



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of Regeneration & Development Services

Date: 24 June 2014

Subject: RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS
SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS

Author of Report: Claire Woods 0114 2734219

Summary:

List of all newly submitted planning appeals and decisions received, together with a brief summary of the Inspector's reason for the decision

Reasons for Recommendations

Recommendations:

To Note

Background Papers:

Category of Report: OPEN

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

REPORT TO PLANNING &
HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
24 June 2014

1.0 RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS SUBMISSIONS AND DECISIONS

This report provides a schedule of all newly submitted planning appeals and decisions received, together with a brief summary of the Secretary of State's reasons for the decisions.

2.0 NEW APPEALS RECEIVED

(i) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for erection of a dwellinghouse (amended scheme to 13/03429/FUL) at land Between 20 And 24 Moonshine Lane Sheffield S5 8RD (Case No 14/00642/FUL)
(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the decision of the Council at its meeting of the 11 March 2014 to refuse with Enforcement Action planning consent for erection of 9 apartments with associated undercroft car parking accommodation (As amended by plans received 26/02/2014) at land Between 1 To 3 And Nos 5 And 7 Dover Road Sheffield S11 8RH (Case No 13/03930/FUL)
(iii) An appeal has been submitted against an Enforcement Notice served in respect of the erection of a wall without planning permission at land between 1 to 3 and 5 and 7 Dover Road, Sheffield (Case No. 14/00171/ENUD)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for erection of a dwellinghouse at Land To The Rear Of 33 To 35 Nottingham Cliff Sheffield S3 9GU (Case No 13/03341/FUL)
Officer Comment:- The Inspector considered that the main issues in this case were the effect on the character and appearance of the local area and on the living conditions of future occupiers especially in respect of light , outlook and private amenity space and the occupiers of 33 and 35 Nottingham Cliff primarily with regard to light, outlook sense of enclosure and potential noise and disturbance He considered that the proposal for a single storey building within a confined space would be incompatible with the existing built form and would appear cramped. It would not improve the character and quality of the area and so

was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and UDP policy H14 and Core Strategy Policy CS74.

The Inspector stated that the light to the two main rooms would be poor and the use of obscure glazing to prevent overlooking would create unacceptably poor external outlook. The use of obscure glazing would also make the rooms gloomy and uninviting.

With regard to the occupiers of 33 and 35, the use of obscure glazing to the proposed bedroom would do little to diminish their perception of being overlooked and would seriously impinge on their enjoyment of their properties because they would perceive an unacceptable loss of privacy.

The new dwelling would cause more disturbance to adjoining occupiers in terms of both noise and night time light and the front wall would heighten a feeling of enclosure in the rear yards on 33 and 35.

The Inspector felt that these matters constituted an overdevelopment of the site and would not provide reasonable living conditions for occupiers of the proposed dwelling or for the occupiers of 33 and 35.

(ii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for conversion of roof space including formation of gable end, raised ridge height and erection of rear dormer window 87 Shenstone Road Sheffield S6 1SP (Case No 13/04148/FUL)

Officer Comment:-

The main issue in this appeal was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Whilst the change of roof style from hipped to gable would be different to the hipped roofs on the properties at the end of this cul-de-sac, the fact that it is a detached property and the houses at either side are angled away would not, on its own, detract from the character of the area. However, the proposed increase in height, change in roof shape plus the lack of bargeboard and minimal eaves detailing would result in a discordance of scale between the roof and the walls of the host property drawing attention to the disparity with neighbouring properties. For these reasons, the Inspector considered the proposal would be out of character and contrary to UDP policy H14, the Supplementary Planning Guidance and the principles of the NPPF and so dismissed the appeal.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Maria Duffy
Acting Head of Planning

24 June 2014

This page is intentionally left blank