



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL West & North Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: Director of Development Services

Date: 22 JANUARY 2013

Subject: RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS
SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS

Author of Report: Sue McGrail 0114 2734404

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 WEST AND NORTH
PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS
COMMITTEE
22 JANUARY 2013

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

An appeal has been allowed by the Secretary of State against the Delegated decision of the City Council for the retention of a decked area and conservatory onto existing rear patio at 23 Stumperlowe View (Case No 12/01589/FUL)

Officer Comment:-

The appeal was submitted in order to remove a condition from the permission granted. This condition required the glazing in the elevation of the conservatory facing towards No. 25 Stumperlowe View to be obscure glazing.

On his visit, the Inspector found that a 1.8 metre fence, required by condition 2 imposed on the permission had been provided and that this fence effectively prevents anything other than a glimpse of the neighbouring property from normal eye level from the decking.

The Inspector also considered that as there was a step up from the decking into the conservatory, there could be greater overlooking to the neighbouring property. However, he concluded that this increased floor level height did not raise his eye level to a degree where intrusive surveillance could be carried out.

The situation was also checked from the neighbouring property where the Inspector felt that the extent of any inter-visibility would be limited.

His overall conclusion was that the requirement for a 1.8 metre fence in condition 2 was sufficient to prevent intrusive overlooking and so condition 3 requiring obscure glazing was not justified and could be deleted.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

David Caulfield
Head of Planning

22nd January 2013

This page is intentionally left blank