



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of Regeneration & Development Services

Date: 17 December 2013

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
17 December 2013

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 against an Enforcement Notice served in respect of unauthorised conservatory at 36 Standwood Crescent (Case No. 13/00331/ENUD)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for single-storey front extension to dwellinghouse at 608 Herries Road Sheffield S5 8TR has been dismissed (Case No. 13/01412/FUL)

Officer Comment:-

The Planning Inspector considered that the main issue in this case was the effect of the proposal on the character of the dwelling and the streetscene.

The property is one of the two middle dwellings in a terrace of four dwellings. There is a strong vertical element to the terrace provided by the end terrace dwellings being sited forward of the middle two. Other terraced dwellings in the vicinity have largely retained their original designs through the absence of frontage extensions.

The proposal would span virtually the whole width of the dwelling and would result in a visible horizontal emphasis, exacerbated by it aligning with the frontage of the end dwelling. It would be a strong dominating feature causing the loss of the symmetrical nature of the terrace. For these reasons, the Inspector also considered it to significantly detract from the dwelling and the street contrary to Guidelines 1 and 2 of the "Designing House Extensions" SPG

There are other properties in Herries Road and Morgan Avenue that have front extensions but these were not considered comparable by the Inspector.

In conclusion, the Inspector considered that the proposal would significantly affect the character of the dwelling and the streetscene, contrary to Policy H14 of the UDP and the guidelines within the SPG and so dismissed the appeal

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for replacement windows at 24 Ashgate Road, A10 3BZ

The Inspector considered the main issue to be effect of the windows on the character and appearance of the host property and whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Broomhill Conservation Area, and the setting of the adjacent Listed Building.

The dwelling is covered by the Article 4 Direction restricting permitted development rights, hence the need for the application. The Inspector noted that the form, detailing, style and construction of windows in the Conservation Area are prominent visual features of the buildings and an important part of the Conservation Area's significance as a heritage asset.

She considered that whilst many properties in the area retain their traditional timber sash windows, those which had replaced these with top hung timber and upvc windows had created an adverse effect on their appearance and diminished their historical and architectural importance, in part due to the loss of original features, and in part to consistency.

She agreed with officers that the windows in no.24 Ashgate Road were out of keeping with the character and detailing of the host property, the wider conservation area, and adjacent listed building, owing to the use of top hung opening windows, thicker upvc frames with a 'glossier' finish, and the lack of finesse in their detailing. As a result she felt the windows only had a 'superficial visual approximation' to the original windows, and do not sit comfortably within the window surrounds.

She considered the appellants view that the windows offered increased thermal efficiency, durability and stability but felt that much the same advantages could be achieved in other ways with the use of more sensitively designed windows.

She therefore dismissed the appeal.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for single-storey front extension, re-roofing and render to side elevation of garage at Edgedale Garage 2 Edgedale Road S 7 2BQ has been allowed subject to conditions (Case No 13/00757/FUL)

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

The Inspector disagreed with officer's judgement that the front extension would have a harmful impact on the street scene, and upon the host building, as it would be visually subordinate to the main building, would not compromise its symmetrical appearance, and would be substantially screened from view by the boundary wall to no.4 Edgedale Road, thereby reducing its prominence.

It was therefore concluded that the proposed extension did not conflict with policies BE5(c) and H14(a) of the UDP and CS74 of the Core Strategy.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Maria Duffy
Acting Head of Planning

17 December 2013