
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/25/3371373

318 Hall Road, Sheffield S9 4AG

- 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 Mark Ollerenshaw against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00758/FUL.
 - The development proposed is an additional terrace house alongside house number 318.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the side garden to 318 Hall Road. This is a two-storey, brick-built end of terrace house within a large corner plot with gardens to the front, side and rear. The area is characterised by predominantly uniform terraces set back from the highway following clear and consistent building lines. These building lines are established along both the front elevations of properties and, crucially, along the side elevation of corner plots to align with the front elevations of properties facing adjoining streets. Consequently, this arrangement ensures a strong sense of order and openness at street junctions, with corner plots, such as the appeal site, contributing positively to the rhythm and spacious character of the area.
4. The proposed dwelling would maintain the established building line along Hall Road. However, by projecting forward of the building line that runs along Chestnut Avenue, the development would interrupt the carefully planned alignment that is a defining feature of the estate's layout. This incursion would erode the sense of openness at the corner and undermine the visual harmony and character that the original estate layout sought to achieve.
5. Reference has been made to the extension at 298 Hall Road, which is cited as a precedent for deviation from the established building line. However, that development differs materially from the appeal proposal, occupying a lesser proportion of its corner plot and retaining sufficient space to maintain a sense of openness. Its design is recessive within the plot and does not result in the same degree of encroachment as the current proposal, and in any event, each scheme must be considered and determined on its own merits.

6. While the appellant contends that the scheme would maintain the verdant character of the estate through soft landscaping and boundary treatments, the existing arrangement of front, side, and rear gardens, largely enclosed by mature hedging, makes a significant positive contribution to the visual amenity and spaciousness of the corner plot. This established green boundary not only enhances the appearance of the site but also reinforces the sense of openness at the junction.
7. The proposed development would substantially reduce the space available for soft landscaping along the side boundary, and no meaningful provision for such planting is shown on the submitted plans. As a result, the proposal would erode the quality and extent of the existing landscaping, leading to a marked loss of greenery and a diminished contribution to the character of the estate.
8. The scheme proposes the use of matching materials and would draw on the architectural style of the adjacent dwelling and terrace. While corner plots may offer scope for architectural variation, in this case the proposal closely follows the established design of neighbouring properties rather than introducing a distinct approach. However, the fundamental harm arises not from matters of architectural detailing, but from the loss of openness and the interruption of the established building line along Chestnut Avenue, which are key elements of the estate's layout and character. As such, the use of sympathetic materials and styling cannot mitigate the adverse impact on the spatial arrangement and visual continuity of the area. Accordingly, these factors are not sufficient to allow the appeal in light of the harm identified.
9. Although the proposal is not an extension to an existing dwelling, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (SPG) is relevant in this case, as it sets out principles that apply more broadly to development affecting the character of residential areas. The SPG states that extensions should be compatible with the character of the area and should not detract from the general appearance of the street. These principles are directly applicable here, and for the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would fail to maintain the established character and would detract from the appearance of the street scene, contrary to the aims of the SPG.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Hence, the proposal conflicts with Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan, March 1998, (UDP) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy, March 2009, (CS) which seek, among other things, to ensure that development does not result in the serious loss of garden space that would harm the character of the neighbourhood, and that it respects and enhances the established layout of the area.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposed dwelling would provide adequate space both internally and externally, allow for sufficient natural light, and respect neighbouring amenity. It is also noted that the scheme would deliver a family home in a location close to educational facilities and within an area of high housing demand. While these are positive aspects of the proposal, they do not outweigh the significant harm identified in relation to the loss of openness and the interruption of the

established building line. Accordingly, these considerations do not alter my overall conclusion.

Planning Balance

12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The proposal is not in accordance with the aforementioned policies of the UDP and CS, with the associated conflict reflecting harm to the character and appearance of the area. For this reason, the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
13. The Council have confirmed that they do not currently meet the Housing Delivery Test and cannot demonstrate adequate supply of housing land, although a precise figure has not been provided. Consequently paragraph 11(d) of the Framework should be applied. Paragraph 11(d) explains that in these circumstances, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
14. The proposal would make a positive contribution to housing supply, with associated social and economic benefits during the construction period and once the dwelling is occupied. However, the scale of development proposed means the contribution of one additional dwelling to meet the Council's housing land supply position would be slight.
15. In the particular circumstances of this case, I have concluded that the proposed development would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the conflict with policies in the UDP and CS should be given significant weight. Consequently, the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would conflict with the development plan, when considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR