



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of Regeneration & Development Services

Date: 9th December 2014

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
9 December 2014

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 Council to refuse planning permission for illuminated free standing advertising display board at Land fronting Sheffield Mail Centre Brightside Lane Sheffield S9 2XX (Case No 14/02480/HOARD)

(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the decision of the Council at its meeting on 3rd June 2014 to refuse planning permission for demolition of fire damaged buildings, levelling of ground and associated filling over extent of former buildings, viewing area and amenity building at Sheffield Ski Village Vale Road Sheffield S3 9SJ (Case No 13/03814/FUL)

(iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for erection of a dwellinghouse at 10 Perkyn Terrace Sheffield S5 0AN (Case No 14/02291/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for two-storey side/front extension including garage, single-storey front extension, single-storey rear extension, erection of rear dormer window, extension to rear raised decking area and demolition of existing garage at 10 Knab Rise Sheffield S7 2ES (Case No14/01559/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues to be the effect upon i) the character and appearance of the area, and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of no.12 Knab Rise.

She noted the pair of semis were hipped roofed and their projecting concrete surrounds were a locally distinctive feature. She felt the single storey front extension would remove this feature and the two storey side extension would

substantially increase the overall width of the house. She concluded that the large additions, including the gable to the two storey side extension, would spoil the symmetry of the two houses and make them unbalanced. She did not consider that other examples drawn to her attention by the appellant provided justification for further harmful development.

On i) therefore she concluded that the development would harm the character of the area and agreed with officer's decision on this point.

In terms of the impact on the neighbour at no.12 the Inspector noted that the appeal site was higher than no 12, and that no.10 was also set further back. She noted the two storey element would be taken closer to no.12 and its impact exacerbated by the gabled roof, and would result in no.12's windows being within the 45 degree line in breach of guideline 5 of the Council's SPG.

She therefore agreed with the Council, and concluded the impact would be overbearing, despite the neighbour offering their support for the extension, in that the planning system has to protect the interests of existing and future occupiers.

She dismissed the appeal.

(ii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for Erection of two-storey rear extension and first-floor front balcony to dwellinghouse (Re-submission of 14/01132/FUL) at 56 Rivelin Street Sheffield S6 5DL (Case No 14/02221/FUL) part dismissed insofar as it relates to the new 1st floor balcony and planning permission is refused.

Officer Comment:-

The proposed first floor balcony would project about 1.3 metres and would be close to the boundary with no. 58 which is built at a lower level. There are some first floor windows in the rear elevations which overlook the neighbouring property. Nevertheless, the Inspector considered that the balcony would project beyond the existing windows and would be open on three sides enabling clearer views over the rear garden of no. 58 than from the windows. Therefore, the Inspector concluded that any existing overlooking would be exacerbated by the proposed balcony and that this would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring dwelling. This would be contrary to UDP policy H14 and the SPG " Designing House Extensions"

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for Erection of two-storey rear extension and first-floor front balcony to dwellinghouse (Re-submission of 14/01132/FUL) at 56 Rivelin Street Sheffield S6 5DL (Case No 14/02221/FUL) part allowed insofar as it relates to the two storey extension.

Officer Comment:-

The two storey extension would be built on the boundary of the adjoining dwelling "The Coach House" which faces the proposed extension and has some habitable windows directly face the closest part of the proposed extension and are about 5.5metres from it. Although the proposed extension contravenes this, it would not be directly in front of the windows of the Coach House and the Inspector considered that the Council's guidelines would not be breached and the outlook from the Coach House would not be substantially affected. This part of the proposal was, therefore granted planning permission.

Although the extension would add to the enclosure of the courtyard belonging to the Coach House, it would only affect a relatively small part and the overall effect would not be significant. The Inspector concluded that the extension would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the Coach House and would not conflict with policy. Accordingly, the Inspector granted planning permission to this part of the development.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Maria Duffy
Acting Head of Planning

9 December 2014

This page is intentionally left blank