REPORT TO PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE 20 October 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 Council at its meeting of 7<sup>th</sup> July 2015 to refuse planning consent for alterations and extension to height of building to provide 5 student cluster flats at second, third and fourth floor levels with ancillary cycle store and bin store at ground floor level (As amended 23/06/2015) at Broom park House, 200-208 Broom hall Street, Sheffield, S3 7SQ (Case No 15/00467/FUL)
- (ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision to refuse planning consent for single-storey rear extension to dwellinghouse and alterations to glazing on side elevation at 3 Mosborough Hall Farm, Hollow Lane, Sheffield, S20 5DN (Case No 15/01861/FUL)
- (iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the decision of the Council at its meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> February 2015 to refuse planning consent for laying out and construction of a hard standing measuring 17m by 31.2m at South Yorkshire Police Sports and Social Club, Club House, Niagara Grounds, Niagara Road, Sheffield S26 1LU (Case No 14/04066/FUL)

## 3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for the erection of a conservatory to rear of the dwelling at 4 Parker Way, Sheffield, S9 3DE (Case No 15/00453/HPN) has been dismissed.

# Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that, under the terms of the General Permitted Development Order, an application for a larger home extension cannot be made retrospectively, which this application was.

He went on to note that the extension would occupy most of the width and much of depth of the small garden and would also appear visually dominant and obtrusive in relation to numbers 2 & 6 adjacent and would also result in

overshadowing at certain times of day and a reduction in light to rear gardens of neighbouring dwellings. He concluded that that the extension would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and was therefore unacceptable.

Members should note that enforcement action will be required to remedy this situation and a separate enforcement report will follow if the matter cannot be resolved my mutual agreement.

# 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Maria Duffy Acting Head of Planning

20 October 2015