

## PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

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

**1. Application Number: 16/03726/FUL**

**Address: 52, 54, 65 Mayfield Court, West Street, S1 4EP**

Comments have been received by Historic England and are summarised below:

Historic England have no objection in principle, to the redevelopment of the site. However they are concerned with the height of the replacement building and consider that this will impact on the setting of the City Hall, Grade II\* Listed.

The views in the design and access statement demonstrate the prominence of the proposed development in comparison with adjacent buildings on West Street, Trippet Lane and key views of the City Hall from Barkers Pool and Balm Green.

Historic England consider that the design fails to respond to the character of West Street. In particular the upper floors and form of the roofscape are intrusive and lack the recessive quality and interest of the existing Mayfield Court. The height of the proposal is emphasised by the large expanse of glazing proposed for the upper storey which is at odds with the solid to void ratio displayed by existing buildings on West Street. The proposal lacks the visual interest and architectural detailing displayed by the existing building at ground and upper floors.

In its present form the proposed development fails to take account of the opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Consider that the development will cause some harm to the City Centre Conservation Area and the setting of a number of heritage assets including the Grade II\* City Hall. Recommend that this harm is weighed against the public benefits of the scheme as required by paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

Request that further consideration is given to the proposals and that the height is reduced and appearance improved.

#### Officer Response

The impact on the historic environment is assessed in the officer report, however in light of the above objection, the impact is now considered in more detail.

The NPPF provides guidance on the historic environment, the most relevant points are highlighted below:

Paragraph 126 advises that Local Planning Authorities should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Paragraph 128 states that applicants should describe the significance of any heritage asset affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

Paragraph 129 requires Local Planning Authorities to assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the development, including the effect on the setting of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that LPAs should take account of:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 132 states that any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraphs 133 and 134 state that if a development cannot be amended to avoid all harm, then the proposal should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

Paragraph 135 requires the effect on the significance of non-designated heritage assets in any planning application should be taken into account.

Whilst the development is located in close proximity to a number of listed buildings, it is not directly adjacent to any. The closest visual relationship exists between the City Hall and the new development, particularly in views along Cambridge Street and Balm Green. The development will undoubtedly be visible from these areas, however it is considered that its scale is not excessive given the separation distances and adjacent development along West Street. It is noted that a minimum distance of 65 metres separates the development from the City Hall and that buildings at 45 to 53 West Street are located in-between. Nevertheless, it is accepted that the impact of the building from these vantage points will be greater than the existing situation.

The site is located within the City Centre Conservation Area. The building is not identified as contributing to the special character of the Conservation Area and so its removal is acceptable. It is acknowledged that the scale of the building is large; however it is considered in context with its surroundings. It is of modern appearance and will create visual interest on West Street.

“Substantial harm’ is defined in the NPPF as proposals which would lead to a direct impact on the heritage asset, its total loss or a change in its setting. The proposal will not lead to any of these things. Historic England stated that the development would cause “some harm” and therefore this needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

The development will lead to the loss of an existing vacant building and its replacement with student accommodation. This is viewed positively as it will aid the regeneration of the City Centre and serve to enliven the area and improve the economy. It is considered that bringing the site back into use is in the public interest. The existing building has limited interaction with the street at ground floor level and does not add to the character of the Conservation Area. In comparison the replacement building has an active frontage, creating interaction with the street scene, again this is considered positively within the wider public interest.

On balance, Historic England's comments are acknowledged, however it is considered that the development will not lead to substantial harm to heritage assets and that its development is within the wider public interest.

**2. Application Number 15/03281/FUL**

**Address Greaves Lane Playing Field**

### **Representations**

One additional representation has been received from the Loxley Valley Protection Society who have asked that the following matters be brought to Member's attention as the LVPS will not be able to be present at the Committee meeting.

The LVPS remain concerned that the site was released by the Council for development of only half of the green open space for half the number of houses proposed.

Sport England has objected to the proposal.

The site is sustainable, being within easy walking distance of many local facilities. However, only four affordable houses are proposed when the site could benefit from more when payments from other developments for off-site affordable housing could be made available.

It is confirmed that a total of 52 letters of representation have been received from local residents. These are objections. A number of these representations have been received from the same person more than once and / or from the same household during the period of the application.

The key issues and concerns raised in the letters of objection remain as per those summarised in the Officer Report.

### **Amendment / Clarification to Officer Report**

With regard to a Transport Assessment, it is clarified that the statement referring to 50 movements during the peak am or pm hours (Page 185 of Public Information Pack) does not apply and is not relevant.

**Amended Condition No. 2:**

Amendments to Condition No. 2 to include all proposed House Types:

The development must be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved documents:

Site Layout - Dwg. No. 182.03.01 Rev. F  
Street Scenes, Site Sections and Levels - Rev. D

House Type L2 Rev. A  
House Type L3 – MOBILITY Rev. A  
House Type 3D6 Foxton Rev. H  
House Type 3D7 Bakewell Rev. H  
House Type 3D8 Cranmore MOBILITY Rev. M  
House Type 3D8 Cranmore Rev. M  
House Type 3S24 Pennymore Rev. G  
House Type 4D32V Kinston Rev. E  
House Type 4D32 (Corner) Revision A  
House Type 4D32 (to Greaves Lane only)  
House Type 4D36G Windsor Rev. D  
House Type 4D36S Windsor Special Rev. D  
House Type 4D48 Kempsey Rev. M  
House Type 4D44X Woodford Rev. J  
House Type 4D44X Woodford (MOBILITY) Rev. K  
House Type 4BLSpec. Rev. D

Single Garage  
Single Garage - Gable  
Pair Garage  
Double Garage - Hipped

Combined Phase I Desk Study and Phase II Exploratory Investigation by Geo Dyne (Project No. 36150, 14 September 2016) – in relation to land contamination purposes only.

Reason: In order to define the permission.

### **Amend Condition No.3:**

Amendments to Condition No. 3:

Notwithstanding the details set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (bsp Consulting, ref. 15448/FRA/Rev C 12/01/2017), no development shall take place until details of the following drainage works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority:

- The proposed surface water drainage design, including means of disposal of surface water drainage, details of any balancing works and off-site works, calculations, appropriate model results; and
- The arrangements and details for surface water infrastructure management for the life time of the development.

The scheme should be achieved by sustainable drainage methods whereby the management of water quantity and quality are provided. Should the design not include sustainable methods evidence must be provided to show why these methods are not feasible for this site. The surface water drainage scheme and its management shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. No part of the development shall be brought into use until the drainage works approved for that part have been completed.

Surface water discharge from the completed development site shall be restricted to a maximum flow rate of 5l/s, to the 225mm diameter public surface water sewer in Acorn Drive.

Unless otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority, there shall be no piped discharge of surface water from the development prior to the completion of the approved surface water drainage works.

Reason: To ensure that no surface water discharges take place until proper provision has been made for its disposal.

### **Additional Condition**

Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, House Type 4D32 – C at Plot 2 shall be built with stone heads and cills to all windows on the Front and Side Elevation (to street) as per all other proposed house types on the Greaves Lane frontage.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

**3. Application Number            16/03624/FUL**

**Address                                Site of 82-84 Winter Street**

### **Representation**

CycleSheffield have put forward a proposal for increasing safety for cyclists at the turn from Bolsover Street/Winter Street into the University at the Arts Tower and asked that this be brought to Member's attention.

This is not part of the application but has been forwarded to Highway Services for their consideration.

**4. Application Number            16/03464/FUL**

**Address                                Site of 79 – 81 Hollis Croft and Land Adjoining  
56 Garden Street**

**Amendment / Clarification to Officer Report**

The following items discussed in the Officer Report are clarified / amended:

- The site area is approximately 0.2ha and not 0.4ha as stated in the Officer Report resulting in an adjusted density of approximately 555 dwellings per hectare.
- It is confirmed that there is no cinema room within the development.
- It is confirmed that there are 20 cluster units and not 18 as stated in the 'Creating Mixed Communities' Section of the report.
- In relation to Vincent House, it is confirmed that the scale of the building on the site's western boundary is a total of 5 storeys. The fifth floor (upper level common room) will be predominantly glazed and set back from the main elevations meaning that the building's main facade will appear as a maximum 4 storey building at the site frontage. As the land rises to the south-west corner, the building follows the topography but maintains a constant roof height. The adjacent new block, running along the south west boundary, also reduces from 4 to 3 storeys in the south-west corner in order to improve the relationship to surrounding existing and proposed adjacent buildings.

It is confirmed that these amendments / clarification points do not result in a change to the planning assessment or recommendation.

### **Amended Condition No.2:**

Amend Condition to include updated plans:

The development must be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved documents:

26118 A(00)01 Location

S361 Topographical Survey

S361/ALL Toledo Works - Existing Floor Plans / Elevations

26118 A(01)01 EXISTING-Site

26118 A(01)02c PROPOSED-Site

26118 A(01)03 PROPOSED-Site And Context

26118 A(02)01j GAplans-PROPOSED-GF

26118 A(02)02k GAplans-PROPOSED-1F

26118 A(02)03k GAplans-PROPOSED-2F

26118 A(02)04h GAplans-PROPOSED-3F

26118 A(02)05g GAplans-PROPOSED-4F

26118 A(02)10b Accessible-GROUND

26118 A(02)11a Accessible-FIRST

26118 A(02)12a Accessible-SECOND

26118 A(02)13a Accessible-THIRD

26118 A(02)14a Accessible-FOURTH

26118 A(03)01a GASections-PROPOSED

26118 A(03)02b GASections-PROPOSED

26118 A(03)03b GASections-PROPOSED

26118 A(03)212 ConstructionSection A

26118 A(03)213 ConstructionSection B

26118 A(03)214 ConstructionSection C-D

26118 A(04)01c Elevations 1+2  
26118 A(04)02e Elevations 3+4  
26118 A(04)03e Elevations 5+6  
26118 A(04)04c Elevations 7+8  
26118 A(04)05f Elevations 9+10  
26118 A(04)06e Elevations 11+12  
26118 A(05)07 Pitched roof reduced  
26118 A(05)10 Street View Pitched  
26118 A(05)13 Section Courtyard 2 Pitched  
26118 A(05)16 Pitched roof reduced courtyard 3  
26118 A(05)19 Aerial View Hollis Croft  
26118 A(05)20 Aerial View Garden Street  
26118 A(05)21 Aerial View Garden Street West  
26118 A(82)01 Typical ACCESSIBLE

Reason: In order to define the permission.

### **Amended Condition 18**

To include the following additional large scale details:

- Lintel design – in relation to new building; and
- Blank windows / pseudo windows – in relation to new building.
- Details of proposed privacy screens – in relation to roof terrace.

### **Additional Condition:**

The following windows of shall be fully obscured to a minimum privacy standard of Level 4 Obscurity:

- South facing windows of Units 105-6, 205-6, 305-6, Mezzanine Studio 6 and Gallery 6; and
- West facing windows of Units – Apartment 1 L/D/K, Apartment 101 L/D/K

The approved obscurity measures shall thereafter be retained and at no time shall any part of the glazing revert to clear glass.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers in adjoining buildings within the development.

### **Additional Condition**

Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, before the development is commenced full details of the design of the boundary treatment proposed along the west boundary of the site (Shared with Vincent House) shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the proposed development and the adjoining buildings.

