



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3372713

54 Norton Lees Lane, Sheffield S8 9BE

- 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 Vyvyan Hopkinson against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01565/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of a vehicular access to dwellinghouse including removal of boundary wall and provision of dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a row of 3 terraced houses which are elevated above the road and all feature a low stone wall to the front boundaries, similar to the boundary wall to the adjacent church and on the opposite side of the road, with hedging above. Many of the neighbouring houses have off-street parking on the frontage but they mostly still retain some form of front boundary treatment and elements of landscaping.
4. The proposal includes the formation of a new dropped kerb leading to a permeable block paved driveway, sloping upwards from the road, across the full width of the house to provide parking for 2 vehicles and would therefore necessitate the removal of the existing front boundary wall and hedge and excavation of the front garden. The resulting open hard surfaced frontage would be out of keeping with this terraced row of houses and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Given the elevated position in relation to the road, the visual impact of the proposed development and parked vehicles on the driveway would dominate the frontage and exacerbate the harm caused to the character and appearance of the area.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the neighbouring houses and surrounding area such that they are contrary to Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (March 1998). These policies aim, amongst other things, to secure good design which respects the scale, character and form of the original and neighbouring buildings.

6. Whilst Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance appear to relate more specifically to extensions to dwellings, they still highlight the importance of new development being compatible with the character and form of an area such that it does not detract from the general appearance of the locality. I therefore find this guidance to be relevant and which the development would be contrary to. The proposals also conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

7. The appellant states the proposed development is necessary to support family life in terms of allowing level and safe access for an elderly relative who is currently unable to visit the property. Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (March 2009) encourages development that provides for the needs of families in terms of convenient and safe access. However, the proposed driveway would be at a maximum gradient of 1:10 which is quite steep and may not necessarily provide safe access for people with reduced mobility. I do not consider that these personal circumstances outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. Reference is made to off-street parking being necessary in readiness for the secure home charging of a future electric vehicle (EV). Whilst there are sustainability benefits to the use of an EV, which would also be supported by national and local policy, this does not outweigh the above conflicts with policy.
9. I also acknowledge that there are no concerns surrounding the proposal with regards to highway safety, adequate garden space and flood risk and drainage. These are all neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of allowing the appeal.
10. I have had regard to the mitigation suggested by the appellant in the form of the retention of soft landscaping to the frontage and incorporation of low-level planting to partially define the front boundary. However, I have not been provided with any details of what this may entail and cannot be certain that this would mitigate the harm identified, particularly given the limited size of the frontage and the need to ensure the safe manoeuvring of vehicles.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to one of the other terraced houses in this row that already has a driveway. However, this is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal as it comprises a vehicle access and driveway located to the side, and at a lower level, than the house, leading to a parking area situated at the rear. The front boundary wall and raised garden of this house remains unaltered such that it still has a similar appearance to the existing conditions at the appeal property.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be dismissed otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR