



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/25/3372385

11 Grove Avenue, Middlewood, Sheffield S6 4AR

- 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 Simon Rolph against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01938/FUL.
 - The development proposed is installation of an air source heat pump.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal in the application form has been amended to omit wording that does not constitute an act of development and to avoid duplication.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of nearby residential properties with regard to noise.

Reasons

4. The proposal relates to a semi-detached dwelling located within an established residential area. The air source heat pump (ASHP) would be freestanding close to the rear elevation wall, broadly central within the width of the plot.
5. The initial submitted MCS 020(a) Manual Sound Calculation (MSC) indicated that the noise produced by the ASHP would be 41.6dB at the first assessment point, being the closest first floor rear window of No 13 Grove Avenue. The appellant has submitted further evidence with regards to a second assessment point, being the first floor rear window of No 9 Grove Avenue, which shows that the noise produced by the ASHP would be 39.8dB. These results would therefore exceed the Microgeneration Certification Scheme - Planning Standards permitted development thresholds of 37dB by between 2.8dB and 4.6dB. The appellant states that the maximum noise level would only be achieved for about 10% of its operating time.
6. A further MSC reflecting the addition of a canopy attached to the rear elevation of the host dwelling indicates a resulting reduction in the noise produced to 36.6dB. However, whilst this has been stated as representing the situation for the first assessment point (as described above), the form itself describes the assessment position as being the closest ground floor window of neighbours across the road from the property.

7. The Council's Environmental Protection Service raises concerns over the ability of the proposed mitigation (canopy) to sufficiently attenuate the noise for neighbouring properties on either side of the appeal property. They conclude that a full assessment by a qualified acoustic professional is necessary to demonstrate that the proposed mitigation would be acceptable.
8. The appellant asserts that the MSC 020(a) calculations have an inherent conservatism and tendency to over predict real-world noise such that the impact would be negligible. Submitted DEFRA Road Noise Maps seek to demonstrate that the background noise levels are already high, being between 45-55 dB, such that the ASHP would not be perceived as a nuisance. However, it is unclear whether these levels relate solely to the front of the dwellings or if this would also be true at the rear. Additional noise maps and a noise report seek to illustrate that the resulting noise levels for the relevant assessment points are acceptable, but it is unclear whether these have been prepared by a competent acoustic professional and no explanation is given to accompany the data and images. Furthermore, despite stating that a comprehensive noise assessment has been undertaken, no such assessment is before me.
9. Where planning permission is required for new development, the onus lies with the applicant to provide sufficient evidence to clearly demonstrate that the proposals would not harmfully impact the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. I am not convinced by the appellant's evidence that the proposals would not result in harmful impacts on adjacent occupiers' living conditions due to noise nuisance. I therefore find that the proposal is contrary to Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (March 1998) which amongst other things seeks to ensure that new development does not lead to noise nuisance for people living nearby.
10. Conflict also arises with paragraphs 135 f), 187 and 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and requires planning decisions to mitigate, and reduce to a minimum, potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development.

Other Matters

11. I have given significant weight to the objectives set out within Policies CS63, CS64 and CS65 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (March 2009) which seek to reduce the impact of climate change, increase energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions. Furthermore, the Framework seeks to increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and supports the transition to net zero by 2050. Also, in favour of the proposal, the appellant advises that a typical ASHP can reduce a house's carbon emissions by 75%. However, these benefits are balanced against the potential adverse impacts of the operation of the ASHP and I find that they do not outweigh the harm identified above.
12. The appellant asserts that the proposal would accord with paragraph 135 a), c) and f) of the Framework regarding providing a sustainable heating solution aligning with broader environmental objectives. However, this should not be at the expense of amenity for existing and future occupiers.
13. The appellant has referred to a need for a "common sense approach" to be taken, however, the public benefits associated with the reduction in overall emissions

resulting from the installation of one ASHP does not outweigh the identified harm to living conditions.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR