



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2025

by **A. Graham BA(Hons) MA** **Ued IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3367216**

**7 Rainbow Drive, Sheffield S12 4BA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Terry Dey against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00908/FUL.
  - The application is for outline planning application for erection of first floor side extension to dwellinghouse.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property appears to be a mid-twentieth century semi-detached house within a wider estate of similar, presumably former local authority houses. The estate therefore is exemplified by semi-detached houses, often with hipped roofs and set within their own generous gardens.
4. It appears that the appeal property once also may have had a hipped roof like so many surrounding houses but has since been modified to create a gable roof form with rear dormer loft conversion and front and side porch extensions. As such the appeal property has seen relatively significant alterations in the past.
5. The proposal before me would seek to create a first floor upwards extension above the existing single storey side porch. This would create a smaller gable roof extension to the first floor which would accommodate a new bedroom. Two windows would be created to the ground floor level to serve a hall and utility room, and an existing air conditioning unit would be reinstalled high up on the extended gable end.
6. The main point of contention between the parties is with regards the effect that this proposal would have upon an adjacent property, number 34 Rainbow Way. This house is a two storey dwelling that was relatively recently constructed upon what was previously the side garden of the appeal house. It therefore represents something of a departure from the large distances between houses that are common in this area.

7. As such, the distance from the rear of number 34 Rainbow Way to the side elevation of number 7 is only around seven metres. Moreover, the appeal site sits upon a noticeably higher level than this neighbour and is orientated directly to the south of number 34.
8. In assessing this appeal, I am aware of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (SPG). Guideline 5 within this guidance recommends against proposals that may have an unreasonable overshadowing or over dominant effect upon neighbours. It uses, as a guide, a distance of 12m between main ground floor windows and two storey extensions to neighbouring houses. Whilst recognising that this is a guide, the general approach appears fundamental to the protection of neighbouring amenity through such proposals within existing residential areas.
9. Whilst the rear windows to number 34 Rainbow Way may not serve wholly habitable areas or may not be the only window to internal rooms, the proximity of this proposed extension, the change in land level and the orientation immediately to the south of this neighbouring property would lead to a very harmful effect of overdominance and a significant likely overshadowing upon this neighbour and upon its rear garden area. The gable extension would therefore dominate this rear aspect and would likely cause overshadowing especially in the winter months.
10. It is clear to me therefore that the proposal before me would have a seriously detrimental effect upon the living conditions of those living at number 34 Rainbow Way both now and in the future. As such the proposal before me represents a poor design response that fails to take into account the policy requirements of Saved Policy H14 of the Sheffield City Council Unitary Development Plan and the guidance within the Council's SPG on Designing House Extensions. It is also in conflict with the requirements within the National Planning Policy Framework and its emphasis upon good design that responds well to context.

## **Conclusion**

11. The proposal would cause significant harm to the living conditions of those at number 34 Rainbow Way and for the reasons given above, whilst taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

*A Graham*

INSPECTOR