



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of City Growth Department

Date: 27 July 2021

Subject: RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS
SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS

Author of Report: Abby Hartley

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

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 Committee decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the Demolition of public house, and ancillary buildings (Use Class A4), and erection of 8no dwellings (Use Class C3) including associated undercroft car parking and formation of access to the highway at The Plough Inn, 288 Sandygate Road, Sheffield, S10 5SE (Case No: 19/02130/FUL).

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – DISMISSED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a hip to gable roof extension to extend habitable room in roofspace at 28 Kingfield Road, Sheffield, S11 9AS (Case No: 20/04233/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Nether Edge Conservation Area.

They noted this part of the Conservation Area contained well established properties set back from the highway and that their form and detailing defined its character and appearance. The arts and crafts detailing on the semi-detached property was mirrored by its adjoining neighbour, which affords symmetry along with their hipped roofs.

The Inspector considered the roof alteration to a gable would provide additional accommodation but would be at odds with the adjoining no.30 and would imbalance the symmetry evident in the pair, even accounting for the significant set back from the highway.

This level of harm was considered less than substantial but as the benefits of the scheme were purely personal to the applicant they did not outweigh that harm.

The Inspector therefore concluded the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and fails to accord with UDP policies BE5, BE16 and H14 and policy CS74 of the Core Strategy and dismissed the appeal.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the Council for the non-determination of an application for planning permission for the alterations and extensions to roof space to form additional habitable accommodation including erection of rear dormer, erection of first floor side extension over attached garage, and erection of single-storey rear extension at lower ground floor level including raised terrace at lower ground floor and ground floor level with new access steps to garden at 43 Pingle Avenue, Sheffield, S7 2LP (Case No: 20/04403/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector noted the sloping street contained mainly semi-detached properties, many of which had been extended in some form resulting in a reduction in the spacing between properties that would have originally been evident. He noted that variety occurred through the stepped nature of the properties following the topography as was exhibited in this case, with no.45 being higher than 43. He also noted two storey flush extensions, with no change in roof line, occupying the full width of the remaining plot space were present, and this caused a terracing effect.

However, whilst he noted that pursuing a design objective of subservience by setting extensions in, back and down was appropriate in certain circumstances, he stated the area was characterised by extensions of similar form to that proposed, but did not feel this was at a level where the cumulative effect was harmful, and the extension would therefore represent a harmonious addition.

He therefore concluded there was no conflict with UDP policies BE5 and H14, or with Core Strategy Policy CS74 and allowed the appeal.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a single-storey front extension to dwellinghouse at 1 Twickenham Glade, Sheffield, S20 4HY (Case No: 20/02656/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

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

Whilst noting the Council's concerns about the fact that a 3 metre front extension would not comply with its Supplementary Planning Guidance and the fenestration would not match that of the host property, they considered that the particular set-back of the property (which is set back further than its neighbours) meant that the extension would not be so obtrusive and there was enough variety in the street scene for it not to harm the character. They therefore allowed the appeal subject to the use of matching materials.

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 2x dwellinghouses at land between 53 Beighton Road and 35A Greengate Road, Woodhouse, Sheffield, S13 7PN (Case No: 20/01455/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the development upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in relation to outlook, privacy and light.

In relation to proximity to numbers 1 and 3 Greengate Close, whilst the Inspector accepted that the 14 to 15 metre separation distance to the new dwellings was below the Council's guideline of 21 metres they considered that the offset arrangement and acute angle was enough to mitigate this and that the overlooking of gardens would not be materially worse than neighbouring plots.

In relation to the plot closest to 44, 46 and 48 Greengate Lane the Inspector was satisfied that, despite the level difference, there would be adequate separation between the side elevation of the new property and the rear elevation of the existing houses. However, the Inspector did consider that the proposed raised terrace to Plot 8, wrapping around the rear and side boundary could give rise to overlooking problems and there were not enough details to understand this impact so they omitted this part of the proposals from the approval. This means that the applicant would have to apply separately for this terrace at a future point.

The Inspector concluded that the development was in line with the adopted plan and the NPPF and allowed the appeal subject to the omission of the terrace and the imposition of conditions.

5.0 CIL APPEALS DECISIONS

Nothing to report.

6.0 NEW ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

Nothing to report.

7.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DISMISSED

Nothing to report.

8.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS ALLOWED

Nothing to report.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted.

Michael Johnson
Head of Planning

27 July 2021

This page is intentionally left blank