



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3367898

18 Poole Place, Sheffield S9 4JR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Mariam Imran against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00968/HPN.
 - The development proposed is single storey disabled bedroom and shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
3. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply, or that the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.
4. It is not in dispute that the proposal falls within the other limitations set out in paragraph A.1 of Class A. However, paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises with regards to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, 18 Poole Place (No 18), forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. It has an existing single storey pitched roof extension which projects part way across the rear elevation, offset from the boundary with both neighbours.

7. It is proposed to replace this with a full width extension which would project along the common boundary with its semi-detached pair at 16 Poole Place (No 16) to a depth of 5.4m, with a maximum height of 2.8m.
8. No 16 has one large ground floor window on its rear elevation which is set close to the party wall and serves a kitchen. There is an open outlook from this window toward the end of the garden and obliquely over the low fence on the boundary with the appeal property. The proposed extension would have a greater depth than the one it would replace, and an expansive mass of blank masonry would be visible from No 16's window right on the boundary and above the fence. Despite its flat roof and modest eaves height, the proposed extension would create a harmful sense of enclosure along the boundary and would lead to a significant reduction in outlook for the occupiers of No 16.
9. Further, due to its siting on the common boundary, as well as its height, the proposed extension would result in overshadowing and the loss of daylight to No 16's kitchen window and part of the garden closest to the house.
10. Consequently, whilst not determinative to my assessment, there would be conflict with Guideline 5 of the Council's 'Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance.' This explains that an extension built up to or near a boundary with another property is in danger of being overbearing and creating unacceptable overshadowing if that neighbouring dwelling is in close proximity to the extension. In such cases, a single storey extension may not extend more than 3m beyond the other dwelling.
11. No 18 and 20 Poole Place (No 20) are offset from their shared boundary by the side access to their respective gardens. The closest ground floor window on the rear elevation of No 20 is also set well off the boundary. The proposed extension would have a greater depth than the existing, but it would be the same distance from the boundary with No 20 and would have a flat, rather than pitched roof. Consequently, it would not markedly increase the sense of enclosure or result in visual intrusion, thereby causing harm to outlook from No 20's closest window, or its garden.
12. There is no evidence before me that the proposal has been assessed against guidelines such as those produced by the BRE but considering the modest additional depth of the proposed extension over the existing, the degree of additional overshadowing of No 20's garden would likely be minimal.
13. Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Saved Policy H14(c) of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) is broadly consistent with this objective. In causing harm to the amenity of neighbouring premises, the appeal proposal would conflict with these policies.
14. For the reasons given above, whilst the proposed extension would not cause unacceptable harm to No 20, it would cause significant harm to the amenity of the adjoining premises at No 16, with regards to outlook and daylight.

Other Matters

15. Matters for consideration in an application for prior approval are restricted to those set out in paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 of the GPDO. Nevertheless, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This requires me to consider the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Protected characteristics include a person's disability.
16. I understand that the plan for the proposed extension was agreed with the Council's Disabled Facilities Grant Team and that a previously approved extension¹ is not suitable for the appellant's needs. I have given these personal circumstances very careful consideration. However, there is no evidence that the appeal development is the only means by which the appellant's needs may be met. I do not therefore find that these personal circumstances outweigh the permanent harm I have found would occur to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 16. Therefore, it is necessary and proportionate to dismiss the appeal in the public interest.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA ref. 24/03664/FUL