



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of City Growth Department

Date: 30 November 2021

Subject: RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS
SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS

Author of Report: Abby Hartley

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

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 the Demolition of existing outbuilding (former shelter) and erection of single-storey building to provide home office and storeroom, erection of single-storey flat roofed building (part subterranean) to provide garden store and garage for two vehicles with provision of associated soft landscaping (resubmission of application 20/01220/FUL) at The Hall, The Old Mayfield School, David Lane, Sheffield, S10 4PH (Case No: 21/03066/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 erection of a single-storey rear extension - the extension will be 6 metres from the rear of the original dwellinghouse, overall height no more than 3 metres and height to the eaves of 3 metres at 343 Deerlands Avenue, Sheffield, S5 8AA (Case No: 21/02923/HPN).

(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 single-storey detached outbuilding to be used as garage to side of dwellinghouse (resubmission of planning application 20/03251/FUL) at 8 Plumbley Lane, Sheffield, S20 5BJ (Case No: 21/02225/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 the erection of side/front extension to dormer bungalow including erection of dormer window to provide additional accommodation at both ground and first floor level with provision of raised decking to side at 1 Brook Lane, Hackenthorpe, Sheffield, S12 4LF (Case No: 21/02119/FUL).

(v) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the alterations to allow use of dwellinghouse as two dwellings at 170 Fife Street, Sheffield, S9 1NR (Case No: 21/01904/FUL).

(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 single-storey side/rear extension including basement/undercroft store room, erection of front porch to dwellinghouse and formation of stairs into rear garden at 47 Crawshaw Grove, Sheffield, S8 7EA (Case No: 21/01052/FUL).

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – DISMISSED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a single-storey front extension with balcony/terrace above, conversion of existing garage space to form additional living accommodation and alterations to fenestration of dwellinghouse at 8 Ranmoor Gardens, Sheffield, S10 3FR (Case No: 21/01996/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues in this case were:

- i) Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ranmoor Conservation Area.
- ii) The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regard to privacy.
- iii) The effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

The Inspector noted that the proposed garage extension would project well forward of the existing front elevation, almost to the highway edge, disrupting the established building line and failing to respond positively to the context of the area. He considered the loss of the small garden area to front of the property would also be harmful to the appearance of the dwelling and the development. Overall, he felt that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA and, while he found that harm to be less than substantial, he identified no public benefits to outweigh the harm that would be caused

In relation to its impact on living conditions he found the proposed balcony to be of ample size to encourage sitting out and other activities. Consequently, the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy (particularly to the immediately adjacent properties) was to be far greater than that possible from the smaller balconies found elsewhere on the development from where the potential for privacy loss is much more restricted.

In relation to highway safety the Inspector found that the forward projection of the extension would likely lead to access and visibility issues and a potential impact on highway safety.

He concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to

refuse planning permission for the erection of detached single garage with under floor storage to side of dwellinghouse at 2 Stephen Drive, Grenoside, Sheffield, S35 8QY (Case No: 21/01018/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues in this case were:

- i) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area bearing in mind the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the adjacent Grenoside Conservation Area.
- ii) The effect of the proposal on highway safety.

The Inspector noted the proposed garage would occupy much of the existing driveway and be positioned well forward of the building lines of both the host dwelling and the neighbouring property fronting Stephen Lane. Also, due to the significant change in ground levels, the garage would appear particularly prominent in the streetscene on Stephen Lane and Stephen Drive, dominating the immediate surroundings of the road junction.

He found that the proposal would result in a visually obtrusive form of development which fails to respond positively to the context of the area and would thus detract from the appearance and setting of the CA and be harmful to its significance. While he found that harm to be less than substantial, he identified no public benefits to outweigh the harm that would be caused.

In relation to highway safety the Inspector noted that the driveway is already used for parking, and whilst the garage would hinder visibility and add to the difficulty of manoeuvring, he considered that this would not be to a degree that would have a materially harmful effect on highway safety.

He concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 3 single-storey dwellinghouses and provision of car parking and amenity space 151-153 Thompson Hill, Sheffield, S35 4JS (Case No: 21/00482/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue in this case was the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to noise, disturbance and activity associated with vehicle movements.

The Inspector noted that the new access would give rise to the movement of vehicles associated with the three proposed dwellings along almost the full length of the boundary with no. 149 and what would be the boundary with no. 151. Given the number of dwellings proposed, they felt that the use of the proposed access would result in an unreasonable amount of noise and

disturbance associated with vehicle movements passing in close proximity to the rear gardens of these properties, where a degree of quiet enjoyment would be expected.

The Inspector noted that eight proposed parking spaces and a manoeuvring area would be located adjacent to the rear gardens of 149, 139 and 137 Thompson Hill, resulting in noise and disturbance, including from manoeuvring vehicles and the closing of doors as people enter and leave the vehicles, in close proximity to them. They felt that the level of disturbance would be substantially different to that experienced from the two cars already parked at the proposed access. As the proposed dwellings would be located in close proximity to the access road, they felt that future occupiers would also be subject to an unreasonable amount of noise, disturbance and general activity associated with vehicle movements.

The Inspector found that the appeal scheme would cause harm to the living conditions of existing and future occupiers, which would be significant and long lasting, and attached substantial weight to this. It was noted that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and moderate weight was attached to the contribution of three dwellings to the supply of housing in the area, with limited weight being attached to the social and economic benefits.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, as well as the Framework, and that there are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework in regard to housing supply, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should not succeed.

(iv) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 4 dwellinghouses and provision of associated car parking spaces and means of access (resubmission of 20/02269/FUL) at 10 High Matlock Road, Sheffield, S6 6AS (Case No: 20/04465/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue in this case was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector found that the proposed development, with two of the proposed dwellings to the rear with no street frontage, would be in marked contrast with the prevailing pattern of development in the vicinity and it would seriously undermine the urban grain and rhythm of plot frontages on this part of High Matlock Road, thereby representing an incongruous built form in this locality.

The Inspector felt that the appeal scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, which would be significant and long lasting, and attached substantial weight to this. Moderate weight was attached to the net

addition of three dwellings to the supply of housing in the area, with limited weight being attached to the social and economic benefits.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole as well as the Framework, and that there are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework in regard to housing supply, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore appeal should not succeed.

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 two-storey front extension including porch to dwellinghouse at 47 Vauxhall Road, Sheffield, S9 1LD (Case No: 21/02511/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue in this case was the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

The Inspector noted a wide variety of dwelling types and styles on Vauxhall Road, including a recently constructed three-storey block of flats opposite the site, and a lack of uniformity within the street scene resulting in an area which exhibits no strong prevailing character or especially local distinctiveness.

In this context the Inspector considered the proposed extension would not undermine the appearance of the host dwelling and would respect the character of the area to which it relates, particularly as the front of the extension would align with the building line established by the immediately adjacent terrace.

Although the extension would project by 2.3m, which exceeds the 1.5m recommended in the SPG, he felt this was reasonable given that it would abut the side gable elevation of the adjacent property and yet still be set back from the highway edge.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal represents an acceptable design solution that would harmonise with the style of the dwelling and respect the character and appearance of the area.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the demolition of single-storey side extension and erection of two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse at 39 Stanwood Crescent, Sheffield, S6 5JA (Case No: 21/00879/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue in this case was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, having particular regard to the Stanwood Crescent/Stanwood Avenue street scene.

The Inspector noted that the contemporary design of the proposal would contrast with the traditional form and character of the host dwelling and would be different in form and appearance to other extensions in Stanwood Crescent. However, it would not project forward of the front elevation and the form and scale of the extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling. There would be adequate separation distance to the road to ensure that it would not project forward to an unacceptable degree nor appear unduly prominent or intrusive in the street scene.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed extension would be an appropriate addition to the host dwelling and would not harm the spacious and established character of the Stanwood Crescent/Stanwood Avenue street scene.

5.0 CIL APPEALS DECISIONS

Nothing to report.

6.0 NEW ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

Nothing to report.

7.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DISMISSED

Nothing to report.

8.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS ALLOWED

Nothing to report.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted.

Michael Johnson
Head of Planning

30 November 2021

This page is intentionally left blank