



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2025

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3363124, 43 Greystones Drive, Sheffield S11 7JQ

- 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 Ms Viveen Dennis against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03660/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed rear extension extending out 4m'.
-

Preliminary Matters

1. The Council described the proposal as the 'erection of single-storey rear extension, front porch and associated works including provision of 1no car parking space to dwellinghouse'. This wording more comprehensively describes the proposed development than the description set out in the heading above, I have therefore used the Council's description of development in this Decision.
2. The Council raised no objection to the proposed rear extension and porch and indicates that conditional planning permission has subsequently been granted for these elements of the proposal. Accordingly, this Decision focusses only upon the issue in dispute, as does the appellant's case.
3. The appellant submitted a revised drawing with the appeal which omits a previously proposed bin store on the frontage. I am satisfied that there would be no prejudice to any parties if this amendment is considered as part of the appeal.
4. Excavation works have commenced to the front of the appeal property and the appeal has been determined on this basis.

Decision

5. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single-storey rear extension, front porch and associated works including provision of 1no car parking space to dwellinghouse at 43 Greystones Drive, Sheffield S11 7JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03660/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) Details of the facing materials to be used for the external surfaces of the retaining walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the construction of those elements of the development hereby permitted. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 2) The car parking space shall not be brought into use until the area has been surfaced with permeable materials in accordance with details that shall first

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved surface shall be retained thereafter.

- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Block Plan and drawing A.02 Plans and Elevations, as amended by the removal of the bin store on the frontage.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on highway safety.

Reasons

7. Greystones Drive is a long, straight road. The houses on the same side of the road as the appeal property (No 43) are 1930s semi-detached houses. They stand at a significantly higher ground level than the road. As a result, the majority of the front gardens are stepped up to the house frontages. They frequently have low front walls at the edge of the pavement similar to the wall that formerly stood at the front of No 43. In my judgement, the consistency of house types, their significant set back from the pavement, and their height above the street level lend the road a sense of visual uniformity. Contrastingly, the street scene on the opposite side of the road is less regular as the dwellings are at a significantly lower level and have a variety of layouts, designs and frontage treatments.
8. Because of the changes in levels between the houses and the road on the western side of Greystones Drive, the frontages are varied. They include retaining walls with planted gardens, steps, railings, and, in the case of wider plots, sloping driveways. The boundary walls are of varied heights, with punctuations at irregular intervals. Some walls have the addition of hedges or fences. The frontage of No 43 is also seen in the context of the more visually prominent neighbouring corner property, No 45. It has a similar brick wall with a timber fence above it and a wide timber gate to the front of its steep drive. The frontages of the two neighbouring properties therefore appear quite different. There is no notable consistency of front boundary treatment along the road. Therefore, in my judgement the brick walls are not a characteristic feature of the area that is essential to the quality of the street scene.
9. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would not affect any design features which are identified as worthy of protection by the Council's Designing House Extensions SPG (SPG). Furthermore, I have not been informed of any relevant Areas Of Special Character, conservation or other designations which would require retention of the walls or which would require the Council's consent for their removal. For the same reasons, the former planting on the frontage of No 43 could have been replaced with hardstanding or other low maintenance finishes, such as are found on other frontages locally.
10. In the absence of any important frontage design consistency, I conclude that the proposed alterations would appear in keeping with the surrounding area, subject to the facing materials used for the retaining walls being controlled by condition.
11. Turning now to the parking area; it is not disputed that permission has already been granted for the proposed vehicle crossover by the Highway Authority. As indicated

on the initially submitted drawings, the proposed parking space would not meet the minimum dimensions for a standard vehicle of 2.75m wide and 5m long, as set out in the SPG. A frontage of inadequate size would lead to vehicles overhanging the adjacent footpath, causing highway and pedestrian safety concerns. However, the appellant indicates that the bin store shown on the plans is unnecessary and bins could be stored to the rear of the house, as they are at present. With this amendment secured by condition, the size of the parking area would satisfy the requirement of the Council's guidance and would thereby enable a vehicle to park parallel to the road. There is no technical evidence to support the Council's view that this parking arrangement would result in highway and pedestrian safety issues.

12. Overall, I conclude that the frontage alterations would not harm the character and appearance of this part of Greystones Drive or erode its distinctive character. The proposed car parking would not lead to highway or pedestrian conflict. The proposed development is not therefore contrary to UDP Policies BE5 and H14; and Guidelines 1, 2 and 8 of the SPG which in summary require development to be compatible with the character and built form of the surrounding area, including where there would be a loss of front garden space to provide more parking space.

13. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

14. As the works have already commenced, there is no requirement for the standard time-limit condition. As noted above, a condition is imposed to require details of the facing materials of the retaining walls, in order to safeguard the appearance of the area. For the same reason, and in the interest of sustainable development, details of the surface of the parking area are required by condition. I have imposed a condition setting out which are the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR