



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3286843

60 Woodstock Road, Loxley, Sheffield S6 6TG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ryan Poulton against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01644/FUL, dated 8 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension to an existing semi-detached dwelling. Expanded full width front drive.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension to an existing semi-detached dwelling and expanded full width front drive at 60 Woodstock Road, Loxley, Sheffield S6 6TG in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 21/01644/FUL, dated 8 April 2021 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plans drawing no. JCA-1293-001 Revision P01; Proposed Floor Plans drawing no. JCA-1293-012 Revision P01; and Proposed Elevations drawing no. JCA-1293-013 Revision P01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of the 2 Austin Court, with particular regard to light and visual impact.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two-storey dwelling in Woodstock Road. The proposed side extension would project to the side boundary of the property, which is also the rear boundary of 2 Austin Court. Due to the angle of the plots, the distance between the extension and the rear elevation of No 2 would vary and part of the extension would fall below the recommended minimum 12m for the separation between a two-storey extension and the ground floor main windows of a neighbour as set out by guideline 5 of the Sheffield City Council Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan (SPG). No 2 also has a conservatory to the rear which would further reduce the separation distance.
5. However, it would appear that the original kitchen window at No 2 has been filled in during the construction of the extension the property. Moreover, the conservatory has a tiled roof which would reduce the outlook from the room that is served by the conservatory and the light received by this room. The south-facing windows of the conservatory, which would receive the most sunlight, would be unaffected by the proposal. The proposed extension would project along part of the rear boundary of No 2 and would not be directly in line with the rear windows of the extended part of No 2. The outlook from and light received by those windows would remain within acceptable standards.
6. For these reasons, the proposed extension would not cause a significant overbearing impact or reduce light levels within No 2 to an unacceptable degree. As such the proposal would not detract unduly from the living conditions of the occupiers of No 2. The proposal would therefore accord with policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) which seeks, amongst other things, for proposals to not deprive residents of light. The proposal would also comply with paragraph 130(f) of the Framework, which requires development to have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and the overarching aims of the SPG which seeks the avoidance of unreasonable overshadowing and over-dominance of neighbouring dwellings.

Other matters

7. The Council has raised no objections to the single-storey rear extension or alterations to the driveway and rear garden. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree.

Conditions

8. In order to provide certainty and in the interests of proper planning it is necessary to impose the standard time limit and specify the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition specifying that exterior materials used match the existing dwelling is also necessary.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to the conditions listed above.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out above.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR