

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of:	Director of City Growth Department 2 April 2019				
Date:					
Subject:	RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS				
Author of Report:	Marie Robinson 0114 2734218				
	d planning appeals and decisions received, together ne Inspector's reason for the decision				
Reasons for Recommer	ndations				
Recommendations:					
To Note					
Background Papers:					
Category of Report:	OPEN				

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

REPORT TO PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE 2 APRIL 2019

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 Replacement of door and windows to front of dwellinghouse and alterations to front boundary wall 80 Brincliffe Edge Road Sheffield S11 9BW (18/03005/FUL).

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i)To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for erection of up to 4no dwellings with integral garages including provision of two access roads and associated parking Land At Junction With Loxley Road Black Lane Sheffield S6 6RR (Case No 18/00177/OUT) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The inspector considered the main issue to be the effect the proposal had on the openness of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area; and if the proposal were to be inappropriate development, whether or not harm by reason of inappropriate, and any other harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to very special circumstances, necessary to justify the development.

He noted that the proposal did not represented limited infill development in a village and therefore the development represented inappropriate development In the Green Belt.

He noted that the sites openness was one of the sites defining characteristics and the proposal would substantially erode the distinctive openness of the site and have an encroaching effect through extending the built up area. He concluded the proposal was inappropriate development and would be in conflict with Policies GE1, GE3 and GE4 of the UDP, Policy CS71 of the Core Strategy and the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for erection of a dwellinghouse including integral garage At Land adjacent to 14 James Walton Drive, Sheffield S20 3GN has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, particularly the openness and local landscaping.

He noted that the site provides an important break between neighbouring developments and contributes to the openness of the footpath corridor and the semi-rural character and setting of the wider estate.

He concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be in conflict with Policy LR5 of the UDP, Policy CS47 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning consent for erection of dwellinghouse and ancillary detached garage to Curtilage Of 126 Bushey Wood Road Sheffield S17 3QD (Case No 18/01878/FUL) has been dismissed.

Office Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

She noted that the appeal site is part of the garden of an existing bungalow. Whilst she understood that the garden depth of the proposed dwelling would be compliant with the Council's usual space standards she noted that it would fall significantly below that of adjoining dwellings on Bushey Wood Road and it would sub-divide the plot and increase density above the prevailing norm in the area as well as diminish the generous spacing which is reflective of the surrounding character. It would be at odds with the established pattern of development in the area.

She concluded that the development would be contrary to Policies BE5 and H14 of the UDP and Policies CS26, CS31 and CS74 of the Core Strategy.

- 4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS ALLOWED
- 5.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DISMISSED

a	Λ	DE	\cap	111		١٨T	IONS	2
n.	u	RE	しいい	VIIVI	EINL	ж	ION	2

That the report be noted.

Colin Walker Interim Head of Planning

2 April 2019