



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

---

**Report of:** The Head of Planning

---

**Date:** 4 June 2024

---

**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 delegated decision of the City Council to refuse an application for a Certificate of Lawful Use - to use detached building to the rear of 4 Crofton Avenue as ancillary accommodation to the main dwellinghouse (Application under Section 192) at 4 Crofton Avenue, Sheffield, S6 1WF (Case No: 23/03970/LU2).

(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the demolition of rear porch and erection of a single-storey rear extension to dwellinghouse at 7 Upperthorpe Glen, Sheffield, S6 3GZ (Case No: 23/03628/FUL).

(iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the erection of 17.5m high Apollo streetpole with associated cabinets and ancillary works (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at land opposite junction with Hatfield House Croft, Hatfield House Lane, Sheffield, S5 6HU (Case No: 23/03050/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 the alterations to roof including raised ridge height and erection of dormer windows to rear and erection of ground floor infil extension to front of dwellinghouse at 54 Blair Athol Road, Sheffield, S11 7GB (Case No: 23/01447/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 alterations and extension to roof including raising of ridge height and erection of a rear dormer, and erection of a one/two storey rear extension at 51 Burrowlee Road, Sheffield, S6 2AT (Case No:

23/03824/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues were the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to overshadowing and overdominance.

The Inspector observed that the appeal dwelling is an anomaly in the row as it has a reduced height and smaller footprint compared to its neighbours. Within the terrace, single storey rear projections are generally shared with a neighbour and/or are set in from one of its side boundaries. No.49 Burrowlee Road (No.49), adjacent, has a ground floor window within its rear elevation, to the side of which is a single storey projection. The adjacent dwelling, No.53 Burrowlee Road (No.53), also has a single ground floor opening positioned in its rear elevation. A mix of boundary treatments exist to the rear of Burrowlee Road, although there is a general degree of openness across the linear gardens.

The Inspector determined that the development would be acceptable with regard to the living conditions of the occupants of No.53. However, in the opinion of the Inspector the siting of the extension on the boundary, would create a narrow corridor to the rear of No.49. This would significantly enclose the amenity space immediately to the rear of No.49, with the extension appearing dominant and overbearing. This sense of enclosure would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of that property.

That placed the proposed development in conflict with Policy H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 (the UDP); guidance contained within the SPG; and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together, amongst other things, those policies seek to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of existing users. For those reasons the appeal was dismissed.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the alterations to roof including replacement dormer windows to front of dwellinghouse (resubmission of planning application 23/01550/FUL) at 264 Darnall Road, Sheffield, S9 5AN (Case No: 23/03364/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue were the effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the appeal building and the area.

The Inspector observed that the appeal property is a detached building which is situated in an area that contains a variety of closely positioned properties. The changes in topography result in properties being sited at different levels, with the level changes also affording views over the predominantly pitched roofs of residential properties in the area. The simple roof forms, as well as

the generally consistent building lines provides for a cohesive character.

The Inspector then noted that the proposed dormers would be situated on the front roof slope, and although they would be of a reduced size compared to the dormers that are currently in place, they would nevertheless be large, prominent structures. The windows on the proposed dormers would also only partially align with the windows on the first-floor front elevation of the host property, with the dormer structures themselves being out of alignment with these existing windows below.

Whilst there may be other dormers in the wider area, including those that the Council has recently approved, there are none on nearby properties on this section of Darnall Road. In the opinion of the Inspector therefore the dormers would as a result, appear as top heavy and alien additions which would be harmful to the visual appearance of the appeal building and the character of the area.

Overall the Inspector concluded that the appeal development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the appeal building and the area and dismissed the appeal.

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the provision of pitched roof over existing first floor bay window at 28 Bignor Road, Sheffield, S6 1JD (Case No: 23/03150/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue was the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector observed that the appeal site is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which is located at the head of Bignor Road, a cul-de-sac, which lies within a predominantly residential area. Dwellings along Bignor Road are semi-detached with either hipped or gable roofs. While some dwellings have been extended and altered, two-storey flat roof bay windows to the front elevation, which sit below the eaves of the roof, are a prevailing characteristic of the street. The front roof slopes of dwellings along Bignor Road are generally unaltered which provide a sense of visual uniformity.

When describing the character of the existing property the Inspector noted that the appeal dwelling has been extended with a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension. Those extensions appear visually subservient. The original front elevation of the dwelling and its semi-detached pairing remain well-balanced, largely due to the design and symmetry of the front bay windows and unaltered roof form.

The proposal includes a pitch above the existing flat roof bay. While modest in scale, the Inspector determined that the addition would project above the eaves of the existing roof, projecting from the roof slope. This would disrupt

the unbroken roof design of the dwelling, resulting in the semi-detached pairing having two bays of varying design. This would visually imbalance the original front façade of these properties. Furthermore, the development would introduce a roof feature which is not characteristic to Bignor Road, breaking the uniformity of unaltered roofslopes. The Inspector therefore considered that the development would result in a standalone feature which would appear alien within its surroundings.

As such the Inspector concluded that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area and dismissed the appeal.

(iv) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of first and second floor side extension to dwellinghouse at 11 Carfield Avenue, Sheffield, S8 9HY (Case No: 23/03011/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector agreed with officers that the extensions, notably the elevated side extension with gable, and poor fenestration, would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area in conflict with policies H14 of the Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Designing House Extensions' and Core Strategy policy CS74, along with the Framework. Private benefits of improvements to energy efficiency and the housing stock did not outweigh this permanent harm.

(v) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of two-storey side extension and two/single-storey rear extension to dwellinghouse (resubmission of application 23/00541/FUL) at 6 Hadfield Close, Sheffield, S9 3GD (Case No: 23/01908/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues were the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal dwelling, and on highway safety.

Living conditions

The Inspector observed that the appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling located within a residential cul-de-sac. The appeal dwelling has a modest size garden to the rear, a drive to the side, and a small lawn to the front. The proposal would introduce a single storey extension to the rear and a two-storey extension to the side and rear, which would occupy most of the space to the side of the dwelling and part of the rear garden.

Taking account of the typical garden furniture and use that is expected for a four bedrooed house that could reasonably accommodate a large family, the Inspector found that the development would over-develop the site, and the

remaining garden space would be inadequate. Consequently, this would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal dwelling and contrary to the aims of Policies BE5 and H14 (c) of the UDP, and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy, which collectively require high-quality developments.

#### Highway safety

The Inspector agreed with Council's concern that the proposal would still fail to provide the necessary number of off street parking spaces for a four bedroomed dwelling. Accordingly, they took the view that the development would be detrimental to highway safety, which is contrary to the aims of Policy H14 (d) of the UDP, which requires developments to provide appropriate off-street parking.

For the reasons given and having had regard to all other matters raised the appointed Inspector dismissed the appeal.

(vi) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the increased ridge height to create habitable room in roofspace and installation of electric sliding gates to front drive at 64 Sandygate Park, Sheffield, S10 5TZ (Case No: 23/01308/FUL) has been dismissed.

#### Officer Comment:-

The main issues were the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to overshadowing and overdominance.

The Inspector observed that the properties in the locality are generally detached, to two storeys, to various designs.

The proposal would seek to increase the roof ridge of the property by approximately 1.8m in order to facilitate additional habitable room space and create the equivalent of a window at a third storey in order to facilitate this. In addition to this, gates would be installed onto the front drive at the boundary.

The Inspector noted that a key aspect of the character of this area of Sandygate Park is that the detached dwellings generally have a uniformity of two storeys and the symmetry of height to those properties.

In the opinion of the Inspector the existing uniformity and symmetry would be disrupted by the increase in roof height and then exacerbated by the bulk and mass of what will appear externally to be a three-storey gable. He found that would lead to harm to the character and appearance of the area by introducing an increase in height to the roof that would be incongruous and out of place in its context.

With regard to the proposed gates the Inspector found that the design and

height of the gates would create a prominent and intrusive feature in the streetscene which would be out of keeping with local character, distinctiveness and sense of place.

Overall, the Inspector found that the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and resolved to dismiss the appeal.

(vii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse prior notification for the installation of telecommunications base station comprising a 17.5m high slimline column, associated GPS module fixed to the top, 2no. equipment cabinets, 1no. meter cabinet and ancillary works (Application to determine if prior approval required for siting and appearance) at land at junction with Worcester Road, Rochester Road, Sheffield, S10 4JQ (Case No: 22/04192/TEL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues were:-

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
- The effect of the proposed development on highway & pedestrian safety

*The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area*

The Inspector took the view that the scale of the proposed mast is strident, industrial in nature and has the external appearance of a structure more often seen in industrial areas and would be harmful to the local context of residential development and public open space. As such the mast would appear dominant in the locality and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, magnified by its proximity to the public footpath.

They also stated that it would be an unattractive and dominating feature. The scale and design of the installation would be incongruous in this setting. Consequently, regardless of the colour finish that could be used on the equipment, the Inspector concluded that the siting and appearance of the proposal would significantly harm the street scene and the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the design and setting aspirations set out in paragraph 135 of the Framework.

*Highway & pedestrian safety*

In terms of pedestrian safety, the width would be sufficient for most pedestrian movements, allowing people to pass in opposite directions. As such, the Inspector found no conflict with Sheffield Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies BE10, T8 and S10 and the NPPF with respect to this issue.

Conclusion

The Inspector concluded that the siting and appearance of the installation

would have harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, they considered that it has not been demonstrated that the amount of harm is outweighed by the need for the installation to be sited as proposed, taking into account any suitable alternatives. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

(viii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse prior notification for the erection of Apollo Medium Duty 20m High VF ARV2 Pole, including 6No. VF Antennas, 1no. GPS Module, and 1no. Lancaster Cabinet and 1no. SFMC Meter Cabinet and associated equipment (Application to determine if prior approval required for siting and appearance) at land opposite Ranmoor Gardens, Ranmoor Road, Sheffield, S10 3FR (Case No: 22/02855/TEL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue was:

- The effect of the siting and appearance of the proposed installation on the character and appearance of the area, with particular reference to the Ranmoor Conservation Area; and if any harm would occur, whether this is outweighed by the need for the installation to be sited as proposed taking into account any suitable alternatives.

The Inspector observed that the monopole would be significantly taller than existing streetlights, signs and the immediately surrounding buildings. In this regard it would be of disparate scale, especially given the absence of tall buildings on the skyline to its rear or significant trees nearby which might assist in filtering those views.

The Inspector concluded that the siting and appearance of the proposed monopole would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Ranmoor Conservation Area. Moreover, the harm identified would not be outweighed by the need for that installation to be sited as proposed taking into account any suitable alternatives. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

(ix) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of dwellinghouse and associated landscaping at curtilage of 57 Snaithing Lane, Sheffield, S10 3LF (Case No: 22/02392/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

In the view of the Inspector the development result in visual harm to the overall character of the area by reason of excessive scale, bulk and mass of the proposal.



In addition, they took the view that the contemporary design and detailing proposed is not consistent with the varied styles of development in the nearby area and would not be an acceptable design approach to use in terms of materials and architectural style.

Overall, and taking all matters into consideration, the Inspector concluded that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered against the NPPF and resolved to dismiss the appeal.

#### 4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse advertisement consent for the installation of 2x 48 sheet freestanding LED illuminated advertising display units in 'double-sided' format at Holiday Inn Express, Blonk Street, Sheffield, S1 2AB (Case No: 23/02969/HOARD) has been allowed.

##### Officer Comment:-

The main issues were the effect of the advertisement on the amenity of the area and public safety.

The Inspector noted that the site has a general sense of openness but large commercial buildings dominate the area. The Royal Victoria Hotel, retaining wall and ramp are grade II listed buildings. They concluded that the hoarding would not detract from the setting of the listed hotel owing to the separation distance and intervening highway. They concluded that the hoarding would in some views partially obscure the listed ramp, however the large buildings would remain the dominant feature and the most sensitive views of the ramp would not be affected.

The Inspector noted that other signage in the area was relatively discreet, however in the context of the large surrounding commercial buildings they found the hoarding would not appear prominent or incongruous and would not harm the visual amenity of the locality.

With regards to public safety, the Inspector noted the adjacent public highway had clear sight lines allowing good visibility and the sign was not close to junctions. As such they found that the sign would not be harmful to highway safety.

#### 5.0 CIL APPEALS DECISIONS

Nothing to report.

#### 6.0 NEW ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

(i) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the Enforcement Notice served in respect of the breach of planning control as alleged in the Notice which is the unauthorised use of land as a car sales lot, the siting of a cabin and the provision of unauthorised signs at site of former 48 Savile Street, Sheffield, S4 7UD.

(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the Enforcement Notice served in respect of the breach of planning control as alleged in the Notice which is the unauthorised erection of a first floor extension, external stairway to front, railings and balustrade at 344 Sharrow Vale Road, Sheffield, S11 8ZP.

(iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the Enforcement Notice served in respect of the breach of planning control as alleged in the Notice which is the unauthorised material change of use of the Land to a mixed use that includes hand car wash, motor vehicle repairs, parking of vehicles and recovery lorries associated with the motor vehicle repair use, and the execution of the following associated operational development associated with the material change of use; the erection of a carwash / valet bay, erection of boundary fencing and display of adverts at Parson Cross Hotel, Deerlands Avenue, Sheffield, S5 8AA.

#### 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

*4 June 2024*