



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09/02/2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3280461

343 Deerlands Avenue, Sheffield S5 8AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Ms Joanne Congreve against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02923/HPN, dated 23 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension with a flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would comply with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a single storey offshoot located to the rear. The Council's reason for refusal sets out that the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and which would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. This would be contrary to the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.1 (j) (iii) of the GPDO.
5. The proposal would be built around an existing ground floor offshoot which is located to the rear of the property, and the appellant submits that the proposal is for a rear extension and not a side extension.

6. However, despite the location of the offshoot to the rear, it includes side walls due to its projection beyond the rear elevation. There are offshoots of a similar design and layout on nearby dwellings, and the offshoot therefore appears to be part of the original dwellinghouse.
7. The appeal proposal would extend beyond the existing side wall of the offshoot which faces onto the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, albeit that it is some distance from the boundary. Nevertheless, the proposal would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The proposal would also have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. Consequently, the proposal would fail to comply with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.1 (j) (iii) of the GPDO.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not comply with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR