

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

**APPLICATIONS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS / REGULATIONS – SUPPLEMENTARY
INFORMATION**

1. Application Number - 17/04961/REM

Address - Baldwin's Omega Ltd, Brincliffe Hill, Sheffield, S11 9DF

Additional Representations

Two further representations have been received. One from an address on Brincliffe Hill; and one on behalf of the local residents from Robert Bryan Planning. The Brincliffe Hill resident raises the following points:

- The entire carriageway associated with Brincliffe Hill is an unadopted public highway and the tracking information provided shows that the whole width of this unadopted highway would be required to get a longer high rise fire tender into the site. As a result, the carriageway would require parking restrictions and a change in status, which the residents of Brincliffe Hill would not agree to.
- The proposals would also lead to increased parking and use of Brincliffe Hill, which is also objected to.

In response, it is accepted that the carriageway associated with Brincliffe Hill is an unadopted public highway, but this does not have any bearing on the consideration of this application.

Tracking information has been provided to show that a high rise fire tender can also access the site from Chelsea Court, and the fire service has stated this is acceptable.

As such, the site is not reliant on Brincliffe Hill to allow access for this type of emergency vehicle and there is no suggestion that restrictions would need to be placed on the relevant section of Brincliffe Hill.

As covered in the main planning assessment, it is not anticipated that the approval of this development will result in any notable increases in vehicles parking or use of Brincliffe Hill. It could in fact reduce the pressures on this highway, as the current use of the application site allows general vehicle access from Brincliffe Hill.

Robert Bryan Planning raise very similar points in relation to the need for parking restrictions to facilitate the Brincliffe Hill fire service access but with the added assertion that under the terms of Article 13 of the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure Order 2015, as Brincliffe Hill is privately owned, it is necessary for the applicant to serve notice on the owners of Brincliffe Hill in order for the application and any resulting permission to be valid.

In response, as stated above there are no proposals for parking restrictions on Brincliffe Hill. The land on Brincliffe Hill does not form part of the application site and

it is not necessary for it to do so in order for the application to be valid. Therefore there is no requirement to notify the owners of Brincliffe Hill under Article 13 of the Town and Country Planning Development Procedure Order 2015.

In any event, given the above representation and others have been received from Brincliffe Hill residents, it is likely that the owners of Brincliffe Hill (unadopted highways are often owned by the residents of the road) have been made aware of the application due to receiving correspondence from the Council informing them of the application through neighbour notification and site notices.

2. Application Number 17/04889/FUL

Within The Curtilage Of 109 Hallam Grange Rise, Sheffield, S10 4BE

Report Clarification/correction

Page 83 of the agenda - RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS section of the report is blank.

Any representations received as part of the application have been considered in the main body of the report and 'other issues' section of the report.

Additional Representation

An additional objection was received on the 8 June 2018 from a resident of a neighbouring property that included two photographs, one showing a line of cars parked on Westminster Avenue adjacent to the site in the evening and early morning (no dates given), and the second, a photograph of the dwellinghouse's proposed access. The resident disagrees with the assessment in the planning report with regard to on-street parking and states that Westminster Avenue close to the development site cannot take more on-street parking and many times she has to park further down the street.

The resident also considers that the developer has allowed damage trees/shrubs to fall onto the SCC owned grass verge to make it look like it is their own land.

In response it is acknowledged that on street parking occurs on Westminster Avenue, however for the reasons set out in the officer report the development which includes off street parking for 1 vehicle is not considered to detrimentally affect highway safety.

In relation to the condition of the site and overgrown trees and shrubbery this is private matter between the relevant landowners.

Amended condition

Condition No. 11 should be reworded to remove the word (variable) from the text. The amended wording of the condition should now read as follows:-

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 1 (Classes A to H inclusive), Part 2 (Class A), or any Order revoking or re-enacting

that Order, no extensions, porches, garages, ancillary curtilage buildings, swimming pools, enclosures, fences, walls or alterations which materially affect the external appearance of the dwellinghouse shall be constructed without prior planning permission being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of the adjoining properties bearing in mind the restricted size of the curtilage.

3. Application Number: 17/4669/FUL

Address: Land to the east of the junction with School Street and Station Road, Mosborough

Additional Representation

A letter of support has been received from a local resident living on Station Road, which makes comment that:

The objections in respect of car parking on School Street which have been raised by local residents relate to a single day when the Rugby Club on Station Road held a family fun day and people came from far and wide all day long. This was a one off event which gave way to lots of cars parking where you would not normally see them. Other events such as matches at the Rugby Club are low key with most of the associated cars using the Rugby Club car park or the large disused bus layby on Station Road. Cars do not park on School Street on a daily basis and have not done so since the school closed some years ago.

4. Application Number 17/04664/FUL

Address Curtilage of 26 Rangeley Road, Sheffield S6 5DW

Additional representations

Four additional representations in objection to the scheme have been received.

Three further representations have been received from the occupier of No.18 Rangeley Road (in the form of two letters from the occupier of No.18 as well as a letter from Lewis Francis Blackburn Bray solicitors on behalf of No.18). A further objection from another local resident on Rangeley Road has also been received.

The representations made by No.18 re-iterate previous comments that have been made regarding the detrimental affect the development would have upon the amenity of the property as a result of overshadowing and loss of light.

The representation states that the application should be refused for the same reasons as the two previous outline applications on this site (submitted in 2011), and states that the development, if permitted, will have a permanent impact on the living conditions of the occupier of No.18. Concerns have also been raised regarding the existing boundary hedge which restricts light.

The letter from the solicitors (sent on behalf of No.18) identifies various 'right to light' case law. It also states that as ground floor room of No.18 is used as a living room/dining room/study a better level of light than might normally be expected is required. The letter goes on to state that development would not have sufficient off-street parking, with No.26 and the new property having only a single parking space each. It is stated that the gradient and width of the access is not compliant with the South Yorkshire Residential design Guide (SYRDG) and the development is not compliant with Policy H15 of the UDP and Policy CS74 of the Core Strategy (CS).

The other objection identifies that the proposal would be out of character and injurious to the street scene contrary to policy H14 of the UDP. It also states that house numbering of the properties on the street does not infer that the site was originally earmarked for development and that the gable of no.26 forms part of an attractive framing of the vista/view across the valley between the gaps in the houses.

In response a driveway at least 3m wide would be provided to the side of each property that is capable of accommodating 2 cars clear of the highway. The new property would utilise an existing access and a new access would be provided for No.26 which would have a maximum gradient of 1 in 6. The initial part of the driveway for the new property would be 4.5m wide, allowing for a separate pedestrian access.

The driveways would be steeper than the recommended 1 in 12 gradient; however given the steeply sloping nature of the site this cannot be achieved and to try and achieve this gradient would have more harm upon the street scene (in terms of land being dug out or built up). The driveways would be of a similar gradient to those of neighbouring properties.

The South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide was written to provide developers and local authorities with guidance when designing schemes and in the assessment of planning applications. The standards set out are applied by Sheffield City Council as best practise guidance. In addition not all of the technical details are applicable to smaller development schemes.

Taking account of the above a highways based refusal of the application could not be justified. The parking arrangements for the proposed development are considered acceptable from a highways safety perspective.

With regard to the two previous applications submitted in 2011 that were refused, in dealing with those applications concerns were raised over the impact that development would have upon the occupiers of neighbouring property in terms of overshadowing and loss of light.

In dealing with the current application similar concerns were raised, hence the amendments to the plans and submission of the light survey in support of the application. Officers are now satisfied that the proposed development would comply with BRE guidelines regarding light and the development would not result in a loss

of light of sufficient levels to warrant a refusal of the application. The development would comply with UDP Policy H15 as basic standards of daylight would still be provided. As stated in the Committee Report 'Right to Light' is not a planning matter.

The boundary hedge between No.18 and 26 is likely to be removed to facilitate the development. If planning permission is granted a condition has been recommended requiring full details of all boundary treatments to be provided before development commences.

In addition loss of view is not a planning consideration; however the affect upon the character and appearance of an area is. Rangeley Road slopes steeply and so users of the street would still be afforded far ranging views as they travel down the road. Gaps would still be maintained between the properties due to the provision of drives for each of the dwellings. These gaps would be similar in size to others along the road.

In terms of the visual impact the officer's report concludes that the development is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the street scene, which includes a variety of dwellings of differing style, age and appearance as a result of infill proposal similar to the current application.

The proposal is therefore not considered contrary to UDP Policy H14 or H15 and Core Strategy Policy CS74.

This page is intentionally left blank