



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3371428

9 Seabrook Road, Sheffield S2 2RZ

- 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 Dan Webster against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01654/FUL.
 - The development proposed is alterations to roof to form additional living accommodation including the erection of front and rear dormers and removal of chimneys.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed front dormer.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed rear dormer and removal of chimneys at 9 Seabrook Road, Sheffield S2 2RZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/01654/FUL and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site Location Plan Drawing Number: 25/3809/006/A; Proposed Second Floor Plan (Amended) Drawing Number: 25/3809/004/E; Proposed Elevations (Amended) Drawing Number: 25/3809/005/E and Block Plan (Amended) Drawing Number: 25/3809/007/B so far as they relate to the hereby approved development.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby approved development shall match that of the existing built form.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. The decision notice refers to alterations to roof to form additional living accommodation, including the erection of a front dormer extension with Juliette balcony and rear dormer extension. During the determination of the application, amended plans were received and considered by the Council, these modified the proposed development, altering the design of the front dormer and omitting the Juliette balcony.
4. I have therefore based my decision on the amended plans submitted to the Council during the application process. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted a revised description of development.

Main Issue

5. The Council considered that the rear dormer was acceptable, comprising a modest and relatively concealed form of development. From my observations during my site visit and based on the information before me, I have no substantive evidence to lead me to a different conclusion upon this part of the proposed development.
6. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed front dormer and removal of the chimneys on the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is a modest semi-detached property located within a predominantly residential area. Most of the properties in this part of the road are as originally constructed; though many feature rear dormers, front dormers are not a common feature in the street. Notwithstanding this, I observed from my site visit that front dormers were visible on a pair of properties on the other side of the road.
8. The appeal site is within close proximity to the Norfolk Road Conservation Area. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
9. The proposed development includes the removal of two chimneys. The loss of these features is not discussed in the Council's Officer Report. Even so, I observed during my site visit that similar properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site differ in terms of chimneys; most have original chimneys, however, some have modified chimneys or have had them removed. As such, given the variation observed, the loss of the chimneys would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. The proposed front dormer would create a bulky addition to the modest property, covering a significant amount of the existing front roof slope. Whilst the scheme has been revised to reduce the size and design of the front dormer, the resulting development would be dominant and incongruous to the existing property and streetscene.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to front dormers within the area, and during my site visit, I observed multiple front dormers of varying designs and scale. Whilst I acknowledge the presence of these dormers contributes to the character and appearance of the wider area, they are in different streets, where other diverse dormers are generally present.
12. The appeal site is not within a street where front dormers are common. Whilst there are two front dormers within Seabrook Road, these are modest in scale, constructed with sympathetic materials, and form a well-balanced coordinated pair that does not detract from the symmetry of the properties. The proposal before me differs from these matching dormers. Notwithstanding this, each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal before me.
13. I conclude that the proposed front dormer would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general. With regard to the main issue

relating to the proposed front dormer only, there is conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), and Policy BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), which amongst other things, seek to ensure developments are high quality, which respects and complement the scale, form and architectural style of surrounding buildings.

14. The proposed front dormer conflicts with the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan, which amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are compatible with the character and built form of the area, and that dormers do not dominate the roof plane on which they sit.
15. In relation to the proposed front dormer, there is also conflict with the Framework, which seeks to ensure developments are of good design, appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion and Conditions

16. I find the proposed rear dormer and removal of the chimneys are clearly severable, both physically and functionally, from the proposed front dormer.
17. I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the proposed rear dormer and removal of the chimneys. However, in relation to the proposed front dormer the appeal should be dismissed.
18. In respect of the proposed rear dormer and removal of chimneys, I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added conditions concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR