
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2026

by **John Felgate BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/26/3378082

Former RF Stokes Co site, Egerton Street, Sheffield S1 4JX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sky-House Co (White Rose) Limited against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application, Ref 23/02417/COND7, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 19 of planning permission Ref 23/02417/FUL, granted on 9 October 2023.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 3 October 2025.
 - The development proposed is: *“Demolition of the existing building, and erection of new buildings ranging between 1 and 6 storeys, providing 60 no. residential units (Use Class C3) and 4 no. commercial units (Use Class E), with associated works, access and landscaping”*.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: the materials specification for the reconstruction of the footways adjoining the site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. Planning permission for the redevelopment of the appeal site was granted in 2023, subject to 47 conditions. As far as I am aware, none of these has been challenged. Condition 19 states:

“No above ground works shall commence until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, of arrangements which have been entered into which will secure the reconstruction of the footways adjoining the site, before the development is brought into use. The detailed materials specification shall have first been approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to ensure an appropriate quality of development.”

3. The present appeal seeks approval for the materials to be used for the required footway reconstruction. On my visit, it was apparent that not only has the above-ground development already commenced, but indeed most of the main external building shell has since been completed. Consequently, in so far as Condition 19 relates to the timing of the necessary approvals, it is no longer capable of being fully complied with. But nevertheless, that does not prevent approval from being granted retrospectively. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Reasons for decision

4. The appeal site comprises a former industrial site on the edge of Sheffield city centre. The surrounding area, re-branded in recent times as the 'Devonshire Quarter', was once known for its metalworking industries, but is now undergoing a gradual transition, through conversion and redevelopment, to a mixture of residential, retail, community uses and modern workspaces. On my visit, I saw that whilst considerable progress has been made in some parts of the area, the fulfilment of this aim remains something of a work in progress, with a large number of redundant or underused buildings and cleared sites still awaiting regeneration.
5. In the Sheffield Core Strategy (the CS), adopted in March 2009, Policy CS74 requires development to be of high quality, enhancing the city's distinctive features, including the character of its districts and quarters, and their associated layout, built form and materials. Where appropriate, developments should also contribute to place-making, help to transform run-down physical environments, and create attractive, sustainable and successful new neighbourhoods.
6. In addition, the Sheffield City Centre Urban Design Compendium (the UDC), published in 2004, provides design guidance, including a strategy for the repair and enhancement of the city centre's public realm. In the Secondary Zones, which include the Devonshire Quarter, the recommended palette of paving materials is specified as 600 x 450mm fibre-mesh reinforced concrete slabs, in pale buff colour, with 310mm mid-grey granite kerbs.
7. During my visit, I was able to see that this combination has been used on the footways surrounding several other recent developments in the area. These include the conversion of the Eyewitness Works building, at the corner of Headford Street and Milton Street, and numerous other schemes in Thomas Street, Fitzwilliam Street and Broomhall Street, amongst others. To my mind, the use of UDC-compliant pavings and kerbs in these schemes has had a noticeable and beneficial impact in upgrading the area in an incremental but coordinated way, bringing a sense of consistency and coherence, together with a distinctive character.
8. In the present case, the existing footways surrounding the appeal site, in Egerton Street and Headford Street, are surfaced in tarmac. The existing surface is worn, patched and scarred. The proposal shown in the submitted plans is to remove an existing redundant vehicular access, make good that section with a new tarmac surface, and to provide two new pedestrian kerb crossing points with dropped kerbs and tactile paving; and elsewhere to retain the existing tarmac. In subsequent submissions, the appellants appear to state their willingness to undertake the re-milling and reinstatement of the whole surface with new tarmac. Whilst this new proposal differs from the original application, the Council has had the opportunity to comment on it, and in the particular circumstances of this application, I have taken all of these submissions into account.
9. I appreciate that the treatment proposed in the application would result in some improvement over the existing situation, not least by improving pedestrian access and safety. However, even with the appellants' revised proposal, that improvement would be relatively minor. In my view, any tarmac surface in this location, either old or new, would not appear as a high quality finish, and would not be of a kind that would complement the standard of the development on the site, in

accordance with Policy CS74. Nor would it contribute to the overall enhancement and transformation of the area, as also sought by that policy. Indeed, to my mind the proposed material would be so markedly inferior to those that I have identified at other nearby developments, that its effect would be to undermine the Council's strategy for the area, rather than to advance it. In all these respects, the proposal would fail to meet the aims and requirements of Policy CS74.

10. I appreciate that neither Policy CS74 nor Condition 19 itself specifically states a requirement for paving materials to follow the recommendations in the UDC. But Condition 19 does explicitly refer to the reconstruction of the footway, not just resurfacing. And in any event, Policy CS74 is clear in seeking good design and high quality materials, to support the CS's regeneration aims. In the light of that policy, it is not unreasonable in my view to apply Condition 19 in a way that ensures that the development contributes to these wider planning objectives.
11. I fully accept that using higher quality materials is likely to increase the costs of the development. However, there is no evidence that this would adversely affect the viability of the scheme, or prevent the delivery of new housing accommodation. Nor does it seem to me that either the need to reconstruct the footway, or to use good quality materials, would represent a waste of resources, especially as the National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear, at paragraph 131, that good design is seen as a key aspect of sustainable development.
12. In the light of the above matters, I conclude that the submitted details of the materials for the reconstruction of the footway at the appeal site are unacceptable, due to their poor quality, contrary to Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy.

Conclusion

13. For these reasons, I conclude that approval of the submitted details should be refused. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

J Felgate

INSPECTOR