



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/23/3316953

20 Underwood Road, Woodseats, Sheffield S8 8TH

- 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 Mr Muhammed Gulfaras against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04083/FUL, dated 9 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear kitchen extension, new garden retaining walls and steps.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension on the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

3. No.20 Underwood Road (No.20) is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse situated on the east side of Underwood Road. To the rear, No.20 benefits from an existing flat roof two-storey extension, with a raised patio area accessed from existing steps to the garden.
4. A single storey extension is proposed that would project around 3.9m from the existing two-storey extension, replacing the raised patio. The levels of the garden of No.20 rise toward the east and 2m retaining walls are therefore proposed along the common boundary with the attached neighbour at No.22 Underwood Road (No.22). This allows level access from the proposed extension to a patio, with new steps to the raised garden.
5. Guideline 5 of the Council's *Supplementary Planning Guidance: Designing House Extensions* is that unreasonable over dominance of neighbouring dwellings should be avoided. It further recognises that an extension built up to or near a boundary with another property is in danger of being overbearing. I observed on my site visit that the attached neighbour at No.22 has a two-storey rear extension set below that of the existing extension to No.20. In combination, the extension and retaining walls would project around 5.8m from this extension, and in comparison to the existing timber fence, would present a solid, stark structure built up to the common boundary. I acknowledge that the

ground level of the proposed extension would be lowered (below the existing raised patio) and its eaves (of the flat roof) would be only around 2.7m, but it would nonetheless appear unduly dominant from the rear of No.22 and notably the ground floor window.

6. No.18 Underwood Road (No.18) has not been extended to the rear and consequently its rear building line is already offset from that of No.20. No.18's garden (which also rises to the east) is overgrown and because of this and No.20's existing extension, the outlook from its ground floor rear window appears already compromised. The proposed extension would be offset a reasonable distance from the boundary with No.18, but its significant depth (around 3.9m from the existing offset extension of No.20) means that outlook would be further compromised, the extension appearing overbearing from the rear of No.22. I find the loss of outlook for both No.18 and No.22 would be such that it would cause harm to the living conditions of these neighbours.
7. Whilst I acknowledge that no objections to the planning application were received from the neighbours, this in itself does not suggest an absence of harm. I am also mindful of the guidance at paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that developments should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing *and* future users. I further acknowledge that the proposed extension would significantly improve the internal arrangement and size of the family kitchen, but, whilst a benefit, this does not outweigh the harm I have found.
8. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed extension would be overbearing and cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbours at No.18 and No.22 Underwood Road. Consequently, it would conflict with the guidance at paragraph 130 of the Framework and SPG Guideline 5, and with Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) which requires extensions to be well designed in relation to neighbouring buildings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR