness between, and relief in, the built form. The scale of the proposal which all but fills this area of land would undermine this purpose, significantly reducing the sense of openness.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with saved Policy H14(c) of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS 74 of the Development Framework Core Strategy (2009). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that a site is not over-developed and contributes towards creating attractive neighbourhoods. It would further conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework in so far as it requires developments to add to overall quality of an area and be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. I understand the concerns of the appellant regarding security and the need to securely park a vehicle that is required for work. I also recognise that the existing parking for No.84 is not particularly secure, accessed directly from Skelwith Road. However, in the form proposed, the garage and associated store room would be at the expense of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, in this case, these other matters would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
9. I also note the appellants' concerns with the way the Council handled the planning application in terms of a perceived lack of communication regarding concerns about design. However, that is a procedural matter which does not impact on my assessment of the planning merits of the case.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR