



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/23/3328551

57 Snaithing Lane, Sheffield S10 3LF

- 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 Blackburn against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02392/FUL, dated 22 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of dwellinghouse, and associated landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site is in the Ranmoor Conservation Area. The duty under Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
4. The appeal site is part of the rear garden to No 57 Snaithing Lane, which has an existing garden of approximately half a hectare. The section nearest the property has a large patio area with grass beyond, and then the appeal site is at a slightly lower level, less tended to, with a number of trees in the site area. The appeal site is "L" shaped, and the short side has an overgrown tennis court within it. Carsick Grange apartments are located beyond the boundary to the rear, largely screened by vegetation. The character of the area is primarily residential detached properties.
5. The proposal seeks to develop the site by one large, detached dwelling, partially sub-terranean in nature, as I understand the land was sold with a covenant restricting building height to single-storey equivalent. Back-land development is not a common characteristic of the area, with development predominantly of large properties and spacious plot sizes. Moreover, whilst views of the proposal would be limited to those from properties adjoining the site, constrained by vegetation, it would be of a considerable length and depth

- within the plot resulting in a development that would appear incongruous and intrusive in its context.
6. Irrespective of whether any local plan policy specifically refers to any subservience, the scale of development is out of keeping with its immediate surroundings and would harm the visual quality of the area.
 7. With respect to S.72(1) of the Act, the significance of the heritage asset arises mainly from the architectural quality of dwellings and the sizing and spacing of plots. The contribution of the site to the significance of the heritage asset is therefore positive given it comprises garden area and trees, relatively in keeping with the local area, largely hidden from public vantage points.
 8. The development would for the aforementioned reasons, however, result in visual harm to the overall character of the area by reason of excessive scale, bulk and mass of the proposal. Accordingly, the proposal, and the change it would have in visual terms, would also neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. However, I conclude that this impact would be at the lower end of "less than substantial" harm given that the development would largely be hidden from public vantage points and that the change would be contained to its immediate surroundings, but the potential loss of trees would be significant.
 9. The overall contemporary design and detailing before me is not consistent with the varied styles of development in the nearby area and would not be an acceptable design approach to use in terms of materials and architectural style. The proposal would be intrusive and incongruous and result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 10. As set out above, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development would be contrary to the development plan in this regard, and I attach significant weight to this conflict. Accordingly, the proposal also results in less than substantial harm to the conservation area, although only to the degree when considering the site context and overall significance of the heritage asset.
 11. Set against this, the development would make a small contribution towards the supply of housing, on a site within an existing settlement. It would also generate some economic benefits during the construction phase and through local expenditure by future residents. Without any idea of future occupiers or any supporting evidence, I cannot give any weight to the argument of the appellant with regard to encouragement of a greater number of businesses from lucrative industries.
 12. On balance, and taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered against the Framework as a whole. Therefore, the development does not benefit from the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, and there are no material considerations that indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
 13. As such, I find conflict with Saved Policies BE5, BE15, BE16, GE15 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policies CS31 and CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) which, when taken

as a whole, expect development to reflect the special character of Conservation Areas and avoid unsympathetic development and should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. I also find conflict with the heritage advice as set out in the Framework.

Conclusion

14. The proposal is not in accordance with the Council's development plan as a whole and there is nothing outlined in the Framework, that demonstrates indicate that I should act other than in accordance with this.
15. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR