



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of City Growth Services

Date: 30 May 2017

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

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 a two-storey side extension including juliet balcony to front of dwellinghouse at 71 Dalewood Road Sheffield S8 0EE (Case No 16/04021/FUL)

(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the non-determination of planning permission for the demolition of public house and erection of single/two-storey retail unit (Use Class A1) with associated parking accommodation, automated teller machine (ATM) and plant and equipment (Amended plans scanned 17 January 2017) at Cherry Tree Inn 2 Carter Knowle Avenue Sheffield S11 9FU (Case No 16/02791/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for the alterations to and use of former warehouse / office unit as dwellinghouse at Land To The Rear Of 15 To 17 Orchard Lane Beighton Sheffield S20 1EW (Case No 16/04157/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues in this case to be (a) the effect on the character of the local area; (b) whether satisfactory living conditions can be provided for future occupants; and (c) the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of users of the access.

On the first issue they concluded that the benefit of improving the appearance of the building with no architectural merit did not outweigh the retention of an incongruous structure out of scale and character with the surrounding neighbouring properties.

On the second issue they concluded that the dwelling would be dominated by access, parking and turning areas and the garden would be directly overlooked, to the extent that the dwelling would not provide satisfactory living conditions for its occupants.

On the third issue they concluded that the access drive was too narrow and fell short of recommended guidelines, particularly bearing in mind the need to provide pedestrian access for the occupiers of numbers 15-17. The Inspector concluded that whilst the principle of residential development is acceptable in the area, the development failed to comply with all of the criteria in policies CS26, CS74 and BE5 and H14 for the reasons cited above.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Rob Murfin
Chief Planning Officer

30 May 2017

This page is intentionally left blank