

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

| Report of: | Director of Development Services |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Date: | 15 March 2016 |
| Subject: | RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS |
| Author of Report: | Claire Woods 0114 2734219 |
| Summary: | |
| | ed planning appeals and decisions received, together 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 15 March 2016

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 use of dwellinghouse as a house in multiple occupation (Use Class C4) and alterations to roof space to form additional living accommodation at 77 Duchess Road Sheffield S2 4BL (Case No 15/03842/FUL)
- (ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for demolition of existing garage and erection of a dwellinghouse at curtilage of 141 Beighton Road, Woodhouse (Case No 15/03879/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for Single-storey front, side and rear extensions and raised decking to rear of dwellinghouse at 73 Cobnar Road, Sheffield, S8 8QD (Case No 15/03112/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issue as the effect on the character of the street scene and the host dwelling.

He noted the variety of house types, styles and ages along the street, but that despite this, bay windows were a prominent and defining feature that have remained unaltered. There are one or two exceptions to this that appear to pre-date UDP policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (SPG).

He agreed with officers that the design scale and mass of the extension wrapping round the front and side of no.73, would dominate the dwelling, and be obtrusive in the street scene. He further felt this would be exacerbated by

the sloping nature of the street. He therefore dismissed the appeal, as being contrary to UDP Policy H14 and SPG.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Mike Hayden Head of Planning

15 March 2016

This page is intentionally left blank