



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2026

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3375150

187 Heavygate Road, Sheffield S10 1PH

- 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 Ms Bethan Woollvin against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02552/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: Demolition of existing single storey extension, new two-storey contemporary side extension, new bay and canopy to entrance door, replacement of rendered corner to stone facing to match rest of the property, new windows returned to traditional sash style throughout the existing building. New outbuilding/office-studio to be used in conjunction with the main house built in a traditional style to match the main property. Alterations to boundary wall and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. As part of the appeal submission, the appellant has put forward an alternative scheme that would reduce the size of the roof element over the single-storey extension. However, I am mindful that it is not the purpose of the appeal process to evolve a scheme and it is therefore important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the Council. To do otherwise would prejudice the interests of the Council, interested third parties and consultees, who have not been consulted on the revised scheme and who may have observations to make. I have therefore proceeded to determine the appeal on the basis of the plans as submitted to the Council for their determination. The merits of a revised scheme would, if necessary, be a matter for the main parties to consider as part of a fresh proposal away from this appeal.

Background and Main Issue

3. The Council considers that the proposed single-storey extension would be out of character with both the property itself and the street scene by virtue of its alignment, forward projection and angled siting and form, creating the impression of an overly intense development. However, the Council considers that all other elements of the proposal do not give rise to any significant harmful impacts upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
4. Therefore, based on the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed single-storey extension element of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is situated in a residential area at the end of a traditional stone-faced terrace row. It is relatively unusual within the local context, being arranged over 3 floors and lacking the characteristic bay windows repeated on neighbouring terraces.
6. The appellant refers to an original property deed plan, which indicates the former presence of a coach house within the rear garden, in order to illustrate the irregular nature of this corner plot. Notwithstanding an existing projecting bay window at ground floor level, the appeal property sits on a building line broadly consistent with the elevated stone-built terrace row that lies to the rear. The properties on the southwestern side of Heavygate Road also follow a generally uniform building line, in contrast to the more varied building line evident on the opposite side of the street.
7. The proposal before me involves the demolition and rebuilding of existing single and two-storey outriggers to a greater height and footprint, in a contemporary design and external finish. Various other alterations to the dwelling and boundary treatments and the erection of an ancillary detached 2 storey outbuilding within the rear garden are also proposed.
8. While most of the alterations would enhance the overall appearance of the appeal site and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, the angled footprint, part-flat and part mono-pitch roof and pronounced projection towards Heavygate Road of the single-storey ground floor extension would extend well beyond the broadly consistent building line and existing bay window. This would result in an incongruous addition which would appear visually intrusive in the street scene. Although it would be partially screened from the northwest by the elevated boundary fence at 205 Heavygate Road, it would remain clearly perceptible from a range of vantage points along the adjacent highway, particularly given the changes in ground levels, with its height and contemporary materials further accentuating its prominence.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development, when considered as a whole, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, in this regard it would conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 (a) of the Saved Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (March 1998) and Policy CS74 (c) of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (March 2009) which together seek to ensure that new development is well designed, respects the scale and form of the original building and enhances the character of the area. It would also not comply with Guideline 2 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (undated) and the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the proposal has attracted support from neighbours and would not be detrimental to their living conditions. Nor would there be harm to highway safety and other technical matters. However, these matters are neutral factors and as such do not weigh in the developments favour.
11. My attention has been drawn to the current poor state of the building and that the proposals would allow for the restoration of the building, which would improve the

overall appearance within the street scene and therefore align with Policy CS74 which supports design led transformation. Notwithstanding the moderate weight attributed to this benefit, I have minimal information before me that demonstrates that the benefits of the appeal scheme could not be achieved in a less harmful way. As such, this does not lead me to a different conclusion.

12. Criticisms laid at the Council's handling of the application have not played into my consideration of the appeal proposal, which I have assessed solely on its planning merits.

Conclusion

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

K Mee

INSPECTOR