



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3366248

Sunnyside, 1 Wooldale Close, Sheffield S20 6SA

- 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 Simon Goodison-Maw and Mark Smith against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00523/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey flat roof rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Wooldale Drive, with particular reference to outlook and light; and
 - Whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of 1 Wooldale Close, with particular reference to the provision of private amenity space.

Reasons

Living conditions – neighbour

3. No 1 is a semi-detached bungalow located within a residential area. The proposed extension would be adjacent to the common boundary shared with the adjoining dwelling, No 8. No 8 is a two-storey dwelling. It has a small window and door close to the boundary. The rear elevation of No 1 is stepped back from No 8, and No 8 also has a two-storey projection to the rear which contains patio doors. The drawings show a new 1.8m boundary fence.
4. The Council's Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) does not form part of the development plan. However, it adds further detail to development plan policies and provides useful guidance. The SPG states that a single storey extension built adjacent to another dwelling may not extend more than 3 metres beyond that other dwelling. The proposed extension would conflict with this guidance as it would project significantly greater than 3m beyond No 8.
5. The extension would be a dominant addition when viewed from particularly No 8's ground floor window and occupiers would feel unduly hemmed in from this window

given the depth and height of the proposed extension, as well as No 8's rear projection. Thus, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the outlook of No 8's rear facing, ground-floor window due to the siting of the proposed extension (adjacent to the common boundary), as well as its depth and height.

6. Furthermore, the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and overshadowing to No 8's rear facing ground-floor window. This is because of the extension's depth, siting and height as well as the orientation of the sun.
7. For these reasons and based on the evidence presented, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Wooldale Drive, with particular reference to outlook and light. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) (UDP) which states, amongst other things, that new development will be permitted provided that it would not deprive residents of light.
8. It would also conflict with Guideline 5 of the SPG. This states that unreasonable overshadowing and over dominance of neighbouring dwellings should be avoided. In addition, it would conflict with paragraph 135 f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that developments should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Living conditions – occupiers of the development

9. No 1 is set within a triangular shaped plot. The outdoor space is modest and includes a garage, driveway and shed which restricts the area of space that can be used as private amenity space. Given the depth and width of the extension, the proposed development would result in the garden space being significantly smaller and there would be little meaningful useable space.
10. Guideline 4 of the SPG states that over development of a house plot with extensions that leave little garden space will not be permitted. The main parties disagree on the resultant size of the garden. Regardless of the exact figure, the development would result in a sizeable extension relative to the size of the plot. Taking into account the depth and width of the extension as well as the triangular shaped plot, the garden would not be of a size and configuration which would provide a flexible outdoor area, including sufficient space for recreation and hanging washing.
11. Whilst the appellants highlight that they do not want a large garden, the role of the planning system is to consider the effects of development on both the current and any prospective future occupiers.
12. For these reasons, the proposed development would result in a poor standard of living accommodation for the occupiers of 1 Wooldale Close, with particular reference to the provision of private amenity space. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy H14 of the UDP which states, amongst other things, that new development will be permitted provided that it would not cause serious loss of existing garden space. It would also conflict with Guideline 4 of the SPG and paragraph 135 f) of the Framework.

Other Matters

13. The appellants set out the purpose and benefits of the extension, their personal circumstances and the implications of an alternative scheme. In addition, they

have expressed dissatisfaction with the way the Council has dealt with the planning applications and the officer who determined the application as well as the financial implications of the planning applications being refused. Furthermore, the appellants assert that the proposal would not impact selling the property in the future and would not reduce the dwellings value.

14. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under the Equality Act 2010. A grant of permission for the development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Wooldale Drive and would result in a poor standard of living accommodation for the occupiers of 1 Wooldale Close. I attach substantial weight to these findings against the appeal. The harm caused by the appeal development outweighs its benefits. Based on the evidence presented, I conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal. The other matters raised do not outweigh the harm set out above, and any issues with the Council are a matter between the main parties rather than the appeal process.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR