



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/22/3302394

33 Hemsworth Road, Sheffield S8 8LJ

- 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 Mick Woolhouse against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00891/FUL, dated 4 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'the change of the existing farm house into a set of four apartments, this will incorporate a single storey rear extension.'
-

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 host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a former farmhouse. Its front elevation is angled towards the junction of Hemsworth Road and Park View Mews, in a position forward of the adjoining properties, 31a and 35 Hemsworth Road, which form part of a new residential development.
4. The appeal property has a pitched roofed two-storey rear outrigger that is less than half the width of the main building, with a ridge height markedly lower than the main roof ridge. The outrigger appears as a subservient element of the overall building. The front elevation of the appeal property has a rhythm and balance due to the regular positioning of the windows and door and the two chimneys located at either end of the roof. The overall appearance of the appeal property, which contrasts with the modern dwellings it adjoins, and its position gives it a prominence in the street scene.
5. The proposal would alter the side elevation that is angled towards Hemsworth Road, nearest to No 31a, which is very prominent in views when travelling along Hemsworth Road towards Warminster Road. The ridge height of the rear outrigger would be increased to the same height as the main roof and the shape of the roof and gable would be fundamentally changed. Such amendments, in combination, would materially increase the bulk and massing of this side elevation. The proposed placing of the first-floor windows close together where they would have no relationship with the position of the ground floor windows would emphasise the proposed change of building form. Furthermore, whilst the provision of parking spaces and bin storage on the

frontage would not be harmful, their position would prevent any meaningful landscaping that could filter views of this side elevation.

6. The two-storey rear extension would increase the eaves level of the main rear elevation and change the existing asymmetric gable on the side elevation next to Park View Mews to a form that mirrors that proposed on the other side elevation. Whilst this elevation is not as prominent in public views and the impact of the development would not be as significant, such changes would, nonetheless, further diminish the appearance of the building to its detriment, as would the proposed removal of the existing chimneys.
7. The front elevation would be largely unchanged, except for the removal of the chimneys. Nonetheless, in public views the appeal building would appear more visually dominant than the existing, due to the prominence of the side elevation angled towards Hemsworth Road. The simple form of the original building would be lost to the detriment of its appearance.
8. The proposed development would not respect the scale, form and detail of the original building. It would thereby cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property, and as a result its surroundings. The use of matching stone would be sympathetic to the existing building but would not address these concerns.
9. Whilst the existing building is unused and in a somewhat derelict state, I am not persuaded that the extent of alteration as proposed is necessary to bring it back into use.
10. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. Consequently, it would not accord with saved Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 which seek to ensure that development is well designed. It would also be contrary to design guidance contained in the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

11. The Council's handling of the planning application has not affected my findings on the planning merits of the scheme.
12. Whilst I note that the Council's previous concerns regarding overlooking and amenity space raised with respect of the previously refused proposal for the appeal site, this does not lend any significant weight to the argument for granting permission.

Planning Balance

13. The Council has acknowledged that it currently does not have a five-year housing land supply. Therefore, according to para 11d) ii) of the Framework consideration must be had as to whether the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
14. The provision of 4 flats would contribute to the Council's supply of housing and future occupiers would be likely to provide economic and social benefits to the

local community and services. There would be temporary economic benefits during the construction phase. Furthermore, I note the government's objective of significantly boosting housing supply and making an effective use of land. Nevertheless, given the small number of proposed dwellings, these benefits would be limited.

15. The adverse impacts of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area would conflict with the development plan as a whole to which I attribute significant weight. Therefore, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no other considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR