



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

---

**Report of:** Director of City Growth Service

---

**Date:** 19 December 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 19 DECEMBER 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 Replacement fence (Retrospective) at 23 Lawson Road Sheffield S10 5BU (Case No 17/02495/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 single-storey side extension, alterations to roof space to form habitable accommodation including formation of gable end and front dormer window at 52 Glenalmond Road Sheffield S11 7GW (Case No 17/02202/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 extension to dwellinghouse at Roegate Cottage Dungworth Green Sheffield S6 6HE (Case No 17/02620/FUL)

(iv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse to issue a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development under Section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for an application to establish the lawful use of building as a dwellinghouse (Application under Section 191) at Building At 'White Waters' Station Road Halfway Sheffield S20 3AD (Case No 17/01900/LU4)

#### 3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for alterations to roof including raising of ridge height to form 2 flats at 46 Wostenholm Road Sheffield S7 1LL (Case No 17/02206/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issues as being:-

- a) Impact on the character and appearance of the Nether Edge Conservation Area;
- b) Effect on living conditions of future occupants – particularly accommodation and amenity space

For a) he noted the 3 storey building containing 5 flats is in a prominent location in the conservation area, which is characterised by detached, semi-detached and terraced properties whose characteristic feature is adequately proportioned traditional hipped and gable roofs.

He agreed with officers that the proposed replacement mansard roof, 0.2m taller than the existing roof, with a pitch of 70 degrees vs 26 degrees as existing, would appear disproportionately top heavy and incongruous, unacceptably at odds with the predominant roof scape on the road. As such he considered it would harm the conservation area and neither preserve or enhance its character. He concluded there were no public benefits to outweigh the less than substantial harm (in NPPF terms).

For b) the 2 proposed flats had a floor space of approximately 50 sqm. Officers felt this fell short of guidance in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide which suggests 62sqm. The Inspector noted this was reflective of the Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard which suggests a minimum of 61sqm. He therefore considered there was a shortfall in floor space.

He also agreed with officers that the usability of the floor space was greatly compromised by the slope of the front and rear walls leading to unacceptably cramped living conditions.

He also considered the absence of access from the flats to useable amenity space to be unacceptable and further representative of poor living conditions.

He dismissed the appeal on both counts for failure to comply with UDP policies BE5, BE15, BE16, H5 and H14; Core Strategy policy CS74; and paras 131-132.

(ii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for the erection of a dwellinghouse and detached garage at Land Adjacent 133 Long Line Sheffield S11 7TX (Case No 17/00548/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

Note: The reason for refusal in this case did not relate to the principle of the erection of a dwelling as officer had concluded this would be in line with UDP policy GE5, and para 89 of the NPPF which permit limited infilling of single plots within the confines of a group of buildings or villages.

The main issues were:-

- a) The effect on the openness of the Green Belt; and

b) The effect on the character and appearance of the Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV).

In respect of a) as the site formed part of an existing garden amongst a group of properties the Inspector considered the development would not lead to encroachment of development into the countryside but would inevitably have some impact on openness. However he concluded that given infill development was supported by national and local policy, there was no encroachment beyond existing residential curtilage, and that it would follow adjacent ribbon development, overall it would not have a greater impact on openness of the green belt and the purposes of including land within it.

For b) he noted the plot size was sufficient to accommodate a relatively large 2 storey dwelling with sufficient space around it. However the substantial and steep pitched roof would result in a dominant appearance and a dwelling taller than adjacent properties and would have the effect of drawing the eye to the extent it would be at odds with neighbouring properties.

He felt that as the property would be visible in views from the south in particular, it would appear as an unacceptable dominant feature within the countryside and have a detrimental effect on the AHLV.

He dismissed the appeal for failure to comply with UDP policies GE4, GE8, and BE5 and Core Strategy Policies CS31 and CS74.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Rob Murfin  
Chief Planning Officer

*19 December 2017*