



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of Regeneration & Development Services

Date: 23 February 2016

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 23rd February 2016

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 Erection of 4 dwellinghouses and garages (amended plans received 24.07.2015) at South Yorkshire Police Rotherham Road Halfway Sheffield S20 8GL (Case No 15/02390/FUL)
(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the decision of the Council at its meeting of 26 th May 2015 to refuse planning consent for erection of two semi-detached dwellinghouses at Land To The Rear Of 328 Bole Hill Road Sheffield S6 5DF (Case No 14/02959/OUT)
(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 4 bedroomed detached dwellinghouse at Land Between 2 Parsley Hay Gardens And 17 Parsley Hay Close Parsley Hay Gardens Sheffield S13 8NN (Case No 15/00387/FUL)
(iv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for Widening of existing vehicular access from 3.6m to 10m (Re-submission of 15/01195/FUL) at Abbey Veterinary Group 90 Wortley Road High Green Sheffield S35 4LU (Case No 15/02709/FUL)
(v) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for Single-storey front, side and rear extensions to dwellinghouse (Resubmission of approved application 15/02933/FUL) at 36 Rosemary Road Sheffield S20 1AR (Case No 15/03557/FUL)
(vi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for alterations and extension to outbuilding to form an annexe for a dependent relative (re-submission of 14/02542/FUL) at 2 Bank Farm Bank Lane Sheffield S36 3SS (Case No 15/02972/FUL)

(vii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for two-storey side extension, incorporating full gable end and including demolition of existing garage and alterations to roof to create additional living accommodation including dormers to rear of dwellinghouse (Re-submission of 15/00939/FUL) at 22 Hallam Grange Rise Sheffield S10 4BG (Case No 15/03798/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for alterations to roof including raised ridge height and dormer to rear of dwellinghouse at 149 Lowedges Crescent Sheffield S8 7LH (Case No 15/02440/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the key issue as being the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

She noted the terrace of properties had a regularly staggered roofline with the ridge of each dwelling set up or down from its neighbour, and all properties contained chimneys which provide uniformity and rhythm.

She felt raising the ridge height to the same as the adjoining property the increase in roof pitch and loss of the chimney would adversely impact on the existing rhythm and uniformity of the terrace.

In addition, the proposed dormer, spanning the entire width of the roof, and visible from a rear would dominate the roof and be an incongruous addition to it, with dormers not being a common feature within the wider estate.

In conclusion she felt the works would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area contrary to policy H14 of the UDP, and did not feel the benefits of additional living accommodation and use of matching materials outweighed that harm.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Maria Duffy
Acting Head of Planning

23 February 2016

This page is intentionally left blank