



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of Regeneration & Development Services

Date: 26 May 2015

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
26 May 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 delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a retail unit at 591 Staniforth Road Sheffield S9 4RD (Case No 14/03802/FUL)

(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the Council's decision at its meeting on the 28 October 2014 to refuse planning permission for the demolition of existing building, erection of a new convenience store with 3 x 2 bed apartments above including garages at lower ground floor level and external terrace areas to the first floor and roof area at Carterknowle Food And Wine 264 Carter Knowle Road Sheffield S7 2EB (Case No 14/01453/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for erection of a bungalow at Land Adjacent 8A Stuart Road Sheffield S35 1XP (Case No 14/02752/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector set out the main issues to be the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, the effect on living conditions of neighbouring properties in terms of outlook, light, privacy, noise and disturbance and on the safety and convenience of users of the access and of Stuart Road

The Inspector considered that the proposed bungalow design would be in keeping with other nearby bungalows but this would not be a substantial garden plot as were the others. It would be side by side with the host property with little space to the boundaries. It would have little space around it other than a shared parking area. It would, therefore, appear cramped and contrived detracting from the open character of this back land area. This being the case, the proposal did not constitute good design and would have an adverse impact on the character and impact of the area contrary to policies

H14 and CS74

The proposed building would be close to the boundaries of 134A and 134B Ecclesfield Road, both of which are at a lower level. Even with a hipped roof and shallow roof pitch, it would appear significantly taller than the boundary wall/fence and adversely affect the outlook from these properties. This would be made worse by the degree of overshadowing and sense of gloominess arising as a result of the position and height of the proposed building to the gardens and to a lesser extent, the windows of 134 A and B.

The parking area does not separate or delineate parking and turning areas. A number of manoeuvres would be needed to turn and to give way to any vehicles accessing the parking area or 8 Stuart Road's garage. This would be particularly the case if vehicles were already parked or if a number of arrivals/departures happened at the same time. This would cause unacceptable noise and disturbance for neighbouring occupiers, especially Nos. 8 and 10 Stuart Road and 134A and 134B Ecclesfield Road. The Inspector concluded therefore that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining properties contrary to Policy H14

The Inspector considered the proposed access and considered that with a 30 metre long drive leading to a relatively small parking area already used by occupiers of one dwelling would lead to obstruction and additional, less than satisfactory reversing manoeuvres. This would lead to increased manoeuvring and parking on Stuart Road, impeding the free and safe flow of traffic. This would be contrary to Policy H14

For these reasons, the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Maria Duffy
Acting Head of Planning

26 May 2015

This page is intentionally left blank