



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL City Centre, South & East Planning & Highways

Report of: Director of Development Services

Date: 14 January 2013

Subject: RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS
SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS

Author of Report: Sue McGrail 0114 2734404

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 CITY CENTRE,
SOUTH & EAST PLANNING &
HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
14 January 2013

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 for the construction of a front dormer window to dwellinghouse at 2 Meersbrook Avenue (Case No 12/02020/FUL)

(ii) An appeal has been submitted against the decision of the Council at its meeting of the 5th November 2012 to refuse consent for the demolition of buildings on Plots 4 & 5, the erection of a retail unit including garden centre, a car dealership, a drive-thru coffee shop and associated car parking on Plot 5 at land and buildings at Meadowhall Way, Meadowhall Drive, Vulcan Road and Weedon Street (Case No 12/01017/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the decision of the Council to refuse planning consent under delegated powers for an extension and alterations to stores, car port and boundary walls at 37 Crescent Road (Case No 12/01808/FUL) has been dismissed

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues to be the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Nether Edge Conservation Area; and the impact upon the occupiers of 54 Steade Road, which faced the rear of the site.

He considered that the 1.8m gates, at 4m wide, incorporated into the boundary treatment were of a scale inappropriate to their context, and that the site demanded something 'more modest and restrained', and were in conflict

with Policy BE16 of the Unitary Development Plan.

He noted that the Steade Road dwellings were already affected by existing outbuildings, and that the appeal site sits at a higher level to properties at the rear, and for this reason the new building would appear as a two storey structure, falling considerably short of the Council's 12m separation guideline, at 7.5m.

He acknowledged the fact that the neighbour at 54 Steade Road offered strong support for the scheme but agreed with the Council that the sense of enclosure created would be unacceptable, and result in significant loss of afternoon sun in conflict with UDP policy H14.

He therefore dismissed the appeal.

(ii) An appeal against the decision of the Council at the Committee meeting of 2nd July 2012 to refuse advertisement consent for a non-illuminated hoarding at 280 Ecclesall Road (Case No 12/01431/ADV) has been dismissed

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the impact on the visual amenities of the locality, and noted the busy commercial context of the Ecclesall Road District Shopping Centre.

He referred to Circular 03/2007 which suggests the scale of buildings in predominantly commercial areas may be sufficiently large to accommodate larger poster displays, but that the display should not be over dominant, and should be in scale with the building.

He noted the building was a modest end terraced property, and considered the high level siting and the set back nature of the adjacent buildings meant the prominence of the hoarding was increased, and is prominent in views from approximately 100m distant.

He felt the hoarding was not in scale with its host building and appears unduly prominent, in conflict with the aims of Policy BE13 of the Unitary Development Plan and paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and dismissed the appeal.

(iii) An appeal against a Discontinuance Notice, served in respect of unauthorised use of the site for the display of advertisements at 337A Glossop Road has been dismissed, and the notice upheld.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue for the Inspector was whether the continued use of the flank wall for the display of advertisements with deemed consent would be substantially injurious to visual amenity.

She noted the significant contribution the brick terrace of properties made to the character of the Hanover Conservation Area, and the presence of the grade 2 listed terrace adjacent to the site, separated by the flank wall of the appeal site. She considered the flank wall to be an interesting feature and one which formed the setting for the listed terrace.

She considered the use of the flank wall for advertising to be harmful to the setting of the listed building, and failed to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. She agreed with the Council that the significantly harmful impact of the use of the flank wall for advertising was 'substantially injurious to visual amenity', and dismissed the appeal.

The discontinuance notice was therefore upheld, with the timescale for removal of the advertisements set at 10th January 2013.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

An appeal against the refusal of planning permission at the Committee meeting of 23rd July 2012 for the erection of 3 dwellinghouses at 31 Brickhouse Lane (Case No 12/00289/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

This appeal followed Members decision to refuse permission contrary to the officer recommendation to grant planning permission.

The Inspector considered the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character of the area, and its impact upon highway safety, with particular regard to car parking.

She considered that the modest size, simple design of the dwellings, use of stone and render, and their position on the site was reflective of local character, and that the dwellings would integrate the scheme into the street scene. She also felt the density levels of the scheme were appropriate, and did not consider the loss of the open green frontage to the street to be significant, and overall found no conflict with policies H14 of the Unitary Development Plan or CS74 of the Core Strategy. In addition she considered the scheme aligned with the core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure high quality design.

In terms of parking and highway safety, the inspector noted that each property had one parking space, and considered that any on street parking likely to be generated by the development would be minimal, and would not materially add to any existing on street parking. She noted that Brickhouse Lane and Newfield Lane had capacity for additional vehicles, and did not feel that the slight underprovision of parking, relative to the Council's guidelines, would cause harm. She therefore concluded the scheme complied with policy H14.

On other matters, in response to residents concerns, she noted a lack of evidence of impact on wildlife and ecological value on the site, and considered the scheme to be too small to impact on local schools, doctors and shops.

She therefore allowed the appeal.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

David Caulfield
Head of Planning

14 January 2013

This page is intentionally left blank