



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3375893

103 Sandygate Road, Sheffield S10 5RX

- 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 Angel Jimenez against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01984/FUL.
 - The development proposed was originally described as two storey side extension. Associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effects of the proposed development on the street scene in Sandygate Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached properties on a part of the road characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses. Although many have been altered the pairs mostly retain a uniform appearance with either hipped roofs or gabled roofs. The appeal premises and its pair have hipped roofs and despite differences between the properties, the first floor and the three-dimensional roof form relate well to each other.
4. The contrasting roof slopes from the existing hipped roof, and the proposed part gable and mono pitch roof arrangement would result in an overly complicated and awkward juxtaposition of roof slopes. This would be at odds with the simple hipped roof arrangement of the pair of dwellings. Moreover, the combination of the overtly low height of the roof of the proposed extension, and the subsequent shallow pitch of the proposed front roof slope in contrast with the existing, would detract from the building's established form and proportions.
5. The proposed side extension would not be set back from the first floor front façade confusing the balance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and adding to my concerns regarding the design. For these reasons, even with matching materials, the retention of the front canopy, and with acceptable window detailing, the proposal would not harmonise well with the host property and the attached dwelling.
6. I saw a small number of houses nearby where alterations to the original hipped roofs had occurred as a result of extensions or alterations. Although I do not have any firm details of the circumstances that led to these developments, those that I

saw, served to confirm how alterations to pairs of semi-detached dwellings can have a harmful effect on the street scene.

7. To conclude the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the street scene in Sandygate Road. As such, I find conflict with the requirements of Policies BE5 and H14 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, the guidance within its Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, when taken together and in so far as they relate to this main issue. These say, amongst other things, that in housing areas, new development will be permitted provided that extensions are well designed and would be in scale and character with neighbouring buildings.
8. I note that the appellant made alterations to the design and was willing to make changes with a view to finding a solution. However, I must determine the appeal based on the merits of the scheme before me. The proposal would mean that no gutters would need to be maintained from the neighbours side. However, this is a private matter between the neighbouring occupiers. Moreover, the absence of harm in relation to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, or other matters, weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
9. 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.
10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR