



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2024

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3337138

264 Darnall Road, Sheffield S9 5AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammed Naseem Shahid against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03364/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to roof to include replacement dormer windows to front of dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Front dormers were in place on the appeal property at the time of my visit. The appeal proposal seeks permission for two reduced size dormers on the front elevation. For clarity, I have dealt with the appeal based on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached building which is situated in an area that contains a variety of closely positioned properties. The changes in topography result in properties being sited at different levels, with the level changes also affording views over the predominantly pitched roofs of residential properties in the area. The simple roof forms, as well as the generally consistent building lines provides for a cohesive character.
5. The proposed dormers would be situated on the front roof slope, and although they would be of a reduced size compared to the dormers that are currently in place, they would nevertheless be large, prominent structures. The windows on the proposed dormers would also only partially align with the windows on the first-floor front elevation of the host property, with the dormer structures themselves being out of alignment with these existing windows below.
6. Whilst there may be other dormers in the wider area, including those that the Council has recently approved, there are none on nearby properties on this section of Darnall Road. The dormers would as a result, appear as top heavy

and alien additions which would be harmful to the visual appearance of the appeal building and the character of the area.

7. I therefore conclude that the appeal development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the appeal building and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies BE5 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. The proposal would also be contrary to Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. Reference has been made to the planning history of the site, and I note the appellant sought to engage and work positively with the Council. This appeal follows the Council's formal decision, and I can confirm that I have assessed the development accordingly, on both its merits and impacts.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR