



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3367533

56 Lees Hall Road, Sheffield S8 9JJ

- 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 Geoff Vande Velde against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00245/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling is one of a pair of semi-detached houses that, in common with many of the properties in the area, have hipped roofs above red brick walls, set away from their shared boundaries. The house designs and the spaces between properties, particularly at first floor and roof level, provide the area with a relatively unified character. The neighbouring property, 58 Lees Hall Road, is angled to face the road junction and is set at a higher level. Despite this, it represents a continuation of the uniform street character.
4. The proposal would result in the loss of the hipped roof and its replacement with a full gable that would be built up to the boundary. Because of the angle of number 58, the gable would be more prominent and exposed within the street scene. Although the positions of the two properties would avoid a more terraced street appearance, the development of a gable, on the boundary, would result in the house dominating its plot which would result in the finished design being perceived as departing further from the prevailing character. This element of the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
5. Although a continuation of the form of the dwelling, rather than being designed to be subordinate, the new form would not, in itself, represent poor design. However, it must be considered within this particular context. In this case, it would be overly dominant with regard to the plot and with regard to it introducing a new form of development that would be at odds with the detail of the majority of properties in the area. The large cheeks of the rear dormer would also be visible beyond the

proposed side gable when viewed from Lees Hall Road. This would detract further from the appearance of the property.

6. The dormer would also be evident from Thorpe House Avenue when viewed across the rear of the two corner properties. The scale, design and full width nature of the dormer would result in it having a greater public prominence and this adds to my concerns. It would add to the harm to the character and appearance of this area. The scale and form of the dormer represents poor design in this context.
7. The proposal would be contrary to the design objectives of policies BE5(a) and H14(a) of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 and policy CS74(c) of the Core Strategy 2009. Reference has been made to Supplementary Planning Guidance but this document has not been provided and I am unclear of its status.
8. The council has not raised concerns with regard to the dormer given the potential for a similar but smaller structure to be built without consent. However, this greater width of dormer would result in greater harm, particularly as it would be viewed to the rear of the new gable from Lees Hall Road. I accept that there are other dormers in the area but these do not suggest that a dormer of this scale should be accepted.
9. I am mindful that a hip to gable roof extension, without the side extension, may not require formal consent. Whilst this weighs in favour of the proposal, such a change would be less dominant given that it would be set in from the side boundary and would not include such clear views of similarly permitted dormer cheeks. Reference has been made to other extensions within the area. They are not so numerous that the character of the area has changed. For the more recent developments, I am not satisfied that the circumstances are entirely similar with regard to the arrangement of properties and the likely perceived prominence of the works. I must in any event, consider this proposal on its own merits.
10. The existence of other similar developments; and the potential for works to be carried out that do not require formal consent, provide weight in favour of the proposal. However, this is not sufficient to outweigh my concern that the larger scale of the two main elements of the proposal, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR