

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2024

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2024.

Appeal ref: APP/J4423/D/23/3334345

4 Oldfield Close, Stannington, Sheffield S6 6EN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Butler against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application, ref. 23/02510/FUL, dated 02 August 2023, was refused by a notice dated 25 October 2023.
 - The development is: Alterations to roof to form additional habitable space including raising of ridge height and addition of 4no. roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for: Alterations to roof to form additional habitable space including raising of ridge height and addition of 4no. roof lights at No. 4 Oldfield Close, Stannington, Sheffield S6 6EN in accordance with application ref. 23/02510, dated 14 April 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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:

Existing Plans and Elevations Drg. No. A100-01 Rev A 03 October 2023
Proposed Site Plan Drg. No. A100-02 12 October 2023
Proposed Plans and Elevations Drg. No. A100-03 Rev A 03 August 2023
Indicative Street Scenes Drg. No. A100-04 23 August 2023

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the likely effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Appeal dwelling and proposed works

3. The appeal concerns No. 4 Oldfield Close, a low detached 3 bedroomed part single part 2 storey 3 bedroom dwelling near the end of a short cul-de-sac road in the settlement of Stannington, west of Sheffield. It is in a small tight group of similar low single storey dwellings with shallow pitched roofs. Vehicular access to No. 4 from the end of Oldfield Close is shared with 2 other dwellings.
4. The ridge height of existing dwelling at No. 4 is 3.85m. It is proposed to enlarge the dwelling by raising part of the roof by 2.15m, to a total height of 5m. The scheme would add a 4th bedroom. The Appellant, Mr Butler, said 3

parking spaces would remain within the curtilage. There would be an extra window at the front, one at the rear. Four roof lights would be fitted in the eastern elevation roof slope.

Considerations

5. The Local Planning Authority said the proposed works would result in a development harmful to the character and appearance of the property itself and to the surrounding locality. It would also create highway safety concerns due to the loss of an off-street car parking space and changes to existing driveway arrangements. The proposed development would be contrary to Paragraph 130 of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy CS74, UDP Policies H14 and BE5, and Guidelines 1, 2, and 8 of the SPG on Designing House Extensions.
6. Seen from public vantage points at the end of the Oldfield Close cul-de-sac, the appeal dwelling No. 4 appears to have only a single storey, the small room beneath the conservatory at the back being at a lower level than the rest of the house. The view of No. 4 from the road shows a gable with 2 windows facing the road. The house then extends to the east at 90° with a front door and the door to what had been an incorporated single garage. The extension project would see the pitched roof of the longer gable ended section of the house raised by 2.15m to a total ridge height of 5m. Two new bedrooms would be installed in the roof of the resulting second floor. Four roof lights would be fitted in the increased height east facing roof slope. An additional window would be built into the enlarged gable wall.
7. In my view, the proposed extension works at No. 4 Oldfield Close are acceptable. As the land falls to the east, the existing main roof ridge of No. 4 is lower than that of the adjoining house to the west at No. 2 Oldfield Close. The raised ridge at No. 4 would become higher than that of No. 2, but by less than its 2.15m extra height. Although Nos. 4 and 2 are built close to each other, I consider that there would not be any undue resulting dominance, loss of sunlight or overlooking caused by the appeal project. The heightened section of No. 4 would be furthest from the neighbouring house to the east, No. 6, again not causing its occupiers any loss or reduction of amenity.
8. The other matter of particular concern to the Council was that there would be a loss of off-street parking space due to the conversion of the incorporated single garage into the extended residential accommodation at No. 4. I understand that the single integral garage parking space was lost to an internal dividing wall alteration some time ago. The appeal extension would add another bedroom to the domestic accommodation within the house. But the existing parking and accessway arrangements within the curtilage would not be adversely affected by this modest increase in the size of the house at No. 4.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the appeal should succeed. Planning permission is granted subject to the general condition limiting the duration of the permission being applied, (s.91 of the Act), as is a condition relating to the submitted plans defining the project.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR