



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3368175
84A Bocking Lane, Sheffield S8 7BL

- 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 P Thompson against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00361/FUL.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alterations at ground/first floor and roof level including pv panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an extended 2-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the junction of Bocking Lane and Westwick Road. The rear roof and first floor of the property are visible from Westwick Road. On the opposite side of Bocking Lane is an area of publicly accessible greenspace. By reason of siting, the property and this pair of semi-detached dwellings are prominent features within the streetscene.
4. The surrounding area is primarily residential in character with a variation in the height, design and appearance of the dwellings. Some of the dwellings have been altered, including by roof extensions which are visible from the surrounding roads. However, the detailed planning circumstances of these other roof extensions have not been provided, including whether these other examples have been, or are being erected, under permitted development provisions available for dwelling houses
5. Planning permission was previously granted by the Council for alterations to the property's roof including a partial raising of the ridge height and the erection of a front dormer window above the 2-storey bay window (Ref 17/03262/FUL). This consent has now lapsed. The appellant has identified that this previously consented scheme was assessed against the same development plan policies which are applicable to the determination of this appeal.

6. The purpose of the proposed development is to provide an additional bedroom within the roofspace which, the appellant claims, is needed for family reasons. The alterations to the roof now being proposed include a raising of the ridge (to the same height as the previous scheme) and other extensions. These proposed extensions include dormers within the front and rear roofslopes which would be sited above existing 2-storey bay windows. The resulting property would retain a hipped roof form.
7. However, there are variations between the previous scheme and the proposed development which includes the rear dormer, the raising of the roof being over a longer length and additional extension, including to facilitate the provision of stairs to the proposed bedroom. Overall, the proposed development represents a bulkier addition to the roof compared to the previous scheme which would be noticeable from the surrounding residential area, including from both Bocking Lane and Westwick Road due to the siting of the property. The cumulative scale of the proposed development would also unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. The use of matching external materials would not mitigate the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
8. Further, although acknowledging a front dormer was previously approved, the proposed dormer extensions would not be subservient in scale to the bay windows below. Contrary to the claims of the council these proposed dormers would not result in the impression of a 3-storey dwelling. However, the proposed dormers do they represent a high quality of design in respect of their scale and, in particular, the fenestration of the front dormer would not be subservient to the bay window in terms of its design.
9. Although the bulk of the proposed development and lack of subserviency would individually not be reasons for this appeal to fail, it is concluded that cumulatively these matters do cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It is also concluded that the proposed development would conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan. Amongst other matters these policies require high quality development and extensions respecting the scale and detail of the original building and neighbouring buildings.
10. The claimed family need for the proposed development is judged not to be of such so great so as to outweigh the unacceptable harm which has been identified. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR