



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2024

**by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10<sup>th</sup> December 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/24/3351465**

**244a High Greave, Sheffield S5 9GR**

- 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 Knowles (Ecco Tap Bar and Bistro Ltd) against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
  - The application Ref 23/03957/FUL, dated 13 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2024.
  - The development proposed is erection of a single-storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner above from the Council's Decision Notice, as it describes the development succinctly and correctly. At the time of this application, the proposal was one of several for the site, and the description referred to that, whereas the Council description just referred to this application, which was correct. I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this course of action.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the residents of the immediate neighbouring properties.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. The appeal site contains a two-storey mixed use residential and commercial structure. It is a corner site, located on the junction of High Greave, Colley Road and Tunwell Avenue and is irregular in shape. Strawberry Road runs to the rear of the site, accessed off Tunwell Avenue. There is a small amount of off-street parking available on site.
5. The proposal seeks to create a single storey extension to the side of the property that faces toward Tunwell Avenue, and would allow for a kitchen extension, freeing up more available space within the unit to allow for additional customer seating. It would be flat-roofed like the existing extension, triangular in shape to make use of the irregular shape of that area of the site.

6. The extension is to be flat-roofed and would make the building substantially larger at ground floor level. The effect of these changes would be to substantially increase the bulk and mass of the building, in a small site area which has the outward effect of already looking visually congested. The proposal's appearance would also be at odds with the main visual components of the larger building. I note that efforts have been made to make the extension appear subservient where the proposed design would mimic the existing. The proposals, if built, would give the impression of a cramped and harmful overdevelopment of a relatively small site.
7. Turning to the size of the extension and its effect more generally on the character and appearance of the wider area, given its prominent location, it would clearly reduce the open feel of the area. The scale and massing of the extended building would, in my view, be at odds with the scale and massing of the main building, unbalancing the overall site appearance and causing harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not fit harmoniously or acceptably into its visual context thus harming the character and appearance of the site's surroundings. Accordingly, a material conflict arises with saved policy BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) (the UDP) and policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009), which, amongst other matters, expect development to respect the scale, form, detail and materials of the original building. I also find conflict with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework, with specific reference to Paragraph 135.

#### *Living Conditions*

9. The Council have raised concerns with regard to the impact the proposal would have on the living conditions of residents that live opposite on Tunwell Avenue, with specific reference to the impact of the proposal when viewed from those properties.
10. The extension would be single storey in nature, located across the highway. Nos 2 and 4 Tunwell Avenue would be looking toward the extension, but they have front gardens to set those properties back from the highway.
11. I find that the combination of the distance across the highway, and the additional setback from front amenity spaces would not cause harm to the living conditions of those residents to any material degree that would necessitate a reason for dismissal of this appeal for this reason alone. However, the harm I have identified from the other matter would still generate harm sufficient to warrant a dismissal of the appeal.
12. As such, on this matter, I find no conflict with saved policy H14 of the UDP which, amongst other matters, expects development to protect the amenities of residents.

#### **Other Matters**

13. I have noted the frustrations of the appellant with regard to the level of service that they felt was received during the process. This does not form part of the appeal procedure and could be raised with the Council directly through their complaints procedure.

## **Conclusion**

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

*Paul Cooper*

INSPECTOR