



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: 13 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/25/3363635

312 Ringinglow Road, Sheffield S11 7PY

- 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 S Crank against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00305/HPN.
 - The development proposed is described as “demolition of existing half-width extension and creation of new full-width constructed along the party wall line of the connected dwellinghouses.”
-

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. 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 Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposed development would be granted planning permission by Article 3(1), Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, and the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises.

Reasons

6. Permitted development rights granted through the GPDO are subject to limitations. These are not discretionary. Where the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, a

proposal must meet all of the limitations in paragraph A.1(j)(i) to (iii) to Part 1 of the GPDO in order to constitute permitted development. One of these limitations (iii) states that an extension would not be permitted development where it would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.

7. The 'Permitted development rights for householders: Technical Guidance (2019)' indicates that a wall forming a side elevation will be any wall that cannot be identified as being a front wall or a rear wall. The diagram at page 22 of this Technical Guidance further indicates that this limitation is applicable even where a rear elevation is 'stepped,' with each wall itself forming a side elevation.
8. The appeal property has a two-storey rear gable projection constructed in brickwork and part finished in render. The gable is shallow, but it is more than minimal or nominal in depth and clearly forms a side wall of the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would extend beyond this side wall (on both sides) and would project across the full width of the dwellinghouse (so greater than half the width of the original). It does not therefore constitute permitted development by reason of the limitation in Article 3(1), Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1(j)(iii) of the GPDO.
9. Consequently, I have no need to go on to consider whether the proposed extension meets the conditions which apply to development permitted by Class A which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g), namely the amenity of adjoining premises.

Conclusion

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

R Gravett

INSPECTOR