

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

APPLICATIONS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS / REGULATIONS – SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

1. **Application Number** **16/00640/OUT**
- Address** **Site Of Garage Block Rear Of 14 To 22 Marlcliffe
Road Sheffield S6 4AG**

Correction

Page 34, penultimate paragraph. Replace reference to Policy CS31 with CS23 (Locations for New Housing) and CS24 (Maximising the use of previously developed land).

Representations

Members are advised that a representation has sent in a second comment objecting to the proposal, raising concerns with regards to sewer capacity; privacy; impact on light; and access for emergency services. These matters are already covered in the report to committee.

A further representation has also been received making comments with regards to the officer report, with regards to comments that they believe are misleading or incorrect. These are summarised below:

- The present strip of open ground (not concreted) behind numbers 14-22 Marlcliffe Road is approximately 150 square metres, and comments that the footprint of the new houses will allow for more soft landscaping is misleading. The driveways are also deteriorating and include soft ground within them.
- Any requirement to reduce the slope of the driveway towards the pavement will increase the gradient of the drive as a whole.
- The number of vehicle movements at present is about 8-10 car movements per week. Two new houses will have movements of 56-84, which is considerably more. The report is incorrect in inferring that movements will be similar.
- Assertions that parked cars will limit vehicle speeds cannot be demonstrated. As the road is long and straight, car speeds are actually relatively high.
- On street parking is higher than inferred by the report due to the fact that several house do not use their drives. In addition, the nursery on the opposite side creates demands for parking.
- The application does not identify where the renters of the garages live, and should not infer that the garages are used more for storage than parking.
- The report negates to mention ambulance access to the site.

- Comments have also been received from the same representation re-iterating previous comments already addressed in the main report.
- With regards to the amount of soft landscaping presently on site, this is measured to be under 130 square metres. The indicative plans show garden areas of over 200 square metres in area. As such, there is disagreement with the figures given in the representation.
- With regards to highways, no change to existing gradients of the drives are sought. The car movements in the report are extrapolated from a logical assessment of the use of the garages and use of a standard family dwellinghouse.
- With regards to ambulance access, the houses are within 30m of Marlcliffe Road, and distances for paramedics would not be different to the level of access to a flat in an apartment complex for instance.
- Separation distances are referred to in the report.

2. Application Number 16/00622/FUL & 16/00623/LBC

Address Walkley Library South Road, Walkley, S6 3TD

Members are advised that a further representation has been received on behalf of the applicant requesting that the opening hours proposed allow for opening times of up to 0100 hours on Friday and Saturday nights (as well as Sundays prior to Bank Holidays). The comment iterates that the local characteristics of the area includes public houses where opening hours extend beyond midnight, and that noise would be caused by reducing the opening hours, and users would leave the site and access other public houses in the area.

In response to this, it is considered that the closest neighbouring public houses are all premises where no planning controls exist (having existed prior to 1947). The closest is more than 150m from the application site, and the area around the application site is quiet, especially after 0000 hours. Users leaving the site prior to this time would be unlikely to cause more nuisance than users remaining in the site after 0000 hours, who would be leaving the site at times when background noise is lower.

The committee report goes into some depth over why the hours of sales and operation should be restricted to 2330 and 0000 hours respectively, taking account of the fact that terraced housing lies immediately adjacent to the site on Walkley Road, whilst ground floor residential flats exist opposite on South Road. Given the lack of existing noise in the immediate vicinity late in the evening, late opening hours would increase late night noise from people talking and being picked up by taxi's, which would cause disturbance to neighbouring residential property at times when people would be expected to sleep. Although the proposed operator has a good track record of managing commercial licences premises, there is no control over the noise of people leaving the site available, which would be expected.

The comment received also explains that the applicant requires later opening hours to ensure delivery of a viable business. This is noted. However, a balance is

required between the opening hours and the needs of residents to benefit from suitable living conditions. In weighing up the benefits of the scheme against the disadvantages of the living conditions of residents, it is not considered reasonable to recommend longer opening hours in the context of the existing area.

Members are also advised that a further representation from a neighbour has been received commenting that they disagree that the loss of library space was unavoidable, and that the report on the scrutiny for the disposal of the library did not look at alternatives. This is noted. However, the matter of disposal is not a material planning consideration, and the recommendation is made in the context of the findings of the determination at scrutiny.

The representation also has requested a new consultation period is applied to allow representations to respond to emails from the applicant and agent and amended plans. This is noted. However, the scope of the amendments are minor, and the information provided is additional information upon deliveries, the mezzanine and the opening hours sought. It is not considered that the level of information received constitute material amendments to the scheme that require additional notification. In addition, comments received from neighbours and the applicant have still been received and publicised within the supplementary report to committee.

A third representation has also written in following publication of the officers report, and wishes it to be noted that consideration should be given to the flats behind the unit. These are considered in the report in general, which looks at the impact on the wider residential surroundings. The representation also re-iterates concerns with regards to parking, and that it cannot be relied on users being local residents. Matters concerning highways are considered in the existing report.

3. Application Number 15/03670/FUL

Address Site of 58 Ivy Park Road

2 additional representations of objection have been received.

1 relates to the following matters:

Will cause serious loss of existing garden space which will harm general character of neighbourhood, not in keeping with the concept of the Conservation Area;
Clearly a commercial development, style and size of the development are out of keeping with properties in the immediate vicinity and development will do nothing to enhance the character of the Ranmoor Conservation Area.

The other is from the Ranmoor Society who objects to the amended submissions:
There are few substantive changes, the amendment is sparse on written detail;
Still represents a severe overdevelopment of this site and all the concerns expressed about the previous submissions are still valid;
Although there are other sites in the Ranmoor Conservation Area which have been overdeveloped in the past this does not justify the proposed development;
10 flats is completely inappropriate;
Traffic based objections are still valid;
Site is ideal for a large family dwelling, at a pinch two substantial houses;

Concerned that this amendment has been allowed in this form rather than a withdrawal and resubmission.

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

The issues raised are considered in the report.

- 4. Application Number 15/02699/FUL**
- Address Silverpride Works, Matilda Street**

Additional Information

The applicant has submitted an addendum to the planning statement to take account of the change of use from open market housing to student housing. This issue is already addressed in the committee report.

Additional Representations

Two further letters of representation have been received, as detailed below.

One of the objections is from a previous objector. The contents of this representation are the same as the previous objections namely that:

- The concentration of student accommodation in the CIQ clearly contravenes Policy CS41 and so is contrary to the aims of this policy.
- The application is contrary to the planning statement submitted with the application which relates to open market housing
- The development is much larger than the vast majority of buildings in the locality and contrary to policy CS76
- Little evidence of sensitivity in the choices of materials, design and architectural form and contrary to policies BE5 and BE17.

A representation has also been received from a nearby factory (White Rose Works)

- The development is directly adjacent to a factory on the corner of Eyre Lane and Newton Lane, which was built in 1947 and manufactures cutlery and giftware
- Natural light is critical to the manufacturing process in the factory and there are a number of windows on the side elevation facing the proposed development
- The company has recently won the "Made in Sheffield" award
- If this development goes ahead the loss of light will put manufacturing jobs at risk
- Planners have the responsibility to protect the heritage of the city
- There is a question as to whether more student accommodation is more important than manufacturing jobs
- Strongly object to the application and consider that it will be detrimental to one of the city's last successful cutlery manufacturers

- The noise report only refers to the air handling plant and does not account for the large presses which stamp the products and make considerable noise and vibration between the hours of 7am and 6pm
- The business has been in operation for 67 years and so has established the right to these manufacturing processes
- If the development goes ahead the factory will not be able to see any sky from the ground floor polishing shops
- The business will seek injunctions to stop the development on the basis of loss of light (which is a right after 20 years)

All of the issues raised in the first representation are fully addressed in the main report.

The representation from the manufacturing company raises a issues which need to be considered in more detail.

The manufacturing unit is located at the junction of Newton Lane and Eyre Lane. The windows referred to in the representation are located 17 metres away from the development and are located to the south west of the development. Newton Lane and a yard area / low level building separate the site from this manufacturing unit. The height of the new development at this point is four storeys, which is well within the tolerances set out in the urban design compendium. The separation distance, coupled with the height and orientation are such that it is not considered that the development will be unacceptably overshadowing to this property. The issue of a legal right to light is a civil matter rather than a matter for this planning committee and there are separate processes in place which consider this issue. The planning judgement is one of amenity. Given that the site directly opposite the factory (immediately adjacent to the development site) was to be developed, it would not be unreasonable to suggest that a development of at least two storeys could be accommodated here (the same height as White Rose Works). This in itself would also have the potential to reduce the amount of light into the manufacturing works but there would be no basis for resisting such a proposal in planning terms as it would be of exactly the same scale as the manufacturing works. If a two storey building was located directly opposite the works, the eyeline view from the ground floor windows would be of this two storey building and not the four storeys of the proposed development presented here today.

A satisfactory noise assessment has been submitted with the application, this indicates that one of the noise measurements was taken directly opposite the factory to which the objections relate. The objection raises concerns that the stamping process which creates a lot of noise/vibration was not recorded on the noise survey. The site is separated from the factory by 17 metres and the presses and stamps referred to are not akin to a large forge. The Council's Environmental Protection Service is satisfied that satisfactory living conditions can be achieved and a condition has been attached to the application requiring suitable internal noise levels to be achieved for the apartments. In order to ensure that any issues of vibration (although unlikely) are suitably addressed it is proposed to amend the

condition to specifically reference this issue. These noise levels are subject to a validation test to confirm they have been achieved, this will ensure there is not a conflict between the student accommodation and the existing manufacturing use.

To date a legal agreement for the affordable housing contribution has not been signed, a decision will not be issued without this agreement.

Revised Condition 13

Before the words "Such works shall" add the words "*but before the construction of the building is commenced a further report dealing with any possible vibration from the nearby White Rose Works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The recommendations of the vibration report shall thereafter be adhered to in the construction of the development.*"