

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

APPLICATIONS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS / REGULATIONS – SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

1. **Application Number** **17/02175/FUL**

Address **352-354 Manchester Road, Stocksbridge**

Representations

Since the publication of the report, objections have been received from Councillors Crowther and Davis, the objections are as follows:

Cllr Crowther

This stretch of Manchester Road is busy and has been the site of multiple accidents. Parking for customers will clash with residential parking as the take-away will be open later than previous businesses at the premises.

This will lead to an imbalance and over-intensification of take-aways in the area.

Late night disturbance and odours will be a problem for residents as stated by the Environmental Protection Service.

The hours of use are not appropriate in a residential area.

The storage use will be in public view

The flue does not integrate into a residential area.

Cllr Davis

There are empty shops in Stocksbridge Town Centre where there are 9 fast food outlets

The road narrows here and has been the site of serious accidents, one quite recently.

There is no provision for off street parking without affecting residential property where young children play.

One additional representation has been received disagreeing with elements of the officer report. At the author's request, a copy of the representation has been sent to each Committee Member in advance of the meeting.

The concerns are:

- i) The proposed flue will be visible from the neighbour's garden although the report states it will not be visible from the neighbouring dwelling. It is felt the flue will affect neighbours.
- ii) If cars park on the opposite side of the road to the property, they will block the view of vehicles coming out of Ashfield Lane. Also, bins are shown to the side of the property preventing access to the rear parking area.
- iii) The building is being given more consideration than people who have lived there all their lives. Their living conditions will be compromised contrary to

UDP Policy H14 and the impact on the highway network has been ignored. There will be a massive impact on children who play out on the shared drive.

Response

- i) The flue is at the rear of the property running up the first floor elevation to terminate 1 metre above the eaves level. It will not be visible from the dwelling but will be seen from the rear garden area. The location of the flue is considered appropriate and the height is that normally accepted. Given this and the distance from neighbouring property, the positioning of the flue is considered acceptable. Full details are to be required by condition.
- ii) There are no parking restrictions along this stretch of Manchester Road Parking can be made available to the rear of the property as the bins indicated on the plans could readily be moved during opening hours. Highway Services have not objected to the proposal.
- iii) The comments made by residents have been considered as part of the assessment but proposals also have to be considered against National and Local planning policy and guidance as well as on the individual merits of the case. The shared drive mentioned is assumed to be that between the application property and No. 356. This is outside of the application site area so should not be used by customers of the property.

2. Application Number 17/01726/A&PN

Address 54A Sandygate Road

The “Prior Notification” process

This application has been submitted under recent legislation changes which, for units of 150 sq. m floorspace or less, allow changes of use from retail (A1) to cafes and restaurants (A3) under “Permitted Development “ rights, subject to the “Prior Notification” procedure being followed.

Under this procedure, Local Planning Authorities can only consider a specific range of criteria. (See page 46) If the proposal is acceptable under these criteria, the decision made has to be that Prior Approval is not required.

If the impacts are considered unacceptable under the stated criteria, but, like planning permissions, conditions can be applied to ensure the proposed use can be made acceptable under these criteria, then the decision has to be that Prior Approval is granted conditionally

If the concerns cannot be addressed by the imposing of conditions, then Prior Approval should be refused as it is not possible to address our concerns even with conditions applied.

On this case, conditions could be attached that would overcome the expected issues so the recommendation is that Prior Approval be granted conditionally

Correction

Page 50 – final paragraph. This should read “...Prior Approval of the Planning Authority is required in this case. However, for the reasons highlighted, it is recommended that approval be granted subject to conditions.”

Whilst such an application would normally be dealt with under delegated powers, the number of representations made is significant and so it was considered appropriate to report the application to Committee for a decision.

Recommendation

Prior Approval Granted Conditionally

3. Application Number 17/00675/FUL

Address Wake Smith & Co, 68 Clarkehouse Road

The following comment is mistakenly included within the Summary and Recommendation Section of the report ‘Need an element on here reflecting Conservation Area/Heritage Assets impact – perhaps reiterating less than substantial harm vs public benefit.’

This comment formed part of the editing process and should be disregarded.

This page is intentionally left blank