



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3362450

2 Storth Avenue, Sheffield S10 3HL

- 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 Julian MacDonald against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application reference is 24/03517/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a side and rear two storey extension and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side and rear two storey extension and associated works at 2 Storth Avenue, Sheffield in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 24/03517/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 24/11/02/001, 002, 013A, 014A, 015A, 016A, 017, 018A, 019A, 020A, 021 and 022.
 - 3) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the three east facing first floor windows in the master bedroom (facing 17 Stumperlowe Crescent Road) have been fitted with obscured glazing up to a minimum height of 1.7 metres above the floor level of the room and this shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the setting of the conservation area; and the effect on the living conditions of the residents of 17 Stumperlowe Crescent Road.

Reasons

3. Concerns have been raised by the residents of 17 Stumperlowe Crescent Road with regard to living conditions. I have included this concern as a main issue.
4. The proposal would result in a two-storey addition to the rear corner of the house, overlapping the side and rear elevations. As it would be set well back from the frontage, it would not detract from the matching detailing of the frontages of this and the attached dwelling. It would be relatively prominent in views from the south,

due to the changes in levels and proximity to Storth Lane, but it would be in matching materials that would complement the main dwelling. The roof form, although reflecting the hipped roof of the dwelling, would result in an unusual juxtaposition but this would ensure that the original proportions of the house would be retained. Given that views of the property from the south are generally from a lower level, the unusual form of the roof would not be particularly noticeable but in any event, in this particular context, it would not detract from the appearance of the property.

5. In views from the north, the new element would be more prominent but would be viewed in the context of the backs of this dwelling and its neighbour. The single storey element would correspond with the neighbouring extension. Care has been taken to ensure that the side facing elevation would be detailed to present a suitable frontage to the road. Although the combination of roof forms would be a little contrived and would not represent a common approach to extending a property of this period, given the topography and the position of the proposed addition, it would not be out of keeping with the appearance of the property and it would assimilate successfully with the appearance of the street.
6. Overall, the proposal would maintain the original character of the property and would represent a subservient addition to it. Although relatively prominent, given its position and level changes, it would be of a design and appearance that would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the property or the wider area.
7. The council has raised a concern with regard to the impact of the proposal on the setting of Ranmoor Conservation Area, particularly with regard to the openness of the character of Storth Lane. It is evident that the Storth Avenue properties and those in the neighbouring Stumperlowe Close, to the northwest, are excluded from the conservation area. The properties on the opposite side of Storth Lane that lie within the conservation area, are more modern additions. The properties on the western side of Storth Lane, including the appeal property, do not provide an open character to the edge of the conservation area and the works proposed would not materially alter this. No harm would result to the setting of the conservation area as a result of the proposed works.
8. Given my findings, the proposal would not conflict with the design or heritage objectives of policy CS 74 of the Core Strategy 2009 or policies BE5, BE16 or H14 of the Unitary Development Plan 1998 (UDP). As these policies generally accord with the design and heritage requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, I afford them full weight. The council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Designing House Extensions 1996 (SPG) does not anticipate an extension of this particular design but it would not conflict with its objectives as it would not be incompatible with the character and built form of the area and would not detract from the appearance of the dwelling, the street or the locality.
9. I have had regard to the living conditions of the residents of the properties opposite that would face the side elevation of the proposed extension. The appeal property has side facing windows at ground floor level that provide direct views towards the first floor windows opposite from a lower level. It has only a stairwell window at first floor level. The proposal would introduce three new first floor windows which would serve a bedroom. The extension would not be overbearing or result in a material increase in shading but it would allow for views down towards the neighbouring garden and ground floor rooms of 17 Stumperlowe Crescent Road in particular. It

would also offer more direct views towards the first-floor windows from a similar height.

10. Although the properties are separated by Storth Lane, the distance between them is relatively limited and appears to be below that sought by the SPG which specifies that new extensions to two storey dwellings should keep a minimum distance of 21 metres between facing main windows. I agree with the neighbouring resident that the proposal would unacceptably reduce privacy within 17 Stumperlowe Crescent Road. This is a matter that would be resolved by obscure glazing the side facing windows. It would only be necessary for this glazing to extend up to a height of 170cm above internal floor levels so that it would prevent downward views and most views towards the first-floor windows. Whilst this would reduce outlook within the room, it would allow for some views above the obscured glazing, if not fully glazed, but in any event, the proposed bedroom would also have a south facing window.
11. In conclusion, the proposal would not result in harm with regard to the character or appearance of the area or the setting of the conservation area. Subject to the obscure glazing condition described above, it would not result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. As there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
12. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The approved plans indicate that the materials would match so a separate condition is not required. The obscure glazing of the side facing first floor windows would be necessary to ensure that privacy for the residents of 17 Stumperlowe Crescent Road would not be unacceptably reduced. It is reasonable to impose such a condition as without it, the extension could not be accepted as it would conflict with the privacy requirements of UDP policy H14c and the SPG.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR