



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

---

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

---

**Date:** 6<sup>th</sup> January 2015

---

**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 6<sup>th</sup> January 2015

#### 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 decision of the City Council at its meeting of 26 August 2014 to refuse with enforcement action planning permission for replacement of front door and frame to dwellinghouse (Retrospective application) at 31 Moor Oaks Road Sheffield S10 1BX (Case No 14/02148/FUL)

(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the decision of the City Council at its meeting of 28 October 2014 to refuse planning permission for demolition of existing building and erection of 4 dwellinghouses (as per amended drawings received 19 August 2014) at Site Of Clear Line Creevela Works Parsonage Street Sheffield S6 5BL (Case No 14/00831/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 erection of detached double garage to front of dwellinghouse at 297 Ecclesall Road South Sheffield S11 9PQ (Case No 14/03131/FUL)

#### 3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for demolition of agricultural buildings and erection of a dwellinghouse at Land And Out Building Acre Lane Sheffield S35 0GE (Case No 13/04265/FUL)

##### Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues to be whether it would be inappropriate development for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the effect on the openness of the Green Belt, the effect on the visual amenity of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area and if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm is outweighed by very special circumstances.

The NPPF sets out that new building in the Green Belt is inappropriate but

one exception is that a replacement building can be erected provided it is in the same use and not materially larger. As the proposal is to replace an agricultural building with a dwelling. The appeal proposal does not accord with this exception.

UDP Policy GE4 refers to dwelling being erected to support agriculture. I was not claimed by the applicant that this was the reason for the proposal so the proposal did not accord with the exceptions. Further, it was not infilling within a village which is also an identified exception in GE5 and the NPPF.

For these reasons, the proposal was found to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to the UDP and NPPF. This being the case, it had to be considered whether there were very special circumstances that outweighed the inappropriateness and any other harm.

In this respect, by reason of its height and bulk, the Inspector concluded it would cause harm to the Green Belt and as such, would conflict with the NPPF. The Inspector also as of the opinion that there would be other ancillary activities associated with the dwelling including amenity space, space for manoeuvring and parking vehicles and when taken together, they would fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment of development and would prejudice the purposes of the Green Belt and so would conflict with the NPPF.

Because of the additional bulk of the proposed building and potential ancillary uses, it would not be a significant enhancement and would not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the Green Belt and so this did not amount to very special circumstances necessary to justify the development and so dismissed the appeal.

#### 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Maria Duffy  
Acting Head of Planning

*6 January 2015*

This page is intentionally left blank