



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of City Growth Department

Date: 12 June 2018

Subject: RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS
SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS

Author of Report: Marie Robinson 0114 2734218

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 12 JUNE 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) To report an appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for application to allow erection of single-storey side/rear extension, alterations to front boundary fence and demolition of existing garage/siting of garden shed at rear of dwellinghouse at 564 Prince Of Wales Road Sheffield S9 4ER (Case No 18/00361/FUL)</p>
<p>(ii) To report an appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for application to allow first-floor rear extension at Flat 3 3 Tenterden Road Sheffield S5 6AJ (Case No 18/00298/FUL)</p>
<p>(iii) To report an appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for application to allow the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at the pavement outside 11 Fargate Sheffield S1 2HE (Case No 17/03092/TEL)</p>
<p>(iv) To report an appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for application to allow the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at the pavement outside 51 Furnival Gate Sheffield S1 4HW (Case No 17/03094/TEL)</p>
<p>(v) To report an appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for application to allow the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) adjacent to 51 The Moor Sheffield S1 4PF (Case No 17/03096/TEL)</p>
<p>(vi) To report an appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for application to allow the siting of solar powered telephone kiosk (Application for</p>

determination if approval required for siting and appearance) adjacent to 6 Paternoster Row Sheffield S1 2BR (Case No 17/03098/TEL)

(vii) To report an appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for application to allow erection of a double-sided illuminated digital display at Park House Old Nunnery Station Bernard Road Sheffield S2 5BQ (Case No 17/04435/HOARD)

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) To report an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 storey block comprising 12x dwellings with associated vehicular access, car and cycle parking 62, 64 And 66 High Street Ecclesfield Sheffield S35 9XD (Case No 16/03410/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues to be:

- i) The effect of the proposal on the Ecclesfield local shopping centre
- ii) The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area,
- iii) Whether living conditions within the proposed flats would be satisfactory,
- iv) Whether adequate provision would be made for car parking and pedestrians within the site, and
- v) The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupants of adjoining properties

The Inspector considered, in relation to point i) above, that the character of the centre is one of the provision of goods and services. The removal of commercial units and replacing them with residential uses would have a harmful effect on the character and viability of the centre and so would be contrary to UDP Policy S10(a) and the NPPF

With regard to the character and appearance of the area, the Inspector felt that, due to the width and height of the building, the mass and uniformity of the roof and the bulk at the third floor and above, the proposed development would have an over-dominant, obtrusive and discordant appearance in the street scene, particularly as viewed relative to the adjacent two storey houses, contrary to UDP Policy BE5 and Core Strategy Policy CS74.

In respect of point iii), the proposed amenity space was considered by the Inspector to be an awkward shape with two parking spaces projecting into it and so was considered unsatisfactory. Outlook for occupants was considered acceptable. However, the ground floor flats would have patio doors close to

the footway on High Street close to a bus stop. These flats would be extensively overlooked and so would not provide sufficient privacy for occupants of these flats. This is contrary to UDP Policies BE5 and H5 In terms of parking and access as identified under item iv) above, the Inspector concluded that sufficient parking would be provided and safe passage for pedestrians could be provided so there would be no conflict with UDP Policies BE5 and H5.

The final issue of concern was the impact on the living conditions of occupants of the adjoining properties. In this respect, the Inspector considered that the distance to some adjoining properties would prevent overlooking whilst other elements of overlooking could be designed out. It was felt, however, that the proposed building would over-dominate the rear garden of 2 Picking Lane creating a gloomy feeling and poor outlook from the garden which would be harmful to their living conditions. It would not have such a harmful effect on other adjoining properties.

As the development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Picking Lane, the development was in conflict with UDP Policies Be5 and H5

There were no other matters considered that outweighed the harm caused and so the appeal was dismissed.

Award of Costs request

Members should also note that an application for costs against the Council was also dismissed.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for erection of a store room linking to existing shop including new external walls Walsh Premier Store 81 - 89 Galsworthy Road Sheffield S5 8QY (Case No 17/03147/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues were the impact on the adjoining resident and on the host property in respect of the development of amenity space for commercial storage.

The Inspector considered that the new external wall and roof would not add a significant amount of height and views from the neighbouring property would be minimal/ There would be no significant loss of light or impact on outlook for the neighbouring property.

There is living accommodation above the shop and the yard is the only external space available However, The Inspector considered that the space did not appear to be beneficial as amenity space for residents and so was not considered to overdevelop the site.

(ii) To report an appeal against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for 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 site of Grass Verge At Bus Terminus Totley Brook Road Sheffield S17 3QS (Case No 17/01410/TEL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issue as the effect of the siting, scale and appearance of the proposed installation on the character and appearance of the area.

He noted the site was a grassed traffic island within a local bus terminus that is set within a residential suburb.

He was satisfied there was a need for the facility within this area and that the improvement to network coverage weighs strongly in favour of this location.

The Council's concerns about clutter of street furniture were noted and the Inspector did not disagree that the equipment would add to visual clutter, and that the column would be prominent. He was not however convinced that in the context of other tall elements of street furniture, and a tall belt of trees that it would be unacceptably obtrusive or harmful.

Given the weight given to the demonstrated need for coverage improvement in this area and his conclusions on the visual harm, he allowed the appeal. In doing so he dismissed concerns expressed by local residents around the potential for anti- social behaviour, vandalism, and impact on human health.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

Rob Murfin
Chief Planning Officer

12 June 2018