



Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 11 November 2025

by Jennifer Vyse DipTP DipPBM MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3374661

66 Portsea Road, Sheffield S6 4QB

- 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 Daniel Taylor against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application No is 25/02272/FUL.
 - The development proposed comprises a single-storey side-return extension with pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted plans show the boundary between Nos 64 and 66 aligned with the centreline of the shared passageway between the dwellings. However, I saw at my site visit that the rear boundary fence between the two properties appeared to align with the side wall of No 66 at ground floor level. For the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with the boundary between the properties as shown on the submitted plans.
3. The grounds of appeal refer to difficulties in engaging with the Planning Authority prior to its determination of the application. However frustrating that might be, that is not a matter for me as part of my remit in determining this appeal, which is confined to the planning merits of the respective cases.
4. In support of the appeal, it is also suggested that the development proposed is of a comparable scale to that which could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, it is not apparent that any such scheme would necessarily be pursued were this appeal to fail, but more to the point, even were that to be the case, no details are before me of any such scheme to allow for a meaningful comparison against the current proposal in terms of likely impacts. Moreover, given the nature of the appeal, I do not have the comments of the planning authority on this matter. I confirm therefore, that I have considered the appeal scheme on its own particular merits.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case relates to the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 64 Portsea Road having particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Decision

6. The appeal property comprises a mid-terrace, two-storey dwelling with a two-storey outrigger to the rear that is set off the shared boundary with No 64. No 64 has a similar arrangement. Whilst Nos 66 and 64 share a party wall at first floor level,

they are separated by a narrow passageway between the two properties at ground floor level. The passage affords access to the rear gardens to both properties, which were separated by low close boarded fencing at the time of my visit.

7. It is proposed to erect a single storey extension within the side return to the outrigger at No 66, with a lean-to roof over. It would align with the rear wall of the outrigger, with a stepped footprint to the side elevation - the rearmost part of the extension would align with the side of the existing ground floor (which wall currently defines one side of the shared alleyway), with a slight recess where the extension joins the rear of the house.
8. Guideline 5 of the Council's SPG on Designing House Extensions generally restricts single storey extensions adjacent to another dwelling to a maximum depth of 3m. The proposed extension would project some 3.76m beyond the rear elevation of No 64, which contains a window at ground floor level. It would also be significantly higher than the existing fence between the two properties. In such close proximity, even allowing for the alley separation as shown on the plans, I consider that the extension proposed would appear unduly dominant and overbearing, with an adverse impact on the outlook of adjoining occupiers. There would also be an adverse effect on levels of daylight available to the neighbouring window, particularly in the afternoon. As a consequence, the development would fail to safeguard the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, contrary to the provisions of policy H14 of the Unitary Development Plan, Guideline 5 of the Council's SPG and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which together and among other things seek to protect such interests.
9. I recognise that no objections from the occupiers of No 64 were submitted in relation to the planning application. However, that could be for any number of reasons and does not equate, necessarily, to support for the proposal. The absence of objections is therefore a neutral factor in the determination of the appeal.
10. In support of the proposal, my attention is also drawn to a number of other properties in the area where apparently larger extensions than that proposed have been approved.¹ However, only limited details are before me of those extensions. In particular, I have no way of knowing what the boundary treatments were between the properties prior to the extensions, or whether the arrangement of windows at the adjoining properties, and the impact of the developments proposed on any such windows in terms of loss of light and outlook, are directly comparable with the relationship of the current appeal property and its neighbour. I confirm, in this regard, that I have considered the proposal on its own particular merits, in the light of the prevailing site-specific circumstances.
11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude on balance that the appeal should not succeed.

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR

¹ 16 Eastgrove Road (Ref: 24/02583/FUL); 45 Onslow Road (Ref: 22/01888/FUL); 4 Woodseats House Road (Ref: 23/03567/FUL); 63 Kendal Road (Ref: 25/02014/FUL); and 45 Overton Road (24/01634/FUL).