



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/24/3350557

697 Attercliffe Road, Sheffield S9 3RE

- 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 & Mrs Ditta against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 24/01266/FUL, dated 24 April 2024, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2024.
 - The development proposed is change of use to House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and residential flat above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:-
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The living conditions of prospective residents.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site has previously been used as a massage parlour and is allocated as being within a local shopping centre and an area of special character.
4. The appeal proposal would see the frontage of the property infilled to make a larger room and conversion of another room to create a communal kitchen. The other rooms would simply be converted to living accommodation. Two new windows would be installed into the side elevation to provide some natural light to two of the rooms.
5. I understand that the property has had a roller shutter door to the front elevation for a number of years but infilling the frontage and inserting one single door into the infilled section would not lift the outward appearance and could be considered to be hostile in appearance. The immediate locality appears tired in outward appearance, but this is no justification for poor design.
6. In summary, this alteration and extension would cause harm the character and appearance of the existing building, the wider locality including the area of Special Character from the poor quality of the proposed design. As such, I find conflict with saved policies BE5 and BE18 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) (the UDP), which amongst other matters, expect development to

respect the scale, form and detail of the original building, and respect the appearance and character of the Special Character Area. I also find conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009) (the CS) in that the development fails to help transform the character of physical environments that have become run down and lack in distinctiveness.

Living Conditions

7. Whilst the intentions of the appellant to retain the internal structure of the property are understood, the current internal layout is not suitable for conversion to residential property. At ground floor level each of the rooms would have natural light to a minimum, which would all be on the side elevation, which in turn could cause issues with the cleared land to the side, initially from parking of vehicles and loss of privacy. This could cause issues in the longer term if that land was subject to development proposals.
8. The corridor that serve the rooms has no form of natural light other than the access doors, and would lead to an oppressive, dark environment for any person using the corridor for access or egress or using the facilities, which are located toward the rear of the premises.
9. This would lead to harm to the living conditions of prospective residents from the lack of natural light to the corridors, compounded with the small windows to the rooms at ground floor level. As such, I find conflict with policy BE5 of the UDP as it relates to criteria h) and i) in particular. I also find conflict with the amenity aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically Paragraphs 135 and 191.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, and having regard to all matters before me, I conclude that the appeal must be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR