
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2025

by **N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3373759

229 Ridal Avenue, Stocksbridge, Sheffield S36 1EY

- 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 Fleetwood against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01909/FUL.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing detached garage with a new larger garage and store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development as set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying documents that the development comprises the replacement of the existing garage with garage and store and landscaping. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling on the prominent corner of Ridal Avenue and Sitwell Avenue. The property has a raised landscaped area with fence surrounding it, and a garage to the side, adjacent to the neighbouring property No.231 Ridal Avenue. The property is in a mainly residential area and both Sitwell Avenue and Ridal Avenue are main roads running through the wider housing estate. The immediate area has several corner plot dwellings such as the appeal site, which are relatively open in character. Due to the varied topography of the area, the dwelling is at a higher level than the road.
5. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing garage which is set forward of the building line of Ridal Avenue and replace it with a large-detached garage and store. The proposal includes the reconfiguring of the raised hard landscaping along the frontage with the highway.
6. The existing garage to be demolished is relatively modest in scale and has a flat roof, therefore whilst it is set forward, it does not appear visually prominent when viewed from the corner of Ridal Avenue and Sitwell Avenue.

7. Although the proposed garage would be partially set back from the edge of pavement, it is larger in scale than the existing, and would fill much of the land between the host dwelling and No. 231. The proposed garage would also have a pitched roof, which would allow for rooflights into the proposed workshop area and allow for the required door heights. However, this would increase its overall prominence.
8. Notwithstanding the proposed materials which would be acceptable, given the large scale of the proposed development together with the proposed height and the position on the frontage of Ridal Avenue, I consider that the proposed garage would appear incongruous in the street scene, especially from views from the east and west. The proposal would therefore not be compatible with the character and built form of the area contrary to the Designing House Extensions SPD.
9. Having regard to the proposed landscaping to the frontage only, as the height of the raised area would be lowered, I do not consider that this element of the proposals would be more harmful than the existing landscaping or unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. My attention has been drawn to examples of other garages in the area, some of the examples show garages to the frontages of properties adjacent to the highway. I have no details of the age of the garages, their planning history or whether they are original or not. Furthermore, due to the differing locations of the examples, and based on the information provided, I cannot be certain that they are directly comparable with the circumstances of the appeal before me, therefore they do not lead me to a different conclusion.
11. Therefore, for the above reasons, and despite my findings in relation to the proposed landscaping area, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan which in combination seek to ensure that development contributes to place-making and be of high quality and that new buildings are well designed and would be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings and should respect the scale and form of the original building.
12. In addition, for the above reasons, the proposal would not accord with Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has stated in their evidence that the proposed garage would provide enhanced security for the appellant's work van and tools together with better storage for other items such as children's bikes. Whilst the convenience of additional storage and security over and above what the existing garage provides would be a practical solution for the family, to my mind, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area in this case.
14. The appellant has expressed general dissatisfaction with how the development plan policies have been applied in whole rather than the relevant parts. The

approach of the Council in this regard is not a significant material consideration for this appeal in my planning judgement.

15. The appellant has stated that they entered into pre-application discussions with the Council and made changes to the overall design as a result. However, I have made my assessment based on the planning merits of the proposal, therefore the pre-application discussions that took place are not a significant material consideration for this appeal in my judgement.

Conclusion

16. 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. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised and for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR