



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of City Growth Department

Date: 20 March 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 20 MARCH 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

(i) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse Advertisement Consent for the display of 1x internally illuminated 6-sheet sequential display unit on telephone kiosk for on the telephone box fronting 129Pinstone Street Sheffield S1 2HL (Case No 17/04108/HOARD)

(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse Advertisement Consent for the replacement of non-illuminated vinyl sign with 1x internally illuminated 6-sheet sequential display unit at the telephone box adjacent To Sheffield Hallam University Arundel Gate Sheffield S1 2PN (Case No 17/04109/HOARD)

(iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse Advertisement Consent for the replacement of non-illuminated vinyl sign with 1x internally illuminated 6-sheet sequential display unit at the telephone box adjacent to Sheffield Interchange Pond Street Sheffield S1 2BW (Case No 17/04116/HOARD)

(iv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse Advertisement Consent for the replacement of non-illuminated vinyl sign with 1x internally illuminated 6-sheet sequential display unit at the telephone box opposite Midland Station Sheaf Street Sheffield S1 2BP (Case No 17/04117/HOARD)

(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 the pavement outside the Town Hall Pinstone Street Sheffield S1 2HN (Case No 17/03091/TEL)

(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 required for siting and appearance) at pavement outside 2 Leopold Street Sheffield S1 2GY (Case No 17/03090/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) at pavement outside Bow House West Street City Centre Sheffield S1 4EP (Case No 17/03087/TEL)

(viii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse Planning Permission for the replacement windows/facade and addition of balconies to 1st , 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors at 40-50 Castle Square Sheffield S1 2GF (Case No 17/04660/FUL)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for a first-floor side extension at Bentiholme Farm Bent Hills Lane Sheffield S35 0GE (Case No 17/04336/FUL)

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues to be whether the proposal was, a) inappropriate development, b) its effect on the openness of the Green Belt, c) the effect on the character and appearance of the building and, d) if inappropriate, whether there were very special circumstances justifying the development

- a) The house has been previously extended. The proposed additional accommodation was considered, when taken into account with the earlier extensions, to be a disproportionate addition and therefore contrary to the NPPF, UDP Policy GE6 and Guideline 9 of the SPG “Designing House Extensions”
- b) Whilst the proposal would be noticeable, the Inspector considered that the effect would be limited and so the impact on openness was not significant.
- c) The appearance of the house has been significantly altered by earlier extensions and its visibility would be tempered by the proximity to larger buildings. The Inspector concluded that the effect on the character and appearance of the house would not be unacceptable.
- d) Whilst sympathetic to the applicant’s needs, these did not outweigh the strong protection given to Green Belts and so no “very special circumstances” were found to exist.

Accordingly, the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Rob Murfin
Chief Planning Officer

20 March 2018

This page is intentionally left blank