



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2026

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004273

Site Of Former 27 Skew Hill, Sheffield S35 8QW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Scothern against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03050/OUT.
 - The development proposed is residential development of one dwelling (outline with all matters reserved)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for residential development of one dwelling (outline with all matters reserved) at Site of Former 27 Skew Hill, Sheffield S35 8QW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/03050/OUT subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal has been made in outline form with all matters reserved. The matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved matters and do not form part of this proposal. I have had regard to the plans submitted, however I have considered Existing Block Plan & Location Plan for determination, and Proposed site plan and Proposed Block Plan & Location Plan are regarded as indicative only.
3. There is a variation between the original description of development as shown on the application form and that used by the Council on its decision notice. However, I have taken the description of development as shown on the application form as this relates to what was applied for.
4. The Council is preparing a new local plan. However, it has not completed its examination and is subject to change. This limits the weight I can give any draft policies referred to in this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in the appeal is:
 - Whether or not the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

6. The appeal proposal is for a single dwellinghouse on a site located off Skew Hill, with an existing access. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraphs 154 and 155 of the Framework set out exceptions whereby development would not be inappropriate.
7. Policy GE1 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (1998) states that in the Green Belt, development will not be permitted except in very special circumstances where it would lead to unrestricted growth of the built-up area, contribute towards the merging of settlements, lead to encroachment of urban development into the countryside or compromise urban regeneration. Policy GE3 sets out that the construction of new buildings will not be permitted except in very special circumstances, or for the purposes listed within the policy. Policy GE4 seeks to conserve the landscape and natural environment of the Green Belt. Policy GE5 allows certain forms of residential development, including the replacement of an existing dwelling on the same site, provided the replacement is not larger than the building it replaces, as well as limited infilling in specified circumstances.
8. Collectively, these policies reflect a number of the objectives and criteria contained within the Framework. However, they pre-date the Framework and do not include any specific provision relating to development on grey belt land. Consequently, where relevant to that matter, I afford greater weight to the Framework.
9. It is agreed between the parties that the site should be considered as grey belt land. Paragraph 155 of the Framework states that the development of homes in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate development where certain criteria apply. In this case, based on the information before me and my observations on site, I am satisfied that in accordance with the glossary definition of grey belt within the Framework, that due to the location of the proposed development and the level of containment around the site that it would not contribute strongly to purposes (a), (b) or (d) of including land within the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 143. Which aligns with the Green Belt Review findings provided in the Council's officer report. In addition, the proposal would not affect areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) which would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.
10. Due to the small scale of the proposal for one dwelling, it would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. It would therefore meet criterion a) of paragraph 155 of the Framework.
11. Having regard to criterion b) which requires there to be a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed, based on the evidence before me, the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and do not dispute this in the evidence. The Council's evidence states that it can demonstrate a 3.07-year housing land supply. The proposal would contribute one net dwelling to the Council's housing land supply.
12. Turning to criterion c), which requires that the development be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework,

the appeal site is located under 300m south of Grenoside, which forms part of Sheffield's urban area and is visible from the site. Skew Hill serves several groups of properties between Grenoside and the appeal site, and planning permission has been granted for a dwelling adjoining the proposal site. In these circumstances, I do not consider the appeal property would be isolated or significantly less sustainable than nearby residential development.

13. The evidence indicates that a public house is located close to the junction of Skew Hill, with schools, shops and medical facilities situated around 1km away. Bus stops are located approximately 350m and 400m from the site, providing access to the public transport network. Although Skew Hill is unlit and lacks a footway, traffic volumes observed during my site visit, although a snapshot in time, were relatively low. Whilst walking is likely to be most desirable during daylight hours and favourable weather conditions, the short distance to services means it remains a realistic option.
14. The Council expressed concern that the gradient of Skew Hill would discourage pedestrian and cycle movements. Although the surrounding area is hilly, especially when approaching the appeal site from Fox Hill to the south, I did not find the gradient between the appeal site and Grenoside to be so steep as to present a significant barrier to walking or cycling. Furthermore, the appellant's evidence indicates that Skew Hill forms part of a National Cycle Network Route, supporting the conclusion that cycling represents a reasonable alternative to the private car.
15. Nevertheless, I accept that future occupiers would be likely to rely on the private car for many journeys. However, given the site's proximity to the urban area and local services, many such trips would be relatively short. Paragraph 110 of the Framework, states that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, therefore based on this, overall, I consider the site to occupy a reasonably accessible and sustainable location for one dwelling.
16. Due to the proposal being for one dwelling, which utilises an existing access and with space to provide on-site parking provision, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the transport network.
17. For the above reasons I am satisfied that the proposal would meet criterion c) of paragraph 155 of the Framework and would be acceptable having regard to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework.
18. Having regard to criterion d) of paragraph 155 of the Framework, as the proposal is not a major development, this does not apply. The appeal proposal would satisfy the criteria as set out in paragraph 155 of the Framework therefore, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
19. Accordingly, considering the effects on openness, other exceptions drawn to my attention, or very special circumstances would serve no purpose.
20. To conclude, for the above reasons, there would be conflict with Policies GE3 and GE5 of the UDP due to the type of development proposed. The proposal would also fail to accord with Policy CS23 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) which states that housing development will be limited to that which is consistent with policies for the Green Belt. However, I have not identified substantial conflict with Policy GE1 of the UDP which seeks to protect the green

belt from unrestricted growth, the merging of settlements, encroachment of urban development into the countryside or compromise urban regeneration.

21. Whilst there is conflict with the development plan, the proposal is grey belt and meets the criteria in paragraph 155 of the Framework, therefore, the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
22. The Council has referred to Policy GE4 in its reason for refusal. This relates to the scale and character of development, however due to the type of application with these matters mainly for future consideration, I find no specific conflict with this Policy when reaching my conclusion on the main issue.

Other Matters

23. The Council's archaeology adviser identifies the site as having archaeological potential because it encompasses the location of a historic farm shown on maps dating from the late eighteenth century, with subsequent nineteenth-century extensions. While the farm's origins are uncertain, it may date from the late medieval or early post-medieval period. As such, buried remains associated with its earliest phase could survive, particularly within the eastern part of the site, and may contribute to an understanding of the development of the surrounding historic farming landscape.
24. However, the Council's evidence considers any surviving remains to be of low local heritage significance and classifies them as non-designated heritage assets. Having regard to paragraph 216 of the Framework, and noting that a planning condition can secure appropriate archaeological investigation and recording in accordance with Policy BE22 of the UDP, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

Conditions

25. I have had regard to the list of conditions suggested by the Council including pre-commencement conditions which the appellant has had the opportunity to comment upon and which I have considered against advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). As a result, I have made some amendments for consistency and clarity purposes.
26. In addition to those suggested by the Council, in the interests of certainty I consider that conditions are necessary in respect of requiring that details of the reserved matters are submitted for approval and specifying when the reserved matters must be submitted by. Together with a condition specifying when the development permitted must be commenced by and specifying the approved plans.
27. I have imposed a condition requiring the submission and approval of details for sustainable surface water and foul water drainage prior to the commencement of development. The condition is necessary to ensure that adequate drainage is provided for the proposed dwelling, thereby preventing pollution of the water environment, particularly given that the site is not connected to the main sewerage network. The approved drainage measures shall be installed before the dwelling is first occupied and retained thereafter.
28. A condition has been included requiring a Written Scheme of Investigation that sets out a strategy for archaeological investigation. This is to be submitted prior to

commencement of development to ensure that the recording and mitigation is effective, in the interests of the historic environment.

29. I have included a condition relating to the installation of biodiversity enhancement measures as suggested in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and suggested by the Council as these would enhance the opportunity for biodiversity at the site.
30. The Council has suggested conditions requiring details of the car parking layout, external materials and finishes of the proposed development, boundary treatments and hard and soft landscape scheme to be submitted. These matters relate to the reserved matters for future consideration. Therefore, I do not consider these conditions to be necessary in this case.

Conclusion

31. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the Framework is a material consideration which in this case justifies a decision other than in accordance with the development plan, and the appeal should be allowed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale hereinafter called "the reserved matters" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
2. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
3. The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Drawing no. 25-026-EX01 Existing Block Plan & Location Plan
5. No development shall commence until full details of the proposed foul and sustainable surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Where infiltration systems are part of the drainage scheme, details of the infiltration systems, including assessment of site suitability for soakaways, soakaway test results, ground water levels, calculations and appropriate model results, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The foul and sustainable surface water drainage scheme and its management shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the dwellinghouse. The sustainable drainage system shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan.
6. No development, including any demolition and groundworks, shall take place until the applicant, or their agent or successor in title, has submitted a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) that sets out a strategy for archaeological investigation, and this has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The WSI shall include:
 - The programme and method of site investigation and recording.
 - The requirement to seek preservation in situ of identified features of importance.
 - The programme for post-investigation assessment.
 - The provision to be made for analysis and reporting.
 - The provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the results.
 - The provision to be made for deposition of the archive created.
 - Nomination of a competent person/persons or organisation to undertake the works.
 - The timetable for completion of all site investigation and post investigation works.

Part B (pre-occupation/use)

Thereafter the development shall only take place in accordance with the approved WSI and the development shall not be brought into use until the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that the requirements of the WSI have been fulfilled or alternative timescales agreed.

7. No development above floor slab level of the dwelling hereby approved shall commence until a low impact lighting design strategy and a scheme to implement the biodiversity enhancement measures as detailed in paragraph 7.2 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Estrada Ecology dated September 2025, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

END OF SCHEDULE