



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2026

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/C/25/3375415

11 Woodhouse Crescent, Sheffield, S20 1AT

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Ms Emma Aldred against an enforcement notice issued by Sheffield City Council.
 - The notice was issued on 2 October 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the enlargement of the dwellinghouse consisting of an additional storey with Juliet balcony and alteration of the roof (as shown on the attached photo).
 - The requirements of the notice are to: (i) demolish and remove from the land the structural work creating an additional storey and alteration to the roof to 11 Woodhouse Crescent; (ii) Make good any damage to 11 Woodhouse Crescent resulting from compliance with paragraph 5(i) and restore its structural state and condition to what subsisted before the unauthorised development was carried out as shown on Picture A; (iii) remove from the land any waste materials resulting from compliance with (i) and (ii).
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: 8 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(c) and (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by:
 - the deletion of the words “with Juliet balcony” in the allegation (section 3 of the Notice).
2. Subject to the correction the appeal is allowed and the enforcement notice is quashed.

The Appeal on ground (c)

3. An appeal on ground (c) is that the matters alleged in the enforcement notice do not constitute a breach of planning control. It is the Appellant's case that the extension constitutes permitted development under Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO).
4. It is the Council's case that the addition to the roof exceeds 40 cubic metres which would mean that it is not permitted development¹ and that no eaves have been left.

¹ Development not permitted B.1 (d) (i)

5. The appellant provided drawings and calculations as part of her Appeal by email to PINs on 23 June 2026 to show that the additional volume created is 39.95 cubic metres. The Council says that the plans are not accurate.
6. These plans show that the extension is set in some 12 cm from the common boundary. It is the Council's case that the extension is actually closer to the boundary, and therefore wider than shown on the plans. I could see the inset at my visit. From the ground, it looked to roughly correlate with what is shown on the plans. On the balance of probability, I consider that the appellant's plans are correct and the extension does not exceed 40 cubic metres.
7. In respect of the eaves; in the case of a hip-to-gable enlargement, there is no requirement to reinstate or maintain the eaves of the original roof or to maintain 0.2m between the enlargement and the outside edge of the eaves.² The development is a hip-to-gable enlargement.
8. In its evidence, the Council referred to the requirement for materials to be of a similar appearance to the original³, noting a "Juliet balcony". However, there is no such balcony on the enforcement notice photographs and the Council has latterly clarified that there was no Juliet balcony when the notice was issued. There is no claim from the Council that any other materials on the extension are not similar in appearance to those of the existing building. I will remove reference to the Juliet balcony from the allegation.
9. There is no claim from the Council that the extension breaches permitted development limitations in any other respect.

Other Matters

10. I note the comments from neighbours. However, matters of appearance, amenity or damage are not relevant to a ground (c) appeal.

Conclusion

11. On the balance of probabilities, the appeal on ground (c) should succeed in respect of those matters which, following the correction of the notice, are stated as constituting the breach of planning control.
12. The enforcement notice will be corrected and quashed. In these circumstances, the appeal on ground (f) does not need to be considered.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR

² Condition B.2 (b) (i)

³ Condition B.2 (a)