



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2023

**by K Ford MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 22 June 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/23/3319341**  
**67 Greenhow Street, Sheffield S6 3TN**

- 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 Hind against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
  - The application Ref 22/03977/FUL, dated 1 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2023.
  - The development proposed is erection of 2 dormer windows to front of dwelling house.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of development as it appears on the Council's Decision Notice and on the appeal form as it accurately describes the development proposed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling positioned roughly midway along Greenhow Street, close to the junction with Camm Street. The dwelling is located in a residential area of similarly styled properties. Whilst there are no examples of front dormer windows in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site there are examples elsewhere in the road and the wider area. However, their design and appearance do not always make a positive contribution to the street scene.
5. The proposed dormer windows would sit lower than the existing ridge of the roof of the property and would align with windows on the ground and first floor of the dwelling. The proposed development would comply with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance in this regard.
6. However, the 2 dormers would be joined by a recessed link that would increase the overall bulk and massing of the development. It would create a development that would cover a large expanse of the roof. The development would be visually dominating on the roof plane. The proposed choice of materials would not overcome the harm generated.

7. Whilst the sides of the dormers would screen the proposed recess at longer distances, it would be clearly visible in some views especially when facing the building and in views from Camm Street. The absence of a main window directly facing the proposal does not make the development acceptable, as has been suggested by the appellant. Nor does the boundary hedging of the property opposite which could be removed.
8. The appellant says removing the proposed link would create construction and maintenance problems. However, I have little evidence before me to substantiate this. Similarly, it has not been demonstrated that the absence of the recess would have any significant impact on the functionality or liveability of the loft conversion, as has been suggested.
9. The appellant refers to other front dormers in the area in support of their case. However, not all dormers in the area have necessarily maintained the character and appearance of the area and therefore cannot be treated as a persuasive reason to allow the appeal. I do not know the circumstances in which the cited dormers were granted planning permission. Furthermore, each case is determined on its own merits and irrespective of the approach the Council took in determining those cases, my assessment is based on the information before me.
10. The appellant says that the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. Be that as it may, the proposed scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with the parts of Policy BE5 and Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan which require new development to respect the scale and form of an original building and that extensions should be well designed and be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. It would also conflict with the part of Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy that expects high quality development that respects and enhances neighbourhoods and their associated scale, layout and built form. It would also fail to adhere to Guideline 1 and Guideline 2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing Housing Extensions which require extensions to be compatible with the character and built form of the area and not detract from the dwelling or the general appearance of the street or locality.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*K Ford*

INSPECTOR