



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3372413

82 High Storrs Road, Sheffield S11 7LE

- 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 Ms Francesca Redmore against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00635/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a gable extension and rear terrace.
-

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 council's concern relates to the proposed alterations to the side of the house. The proposal would result in a hip to gable roof extension to the main house and the addition of a marginally lower side extension with a similar roof form. The extension would be flush with the front wall and would extend to the side boundary.
4. The area includes a mix of properties but includes a large number of similar semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. These are generally separated by a similar gap which in this case, is occupied by two narrow garages. This has resulted in the street having a relatively uniform appearance and a consistent rhythm with regard to the built form and spaces between, particularly at first floor and roof level. The sloping nature of the road results in the characteristic form of the roofs being more noticeable. Many of the detached and terraced properties, that are also present in the street, have a similar roof form.
5. The proposal would result in a cramped appearance, given that the extension would be built up to the boundary. The semi-detached character would be entirely eroded if the neighbouring property owner sought a similar extension. Whilst the council would have some control over such an application, it would be unreasonable to impose greater restriction on a similar neighbouring proposal. The limited set down of the roof would offer only limited relief in these circumstances. Whilst it has been suggested that the changes in levels would assist in preventing the appearance of terracing, I am not persuaded that this would be the case. Furthermore, the raised position of number 82, prior to any development of number 80, would ensure that the side facing gable would be more prominent in the street scene.

6. It is acknowledged that the hipped roof could be extended to a gable without consent. Whilst this would be at odds with the prevailing design characteristics, it would not so significantly erode the spatial qualities to the extent that they would be harmed by this proposal. The cramped appearance resulting from the lack of any set back from the frontage and the boundary; the loss of the distinctive form and character of the existing house resulting from the change in roof form and the lack of set back of the extension from the frontage; and the terracing resulting from the lack of set back and the limited reduction in roof height, would, when taken in combination, represent poor design.
7. Although the original characteristics of the street remain, it is acknowledged that there are numerous examples of alterations and additions to properties that are at odds with the prevailing original character of the area. Within this street, the appellant lists two properties that have had hip to gable roof alterations and two storey side extensions; and seven others having side extensions flush with the house frontage. The attached neighbouring property has an extension that extends forward of the main dwelling. Thirteen other houses are listed as having had hip to gable extensions. Although this is a significant number of properties, this is a long road with many pairs of semi-detached houses that have not been so materially altered. Whilst many of the examples listed are at odds with the original character of this road, the original form and appearance of the dwellings along most of the length of High Storrs Road, remains as the dominant characteristic.
8. The extensions at 62 and 64 High Storrs Road are those referred to as having a hip to gable roof alteration and a similar side addition. Although not entirely as currently proposed, they illustrate the concerns raised by the council with regard to this development. I am mindful however that the council has accepted these extensions and that the local policy position has not changed since. Consistency in decision making is important although specific details and local context are also relevant. The properties lie close to a row of houses that have original gable roofs (ending at number 50). The design of the extension at number 64 also differs, retaining part of the original hipped roof frontage. Whilst the combination of the two extensions detracts from the overall character of the street, there is some mitigation compared to the current proposal, such as the lower roof form and retained hipped roof element of number 64 and the set back of the extension at number 62. I am not entirely clear of the circumstances that led to these two decisions and whilst they offer some support for the principle of this proposal, they do not suggest that it would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the immediate area within which it is set.
9. Overall, the loss of the gable combined with the proposed new two storey element being proposed to be built both flush with the front of the house and the boundary, would result in a cramped appearance and would detract from the existing character of the street. Although it would have matching materials, it would represent poor design in this context. As it would represent poor design and would fail to respect the scale and form of its surroundings, it would conflict with the design requirements of policies BE5(a & c) and H14(a) of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998; and policy CS74(c) of the Core Strategy 2009.
10. The proposal would also conflict with the design expectations of the National Planning Policy Framework which is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused. I also find conflict with the council's Supplementary

Planning Guidance document on Designing House Extensions which specifically seeks to retain hipped roofs, which would at least allow for some upper-level separation.

11. I have had regard to the other extensions built locally and the permissions referred to in the wider area. The consent at 9 High Storrs Rise in 2020 is very similar in design but the immediate area appears to have a large number of such additions. I have considered other extensions listed, including the appeal decision relating to 25 Huntley Road. However, each proposal has to be considered on its own merits, and the particular circumstances will vary depending on the surrounding developments and other matters. Overall, whilst I am not satisfied that the council has been entirely consistent in its approach, I do not find the examples listed to represent a good reason for accepting poor design in this particular case.
12. I have had regard to the matters put forward by the appellant including the details of the extension to the attached dwelling. I also note the support offered by the neighbouring residents. Whilst these are matters that weigh in favour of allowing alterations to the property, they are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns with regard to accepting poor design. In conclusion, as there are no matters that outweigh my concerns, I dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR