



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2023

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/23/3322425

Flat 7, 3 Kenwood Road, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S7 1NP

- 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 Robert Androsch against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03997/FUL, dated 20 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension to form dining room and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Nether Edge Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises of a large stone-built detached property which has been converted into a number of apartments. Although it is not a listed building, it is situated in the Nether Edge Conservation Area (CA). There are variations in the design of properties in the area, and some have been subject to extensions. The pitched roofs and other features such as bay windows as well as properties being set within their own grounds behind verdant gardens and parking areas, gives the area a leafy, traditional character which contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
4. The proposed extension would be situated at roof level in an area that is currently used as a roof terrace. The proposal has been amended following a previously refused planning application and would be formed with natural stone as well as incorporating various detailing, including around the windows that would match the existing property.
5. The extension would however have a flat roof form that would contrast with the predominant pitched roof form of the host property and others in the area. Although part of the existing building does have a flat roof element and reference has been made to the square shape of the extension reflecting the fire escape, the proposal would project from the existing elevation, and it would have a box like form that would not be sympathetic to the traditional

pitched roofs on the host property and others in the CA. The elevated position of the extension would result in it being viewed from a number of public vantage points and from neighbouring properties, where it would appear as a prominent, incongruous feature. The appeal property and others in the area have been extended previously but the presence of other unsympathetic extensions and alterations would not however outweigh the harm that I have identified.

6. The Council has raised concerns in relation to the proposed UPVC windows and whilst they would have a different appearance and profile to timber-framed windows, they would be seen in distant views, such that this difference would not be pronounced. As such, I do not consider this element of the proposal, nor the proposed roof light would be harmful.
7. Nevertheless, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and it would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, it would be contrary to Policies BE5, BE15, BE16, BE17 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan and Policy CS 74 of the Council's Core Strategy, which seek, amongst other matters, for extensions to be well designed, including in terms of scale, form and detailing and which seek to resist development that harms the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to conserve the special interest of heritage assets.
8. Where less than substantial harm would arise, such as in this case, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I have not been made aware of any such benefits in this instance.

Other Matters

9. There would be no adverse issues arising in terms of car parking, but this is a neutral matter and not one which weighs in favour of the proposal.
10. Although there may be a reduction in noise levels for the flat below as a result of increased insulation, the extension would also provide a covered internal area that would also allow the increased use of this space when compared to the existing roof terrace. As such, there is no clear evidence before me that the appeal proposal would provide a benefit in this regard.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole. It has not been demonstrated that there are any material considerations of sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR