

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

REPORT TO WEST AND NORTH
PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS
COMMITTEE
23 OCTOBER 2012

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 APPEALS DECISIONS - ALLOWED

i) An appeal has been allowed, conditionally, against the decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission, under delegated powers on 10th November 2011, for the erection of a dormer bungalow in the garden at Brook Lodge, 185 Brookhouse Hill, Fulwood, Sheffield, S10 3TE (Case No 11/03065/FUL).

Officer Comment:-

Although within the Fulwood Conservation Area, the Inspector considered that the bungalow would have a garden of comparable size to existing houses in the area and would leave the existing house with a garden of appropriate and considerable size and still in character with the neighbourhood.

The area contains trees walls and hedges and the dwelling, having a low profile and being a distance from vantage points would not be noticeable from the Conservation Area or the Green Belt nearby. There are no highways objections to the proposal and the access for the proposed dwelling being in front of the existing houses was not considered to be a problem for existing residents, in terms of the creation of significant noise or disturbance. Accordingly, the appeal was allowed.

ii) An appeal has been allowed, conditionally, against the decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission, under delegated powers on 11th June 2012, for a single-storey side extension to a dwellinghouse at 71 Studfield Hill, Sheffield, S6 4SH (Case No 12/01073/FUL).

Officer Comment:-

The main issue here was the impact of the proposed extension on the property and the street scene.

The Inspector found that the proposed extension would be built in matching materials with a hipped roof. This not be detrimental to the street scene of the original house. The extension needed to be large enough to enable carers to have adequate working space.

The extension would, in the Inspector's view, be barely visible from the neighbouring property and have no harmful effects on the amenities of nearby occupiers. Similarly, it was considered that there would be no significant detrimental effect on the streetscene. This being the case, the Inspector allowed the appeal.

iii) An appeal has been allowed, conditionally, against the decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission, at its meeting held on 15th February 2012, for the erection of 5 x one/two bedroom flats/maisonettes in a two-storey block with rooms in the roof space at the garage block between Barnsley Road and 89 Idsworth Road, Fir Vale, Sheffield, S5 6UN (Case No 11/03581/FUL).

Officer Comment:-

The proposal replaces a garage court and although it is at a high density, the Inspector considered that the development would provide a building that is in character with the area, would support the creation of balanced communities, and be an efficient use of land. It was also noted that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land.

The Inspector agreed that the development did not provide private amenity space to the amount required in guidance but felt that this was not a "hard and fast requirement" acknowledging that the amount to be provided can be relative to the quality, quantity and accessibility of other local open space.

The development was also not considered to impinge on the amenities of neighbouring residents. The scheme was not found to be an overdevelopment of the site.

When considering the level of car parking provided, the Inspector considered that the location of the site was in a sustainable location, close to many facilities. Given this location, all residents may not feel the need to own a car. The development could make a contribution to balancing the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes.

iv) An appeal has been allowed to vary a condition imposed by the City Council, under delegated powers on 5th April 2012, in respect of granting planning permission, for the amendments to house type (Plot 1) previously approved by Case Nos. 06/04303/FUL and 10/01196/FUL at Barncliffe House, 17 Redmires Road, Sandygate, Sheffield, S10 4LA (Case No 12/00322/FUL)

Officer Comment:-

This appeal relates to the condition imposed on the new dwelling to have obscured glazing to all side windows facing towards No. 451 Sandygate Road. The main issue being whether the condition was necessary and reasonable.

Of the four windows, the northernmost two provide light to a stair well, the other two, to the living room.

The Inspector considered that the views from the living room windows would be filtered by the Beech hedge on the boundary and, at a distance of 24 metres from the boundary, would not provide sustained views and so felt that they would not cause harmful overlooking or a perception of overlooking.

The condition was therefore varied by the Inspector, requiring only the northernmost two windows, to the stairwell, to be obscurely glazed.

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

i) An appeal has been dismissed against the decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission, under delegated powers on 17th April 2012, for the erection of a dwellinghouse with parking provision to the rear of Tudor Lodge, Long Lane, Stannington, Sheffield, S6 6EE (Case No 12/00465/FUL).

Officer Comment:-

The main issue considered by the Inspector was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

The dwelling would require the removal of some semi-mature trees within the site to make way for it. The dwelling is also proposed to have a tall, asymmetrically pitched roof whose profile would be visible from the driveway. The Inspector considered that it would represent a departure from the pattern of development, with the roof sitting awkwardly when viewed with the other dwellings. It was felt that it would appear as a discordant and possibly jarring feature in its setting.

Furthermore, the proposal would leave both itself and the original house with confined garden space and with it running close to the site boundary; it would have a cramped appearance. The proposed access would cut across an otherwise untouched verge, underlining its intrusiveness.

Taking these points into consideration, the Inspector was of the opinion that it would harm the character of the area and would conflict with Policy H14, and CS74 and paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

David Caulfield
Head of Planning

23 October 2012

This page is intentionally left blank