



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: The Interim Head of Planning

Date: 22 November 2016

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
22 November 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 the laying out and construction of a means of vehicular access to dwellinghouse at 2 Mawfa Crescent Sheffield S14 1AS (Case No 16/00776/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 a second-floor extension to dwellinghouse (Re-submission of 15/01394/FUL) at 200 Norton Lane Sheffield S8 8HB (Case No 16/01351/FUL)
(iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for a two-storey side/rear extension, single-storey rear extension and formation of gable end at 21 Glenorchy Road Sheffield S7 2EL (Case No 16/01695/FUL)
(iv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the partial demolition of existing boundary wall, erection of a new boundary wall to accommodate widening of the drive at 34 Beech Hill Road Sheffield S10 2SB (Case No 16/02686/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse advertisement consent for 1x internally illuminated free-standing sign at Unit 5A Leopold Square Sheffield S1 2JG (Case No 16/01664/ADV) has been dismissed.
Officer Comment:- The Inspector noted that the existing premises around the Square have generally focussed the installation of signage on the fabric of the buildings and by using projecting, window and internal signs. These set the established character and set the visual context. He noted that the proposed sign would

not reflect this modest signage and would be the only freestanding totem in the Square and like no other in the vicinity. He found that the decorative design would also be in marked contrast to the more contemporary signage in the Square, which would appear incongruous and at odds with the character of the locality, harming the appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the surrounding listed buildings.

(ii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning consent for provision of vehicular access and hardstanding to front of dwellinghouse at 66 Psalter Lane Sheffield S11 8YQ (Case No 16/00993/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment

This relates to a property within Nether Edge Conservation Area, where the Article 4 removes permitted development rights for works to the front of properties.

The Inspector identified the main issue as the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the property and the Conservation Area.

He notes the front garden present and the pedestrian access obtained by a narrow opening in the stone boundary wall, and that such features are important features of this prominent part of the Conservation Area. Indeed they and the villas themselves are referred to in the Conservation Area Appraisal.

He considered the removal of a section of the wall to allow vehicle access, and the resulting hard surfacing would represent the permanent loss of heritage assets within the Conservation Area and significantly detract from its character and appearance.

As required by the NPPF he balanced the harm against the public benefit of providing off street parking on a busy road but felt this was insufficient to outweigh the harm generated.

Referring to other similar examples drawn to his attention by the appellant, he commented that these merely serve to confirm the harm and erosion of character that has resulted.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Flo Churchill
Interim Head of Planning

22 November 2016

This page is intentionally left blank