



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of City Growth Department

Date: 27 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
27 FEBRUARY 2018

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

<p>(i) 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 garage and erection of a dwellinghouse at 126 Ranby Road Sheffield S11 7AL (Case No 17/02872/FUL)</p>
<p>(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the installation of telecommunications equipment including 12.5m column, 2 transmission dishes, 2 equipment cabinets and ancillary development (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at Grass Verge At Bus Terminus Totley Brook Road Sheffield S17 3QS (Case No 17/01410/TEL)</p>
<p>(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 siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at the Outside 112 West Street Sheffield S1 4EP (Case No 17/03085/TEL)</p>
<p>(iv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Adjacent To John Lewis Barker's Pool Sheffield S1 2HB (Case No 17/03070/TEL)</p>
<p>(v) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at Tudor Square Sheffield S1 2LA (Case No 17/03174/TEL)</p>
<p>(vi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval</p>

required for siting and appearance) Outside 60 - 62 Pinstone Street Sheffield S1 2HN (Case No 17/03075/TEL)
(vii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Outside Central United Reformed Church 60 Norfolk Street Sheffield S1 2JB (Case No 17/03073/TEL)
(viii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Outside 2-4 Fitzalan Square Flat Street Sheffield S1 2AY (Case No 17/03084/TEL)
(viii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Adjacent To Castle House Angel Street Sheffield S3 8LN (Case No 17/03067/TEL)
(x) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Outside Stone The Crows 19 - 21 Barker's Pool Sheffield S1 2HB (Case No 17/03071/TEL)
(xi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Pavement Outside 48 Howard Street Sheffield S1 2LW (Case No 17/03093/TEL)
(xii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Pavement Outside The Moor Car Park Eyre Street Sheffield S1 4QY (Case No 17/03095/TEL)
(xiii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Adjacent To The Town Hall Surrey Street Sheffield S1 2LG (Case No 17/03097/TEL)
(xiv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse prior notification for the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) Adjacent To 38 Haymarket Sheffield S1 2AW (Case No 17/03099/TEL)

(xv) 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 front/side/rear extension to dwellinghouse at 70 Earl Marshal Road Sheffield S4 8LA (Case No 17/04524/FUL)

(xvi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the enforcement notice for fencing height at 83 Northern Avenue Sheffield S2 2JA (Case No 15/00346/ENUHD)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for 2 illuminated advertisement hoardings at 90-92 Harwood Street Sheffield S2 4SE (Case No 17/02148/ADV) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issue as being the effect on amenity including whether the adverts would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the John Street Conservation Area.

He noted the industrial and commercial nature of the area and the presence and large scale of the adjacent football stadium. Within the area he noted the wide range of advertisements including the two 48 sheet hoardings immediately adjacent to the site that are the subject of enforcement action.

He felt the large scale internally illuminated hoardings would be a prominent, dominant and intrusive feature on Bramall Lane that would fail to preserve and enhance the character of the John Street Conservation Area. He considered this to be less than substantial harm in the context of the NPPF (paras 131-134) but in the absence of public benefit (only private economic benefit for the appellant's business) this harm was not outweighed.

He concluded the adverts conflicted with policies BE13, BE15 and BE16 and dismissed the appeal.

(ii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for single-storey front and side extension, entrance portico to front, porch to side, installation of and replacement of windows to dwellinghouse at 185 Long Line Sheffield S11 7TX (Case No 17/03685/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issue as being a) whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including the effect on openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it; and b) the effect on the character of the property and surrounding area.

For a) he noted the increase in footprint over and above the original dwelling, at 33% met the Council's limit on proportionate additions and was satisfied the proposal was not therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt. An extension that is not disproportionate and therefore meets the exceptions in NPPF para 89 is not therefore subject to an assessment of openness.

For b) however, he considered the introduction of a portico element with columns and a pediment and its resultant impact on the roofline and front gable would lead to a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area due to its incompatible design.

He concluded the proposals were contrary to the aims of policies BE5, and CS74 and dismissed the appeal.

(iii) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse listed building consent for the replacement of wooden guttering with aluminium at 100 - 104 Townhead Road Sheffield S17 3GB (Case No 17/00698/LBC) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue was the effect of the proposed aluminium gutters on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Dore Conservation Area.

The works related to 3 of the 6 dwellings in the terrace and the existing timber gutters are an unusual feature that contributes to the special architectural interest of the building. The replacement aluminium gutters would have much cleaner lines and lack texture, despite having a painted finish akin to the timber ones present. He concluded this would have a harmful impact upon the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, and I turn the Conservation Area. In the context of paras 132-134 of the NPPF he considered the harm to be less than substantial, requiring the harm to be weighed against the public benefit.

He took into account the appellant's assertion that the gutters were under capacity and leading to drainage problems, including a sunken pavement however he felt there were other ways to resolve this problem and was not convinced this represented any public benefit to outweigh the harm.

He therefore concluded the proposal conflicted with policies BE16 and BE19 of the UDP and dismissed the appeal.

(iv) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse prior notification for the installation of telecommunications equipment including 12m column, 3 no. antennas, 3 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary development (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at Junction Of Arnold Avenue And Stoneley Crescent Sheffield S12 3JA (Case No 17/01460/TEL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Planning Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the street scene. She noted that the immediate surrounding area is open and undeveloped and contains a large area of grass and a few young trees, making the appeal site prominent. The open area has no existing built structures and is uncluttered, save for street lights. On this basis she felt that the proposal would be viewed as an isolated form of development, would be taller than the street lights and would be on a prominent corner and would be conspicuous. The need for telecommunications equipment did not outweigh the visual harm in this case. For these reasons she concluded that the installation would harm the appearance of the street scene and would be contrary to Policy BE14 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse advertisement consent for 2 non-illuminated parking signs and 2 illuminated banner signs at Site Of Betafence Wire Factory Lock House Road Sheffield S9 2RN (Case No 17/02339/ADV) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the Council originally issued a split decision and approved 4 illuminated name signs, 7 illuminated entrance signs, 1 illuminated exit sign, 1 illuminated collection point sign, 5 illuminated directional signs and 2 non-illuminated parking signs, such that the appeal is only in respect of 2 illuminated banner signs.

He noted that the main issues are the effect on the amenity of the area and on public safety. The high level signs are sited towards the eaves of the building and are 8m wide by 5m high. He felt that the large scale of the IKEA building provides a substantial backdrop and that the banner signs were of a design and scale that sit comfortably on the expanse of the elevations, rather than being obtrusive features. He did not consider that the signs would result in visual clutter when viewed with other existing signs and concluded that they would not harm the character and appearance of the building. He also concluded that there were no public safety issues.

He determined that the advertisements would not conflict with UDP Policy BE13 or Core Strategy Policy CS75.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to grant conditionally the erection of a temporary 2.4 metre high palisade boundary fence at Handley Street Sheffield S3 9LG (Case No 17/02482/FUL) has been allowed by deleting condition No 2.

Officer Comment:-

Planning permission was granted for the erection of a temporary fence subject to a condition requiring the removal of the fence by 22 August 2022. The applicant appealed against this condition, requesting a longer (undefined)

period.

The Inspector was of the view that there was no specific reason why a five year period had been given and taking into account the nature of the development, the presence of other similar fences in the area and the need for the fencing, he concluded that the restricted time period was not necessary, relevant or reasonable. This being the case, the Inspector deleted the condition.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Rob Murfin
Chief Planning Officer

27 February 2018

This page is intentionally left blank