



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3360348

53 Struan Road, Sheffield, S7 2EJ

- 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 Jake Sutherland against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02894/FUL.
 - The development proposed is alterations to roof including raised ridge height, hip to gable extension and dormer window to rear of dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two-storey dwelling with bay window and hipped roof. It has a single storey side extension with hipped roof and off-road parking to the front. The width and height of the property and fenestration give the dwelling a well-balanced, proportionate appearance. The appeal site and adjoining dwelling at 55 Struan Road are located between two pairs of semi-detached dwellings sited at an angle as they turn the corners with Knab Croft and Dalmore Road. Due to the topography and curve in the road the host property is highly visible within the wider street scene.
4. The road slopes downwards and at present the roofline of the host property sits between the ridge heights of Nos 51 and 55. The pattern of the street scene reflects the sloping topography with pairs of semi-detached properties stepping downwards. There are some examples where roofs have been altered, particularly in the surrounding streets. However, I observed that the majority of original hipped roofs along Struan Road have been retained and form part of the established character of the area. There remains a regularity in the pattern of development through the rooflines, orientation and spaces between dwellings which provides a sense of rhythm to the appearance of the street scene.
5. The proposal seeks to extend the property by raising the existing ridge height, with hip to gable extension and rear dormer with glass Juliet balcony. As a result of the increased ridge height the host property would be of a similar height to No 55 and be much higher than No 51, which would erode the regular stepped pattern of the street scene. The proposed changes to the hipped roof would alter the balanced

proportions of the host property and disrupt the visual rhythm and pattern of the wider roofscape. Due to the sloping nature of the street the proposed changes would be prominent when viewed from along Struan Road, with the rear clearly visible from Dalmore Road. Together, the increased ridge height and removal of the hipped roof would be at odds with the established character of the street scene, thereby causing harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. The appellant has referred me to examples at 47 Glenorchy Road, 18 and 29 Glentilt Road, 55 Montrose Road, 10 Dalmore Road and 60 Archer Lane, where roof heights have been raised. I have not been provided with all the details of these cases or the circumstances which led to permission being granted. However, in each of these examples the host property is either of different architectural style or has a different visual relationship with the adjoining properties than in the case of the host property. Therefore, these examples are not directly comparable to the appeal case. In any event I have considered the appeal on its own merits in light of the evidence before me.
7. For the reasons outlined the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal conflicts with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009). These policies seek amongst other things to ensure high quality development which complements the scale, form and architectural style of surrounding buildings.

Other Matters

8. The appellant states that in order to pass building regulations the ridge height could be reduced by 94mm lower than the current plans. However, no plans have been submitted to show these changes and therefore I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant. I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This harm is not outweighed by the benefits I have identified and is sufficient to justify dismissing the appeal. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR