



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3366173

Totley Grove Cottage, Hillfoot Road, Sheffield S17 3AX

- 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 Mr Christopher Staniland against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00494/FUL.
 - The development proposed is to replace two rear facing Velux windows with two dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and retrospective planning permission is granted for two dormer windows at Totley Grove Cottage, Hillfoot Road, Sheffield in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/00494/FUL, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted relates to the following approved plans only: Site Plan DRG1 in so far as it relates to the red line of the site; First Floor plan in so far as it relates to the position and width of the two dormers; and Phase 1 Proposed Section 12 Rev C in so far as it relates to the form, height and depth of the two dormers.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt; whether there would be any other harm to the Green Belt; and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for two small dormer windows to the rear roof slope of the property. Two small dormers have already been installed. The various submitted plans differ and appear to show dormers of two different sizes. Some of the plans show structures smaller than those built with different window detailing. This decision can only relate to the details of submitted plans but as some of the plans do appear to relate to the development as built, I have considered the proposal on the basis of those plans only, which are listed above in condition 1.
4. The council has not raised concerns with regard to the design of the dormer windows only that they, in combination with a previous extension, constitute inappropriate development and result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

Whether inappropriate development and any other Green Belt harm

5. The council advises that the building was originally a garage with a flat roof. The pitched roof was then added, following permission in 2016, when the building was to be used as an acupuncture studio. At that time, the council took the view that the addition of a pitched roof would not represent a disproportionate addition to the garage. A change of use to a dwelling was accepted in 2021.
6. Policy GE6(a) of the Unitary Development Plan 1998 (UDP) advises that extensions in the Green Belt will be permitted where they form a minor addition to the original house. These two dormers clearly result in only a very minor addition to the original house. The original house in this regard, must relate to the size of the building when it became a dwelling. I therefore find no conflict with this policy.
7. The council makes reference to Designing House Extensions: Supplementary Planning Guidance which reflects the UDP requirements. I am not clear as to the status of this document.
8. These Green Belt policy differs from the updated National Planning Policy Framework in relation to referring to the original house rather than the original building. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Given the significant differences between the development plan and the Framework, in this instance, greater weight should be afforded to the policies of the Framework. Conflict with the Framework, could represent a material consideration that indicates that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached.
9. The Framework advises that new development in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate unless it falls within a specified exception. The exceptions include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. For the purposes of the Framework, the original building would be the former garage before it was extended.
10. According to the council, the addition of the pitched roof resulted in the building having an increase in volume of 56%. The council's figures are that the original volume of the building was 228m³ and the roof added 136m³. Based on the plans that most closely resemble the finished works, the council calculates that each dormer has a volume of 1.5m³. The 3m³ figure, for two dormers, would represent an increase of 139m³ or 61%.
11. The Framework does not specify a figure as to what represents a disproportionate addition. Whilst volume calculations and percentage increases can be helpful, the two dormers, as built, represent a very minimal change overall, when considered in combination with the original roof extension. Whilst an increase from 56% to 61% may be material in some cases, in this particular case, the difference between extending the property by 136m³ compared to 139m³ (an increase of 2.2%) is, in these circumstances, not significant and represents a de minimis change. As the council accepted that the previous roof extension was not inappropriate, I am not satisfied that this very small further addition, which does not increase the footprint or floor area of the building, results in a change in scale of development overall, that would take the extension from not being a disproportionate addition to being disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

12. With regard to the Framework, on the basis that the scale of the building has barely changed, the small dormer windows, together with the previous alterations, do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. They do not therefore represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
13. As the works do not represent inappropriate development, there is no need to consider openness further, although in any event, there has similarly not been a significant or material change in this regard. The council has raised no other concerns.

Conclusions

14. The additions satisfy the UDP policy. As there is no conflict with the specific policies of the Framework, relating to the Green Belt, there would be no justification for taking a decision contrary to the policies of the development plan. As there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
15. As the dormer windows are complete, there is no need for a commencement condition. I have made reference only to the plans that appear to represent the development as built. As the dormers appear satisfactory as built, no further conditions are necessary.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR