



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/23/3330842

6 Hadfield Close, Sheffield S9 3GD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ali Asghar against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application reference is 23/01908/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey rear and double storey side and rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Council's decision notice refers to Policy BE4 of the 1998 adopted Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The Council stated that the relevant policy is not Policy BE4, but Policy BE5 (Building Design and Siting) of the UDP, as outlined within the Planning Officer's report. Given that the assessment of the proposal carried out by the Council was against Policy BE5 of the UDP, amongst other policies and guidelines, I have followed the same approach in my consideration of the appeal development.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal dwelling, and on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living conditions

5. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling located within a residential cul-de-sac. The appeal dwelling has a modest size garden to the rear, a drive to the side, and a small lawn to the front. The proposal would introduce a single storey extension to the rear and a two-storey extension to the side and rear, which would occupy most of the space to the side of the dwelling and part of the rear garden.
-

6. Policy H14 (c) of the UDP states that the site should not be over-developed or cause serious loss of existing garden space which would harm the character of the neighbourhood. Guideline 4 of the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan (SPG) reinforces this requirement and outlines that in most circumstances a garden size of 50 square metres is the minimum for a two or more bedroomed house.
7. The submitted floor plans indicate that the proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four, whilst reducing the private outdoor amenity space located to the rear. The Council indicates that the remaining garden space would fall below the 50 square metres threshold, and I note that this has not been contested by the appellant. Given the use of the private amenity space, the introduction of garden furniture, washing lines or play equipment, and other domestic paraphernalia is common. As I observed during my site visit, part of the garden was occupied by play equipment and storage.
8. Taking account of the typical garden furniture and use that is expected for a four bedroomed house that could reasonably accommodate a large family, I find that the development would over-develop the site, and the remaining garden space would be inadequate. Consequently, this would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal dwelling.
9. Therefore, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal dwelling, and contrary to the aims of Policies BE5 and H14 (c) of the UDP, and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy, which collectively require high-quality developments.

Highway safety

10. Guideline 8 of the SPG states that highway safety is threatened by excessive on-street parking, and that 2 off-street car parking spaces are required for dwellings with 2 or 3 bedrooms. For dwellings with 4 bedrooms, an extra space may be required.
11. The Planning Officer's report indicates that the existing drive to the side/front provides one off-street parking space. The ground-floor of the two-storey side/rear extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling to accommodate a car port to the front/side.
12. I note the Council's concern regarding the standard of the proposed off-street parking space. The appellant has not provided further details regarding parking spaces. Nevertheless, even if the off-street parking space would be considered adequate, the proposal would still fail to provide the necessary number of off-street parking spaces for a four bedroomed dwelling.
13. I noticed during my site visit that on-street parking is common within the area. The proposal, due to the increase in the number of bedrooms, has the potential to increase the need for additional vehicles, which would exacerbate the on-street parking and increase the risk to highway safety.
14. Accordingly, the development would be detrimental to highway safety, which is contrary to the aims of Policy H14 (d) of the UDP, which requires developments to provide appropriate off-street parking.

Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR