



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

---

**Report of:** Director of Regeneration & Development Services

---

**Date:** 11 July 2017

---

**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  
11 JULY 2017

### 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 a single-storey rear/side extensions to dwelling house (Re-submission of 16/00378/FUL) at The Lodge Standhills Long Line Sheffield S11 7TX (Case No 17/00452/FUL)

### 3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for a two-storey side extension including juliet balcony to front of dwellinghouse at 71 Dalewood Road Sheffield S8 0EE (Case No 16/04021/FUL) has been dismissed.

#### Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issues as the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, and on users of the adjacent footway.

He noted the prominent corner position of the dwelling and that the proposal sought to broadly mirror an extension on the adjoining semi, with the key difference being the added prominence of the proposal owing to its close proximity to the site frontage and its higher land level.

He felt the prominence of the extension was exacerbated by the proximity (1.5m) to the footpath, projecting forward of the building line, with no protection from the hedge along the frontage when not in leaf. The first floor Juliet balcony would add to the discordant effect of the proposal on the dwelling and the area and overall he agreed with officers that the extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

He did not agree that the extension would be overbearing on the users of the

footway despite being clearly noticeable.

He did not consider the appellant's need and personal benefit for larger family accommodation to justify the harm and dismissed the appeal for failure to comply with policy H14 of the UDP and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

(ii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for alterations to attic space to form 2x self-contained flats (Use Class C3) at 36 Priory Road Sharrow Sheffield S7 1LX (Case No 16/04163/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal space.

He noted the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide (RDG) best practice guidelines of 33 and 46 square metres for studio and one bed flat accommodation respectively, and that the proposal offered 24 and 40 square metres, again respectively, significantly below the guidelines.

The appellant argued that the accommodation exceeded (non-planning) HMO standards.

The Inspector concluded however that the accommodation being in the roof space severely limited usability and sloping roof forms would give the impression of the accommodation being very small and claustrophobic. He therefore found the accommodation to be unsatisfactory.

He dismissed the appellant's argument that many such examples exist within the city on the basis that, as is always the case, he must assess the individual merits of the case in question.

He dismissed the appeal for its failure to comply with policies H5 and H14 of the UDP, the space standards in the RDG, and the NPPF.

(iii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for the demolition of stables and extension to existing barn to form dwelling at Hole In The Wall Farm David Lane Sheffield S10 4PH (Case No 16/03062/FUL & 16/03048/LBC) both have been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues for both appeals to be whether the proposal was inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the effect on the openness of the Green Belt, whether, if inappropriate, there are very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness, the effect on the character and appearance of the area

and the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest and the setting of the listed buildings.

The Inspector concluded that the size of the extension would be disproportionate and so inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The additional bulk of the proposed extension would inevitable increase the built up area of the appeal site and so reduce the openness contrary to UDP policy and the NPPF

The proposed extension would be extensively glazed on a prominent elevation and be clearly seen from the public footpath and Mayfield Road. Together with its disproportionate size, this was considered to result in an unduly dominant addition which would harm the character and appearance of the wider area including hr Area of High Landscape Value.

In terms of the impact on the Listed Building, the extension was considered to disrupt the form of the existing building. Its size and scale would appear overly dominant and it would not be seen as a subordinate addition. The extensive glazing to the south elevation would contrast with and detract from the agricultural character and the use of land adjacent to the building would introduce domestic features altering the agricultural character of the undeveloped yard. For these reasons the proposal was considered to harm the setting and the architectural and historic character of the Listed Building.

The public benefits of the proposal and other considerations were considered but were not considered to comprise “very special circumstances” and so did not outweigh the harm caused.

#### 4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for alterations to basement to form additional living accommodation and provision of stairway to front basement entrance at 333 Psalter Lane Sheffield S11 8WA (Case No 16/04706/FUL) has been allowed.

##### Officer Comment:-

The Inspector notes the main issue to be the effect of the development on the appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene.

She noted its location within a stone built terrace and that in common with the rest of the terrace it contained a small front ‘garden’ between the house and the busy highway, separated by a low stone wall that provides some uniformity to the street scene.

The front gardens however vary in their treatment (hedges, gardens, hard surfaced) and she noted the proposal involved removal and excavation of the

hard surfaced area that currently contains a small light well to enable a flight of steps to be constructed to access an entrance door (and windows) within a fully excavated front garden with retaining walls.

The Inspector concluded that the top of the door and windows would be no higher than the existing light well and that the bulk of the alterations would be barely visible from outside the site.

She concluded that the works would not significantly harm the appearance of the dwelling and would have very little impact on the wider street scene, finding the works would be consistent with policy H14 (UDP) and CS74 (Core Strategy). She allowed the appeal.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Rob Murfin  
Chief Planning Officer

*11 July 2017*

This page is intentionally left blank