



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

---

**Report of:** Director of City Growth Department

---

**Date:** 6 February 2018

---

**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  
6 FEBRUARY 2017

### 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 alterations to attic to form two studio flats (Additional to the 8 flats granted under 16/01228/FUL) (Re-submission of 17/00726/FUL) at 272 And 274 Glossop Road Sheffield S10 2HS (Case No 17/03468/FUL)
(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 existing dwellinghouse and erection of a dwellinghouse (Amended Plans Received 24th August 2017) at 11 Harewood Way Sheffield S11 9QR (Case No 17/01996/FUL)
(iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a porch to the front of a dwellinghouse at 3 Bannerdale Close, Sheffield S11 9FH (Case No 17/03152/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 a first floor side extension to dwellinghouse at Bentiholme Farm Bent Hills Lane Sheffield S35 0GE (Case No 17/04336/FUL)
(v) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse advertisement consent for a digital advertising display board at Barrel Inn 123 London Road Sheffield S2 4LE
(vi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a detached outbuilding to use as office accommodation in ancillary to number 7 Chelsea Rise at 7 Chelsea Rise Sheffield S11 9BS

### 3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decisions of the Council to refuse planning permission for “the installation of a freestanding payphone kiosk on the pavement” at: -

44 Leavygreave Road, Sheffield S3 7RD (Case No 17/01815/TEL)

221 Glossop Road, Sheffield S10 2GW (Case No 17/01816/TEL)

210-214 West Street, Sheffield S1 4EU (Case No 17/01817/TEL)

139 West Street, Sheffield S1 4GB (Case No 17/01818/TEL)

4-10 Blonk Street, Sheffield S3 8BH (Case No 17/01822/TEL)

Debenhams, 2-14 The Moor, Sheffield S1 3LR (Case No 17/01825/TEL)

78-82 The Moor, Sheffield S1 3LT (Case No 17/01826/TEL)

Deacon House, 32 Eyre Street, Sheffield S1 4QZ (Case No 17/01827/TEL)  
have been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered that the main issues in these appeals were the effect of the siting and appearance of the payphone kiosks on the character and appearance of the area and, in relation to 6 of the appeals, the effect of the kiosks on the safe and efficient operation of the highway.

In all of the above cases the Inspector concluded that, due to their siting and appearance each of the kiosks would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy BE10 of the Unitary Development Plan in respect of the design and environmental improvement of streets and pedestrian routes. The proposals were also found to be in conflict with Policies CS61 and CS74 of the Core Strategy which require development to respect and enhance the City’s townscape and provide a high quality pedestrian environment.

In respect of the six appeals that the Council were concerned with the impact of the kiosks on the safe and free movement of pedestrians, the Inspector concurred with that assessment and concluded that proposals would conflict with Policy BE10 and Policy CS61 which seek to ensure the safe and convenient movement of pedestrians within the city centre.

In respect of the National Planning Policy Framework the Inspector concluded that the kiosks did not represent a high quality of design.

He therefore dismissed all eight appeals.

(ii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for “the installation of a freestanding payphone kiosk on the pavement” at:-

25 Church Street, Sheffield S1 2GJ (Case No 17/01820/TEL)

30-34 High Street, Sheffield S1 2GE (Case No 17/01821/TEL)

45 Division Street, Sheffield S1 4GE (Case No 17/01823/TEL)

30 Arundel Gate, Sheffield S1 2PP (Case No 17/01824/TEL)

have been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

All of these appeals relate to sites within the City Centre Conservation Area.

The Inspector considered that the main issues in these appeals were the effect of the siting and appearance of the payphone kiosks on the character and appearance of the area, with due regard to the City Centre Conservation Area and, in relation to 2 of the appeals, the effect of the kiosks on the safe and efficient operation of the highway.

In all of the above cases the Inspector concluded that, due to their siting and appearance each of the kiosks would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the City Centre Conservation Area and would conflict with Policies BE10 and BE16 of the Unitary Development Plan in respect of the design and environmental improvement of streets and pedestrian routes and the impact on the Conservation Area. The proposals were also found to be in conflict with Policies CS61 and CS74 of the Core Strategy which require development to respect and enhance the City's townscape and provide a high quality pedestrian environment.

In respect of the two appeals that the Council were concerned with the impact of the kiosks on the safe and free movement of pedestrians, the Inspector concurred with that assessment and concluded that proposals would conflict with Policy BE10 and Policy CS61 which seek to ensure the safe and convenient movement of pedestrians within the city centre.

In respect of the National Planning Policy Framework the Inspector concluded that the kiosks did not represent a high quality of design and would cause harm to the City Centre Conservation Area.

He therefore dismissed all four appeals.

(iii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for a two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse at Roegate Cottage, Dungworth Green, Sheffield S6 6HE (Case No 17/02620/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues were whether the proposal was inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the effect on the openness and character of the Green Belt and, if the proposal was inappropriate, whether the harm was outweighed by other considerations sufficient to comprise very special circumstances.

The Inspector considered that the increase in volume of the building by 55% would be a disproportionate addition and so conflict with UDP policy. This being the case, the proposal should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

It was also considered that the extension would be visible in views across open land and from the highway being prominently visible as an incongruous large addition failing to complement the original dwelling. It would, therefore,

have a small impact on the openness and character of the Green Belt conflicting with the UDP and the NPPF.

As the development was inappropriate and harmed the character and openness of the Green Belt and no very special circumstances were found, the appeal was dismissed.

#### 4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a storm porch at The Corner House New Hall Farm New Hall Lane Sheffield S36 4AE (Case No 17/01847/FUL) has been allowed conditionally.

**Officer Comment:-**

The main issues were whether the proposal was inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the effect on the openness and character of the host building and the area.

The proposed porch is a relatively modest structure and the Inspector agreed with the Council that it would not be a disproportionate addition to the host building.

The Inspector considered that the character of the group of buildings had changed from that of a traditional farm appearance to have more of a residential character. It was also considered that, although the host building did have some of the characteristics of an agricultural building, the porch would not constitute an alien addition and provided it was to be constructed using sympathetic materials, it would not harm the character or appearance of the locality.

On this basis, the proposal was not considered to conflict with either local or national policies and so the appeal was allowed

#### 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Rob Murfin  
Chief Planning Officer

6 February 2018

This page is intentionally left blank