

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

APPLICATIONS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS / REGULATIONS – SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

1. **Application Number** 16/01375/FUL
- Address** Quarry Motors, The Yard, Rutland Street, Sheffield S3
 9PA

Additional Representations

2 additional representations of objection have been received (including one on behalf of 5 local businesses) relating to matters previously raised and to the following additional matters:

- current businesses on Rutland Street operate from early morning to late at night;
- Rutland Road is a route to the Northern General Accident and Emergency Hospital, surrounding streets are narrow so this is the only entrance as there is a low railway bridge on Woodside Road;
- site fails to comply with UDP Policy IB(f) and NPPF paragraph 109 as large vehicles exiting and entering the site will need to use the middle of the road which will result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety;
- if a TRO is being considered to make it easier to enter and exit the proposed site it clearly demonstrates that this is not suitable for the size of vehicle that will be using the site;

- a noise impact statement stating that the development would have a low noise impact has not been confirmed by the Council's environmental health officer, this could have effects on wider area such as residential properties;
- even if best techniques are employed there is no guarantee that there would not be emissions affecting health and welfare of the public;

- needs an in depth visual assessment rather than the impact being mitigated by the existence of trees particularly in winter time, the total overall height is not stated in the report, the application does not comply with UDP Policy IB9(c), scale and nature of the operation will create an unacceptable and detrimental visual and environmental impact to that of the semi-permanent containers and stacked scrap currently on the site, this type of development is out of sync and not in line with existing structures, the structures will continually dominate the visual environment for future generations;

- this application contradicts the Council's vision for the area as per Sheffield Core Strategy;
- Policies IB6, CS11 and CS6 would not be satisfied if the application went ahead, it would detract from the regeneration of the centre which appears to be extending to the proposed site, it does not materially compliment the physical renewal of the area, it would maintain the area as industrial, it is not the commercial type envisaged in the Kelham Action Plan;
- there is doubtful evidence that there will be an increase in employment over and above those affected.

Correction

In the Highway and Transportation Issues part of the main report (fourth para) it refers to 'the railway bridge over Rutland Street ...'. This should be 'the railway bridge over Rutland Road ...'.

Planning Assessment

The highway matters raised have been considered in the main report. The existing road network can accommodate the increase in traffic generated by the proposal. One of the recommended conditions (condition no. 8) seeks to secure the detailed design of the access arrangements. The aim of this condition is to deliver a satisfactory access avoiding the need for waiting/loading restrictions on Rutland Street and retaining parking between the widened accesses.

The noise, dust and odour matters have been addressed in the main report. Conditions are recommended to provide adequate controls over noise, dust and odour. The recommended noise condition includes provision for pre-commencement reporting of mitigation measures and verification of achieved noise targets.

The heights of the proposed structures are stated and assessed in the main report.

The proposed use would not conflict with land use policy for the area. Conditions are recommended to secure mitigation measures where necessary which will ensure that there would be no significant impact on the opportunities for delivering housing at Stanley Fields.

- 2. Application Number 18/02919/FUL**
- Address 70 Gell Street S3 7QW**

Additional Representations

Two additional representations have been received (from neighbours who have commented previously) since the amended plans reducing the scale of the outbuilding were submitted.

Members should note that neighbours were not re-consulted formally about these proposals given that they represented a reduction in scale compared to the originally submitted plans.

The comments can be summarised as follows:

- Appreciate the change in roofing material but the drop in height is only slight and the structure will still be well above the height of the garden wall
- This row of 1806 terraced houses is unique for Sheffield with sunken courtyards and gardens being an unusual feature only seen from neighbouring houses
- The proposed development is not in keeping with the age and uniqueness of this terrace and the amendment does not alter the fact that the proposal is out of character for this treasured terrace.

- The roof of the kitchen extension offers a vantage point to look through the windows of neighbouring properties.
- The outbuilding is still too high and will offer a higher vantage point from which to invade the privacy of neighbours.

In response to these comments, the ridge of the outbuilding will be just 30cm above the rear boundary wall, which it is considered, would be inconsequential. The overall height of the outbuilding is 2.95 metres to the top of the ridge (just 45 cm higher than one which could be built without planning permission). It is accepted that the row of terraced properties is an important non-designated heritage asset. Nevertheless, the terrace is not listed and nor does it fall within an Article 4 Direction area. As such the terrace benefits from permitted development rights to extend. The contemporary addition is deliberately in contrast to the original property to provide a clear distinction between old and new, rather than a pastiche response. The roof of the extension will not be utilised as a roof terrace so cannot be considered a vantage point. It is not clear how the outbuilding could be considered to invade the privacy of neighbours given that there are no windows within it and this area of the garden could be used as a sitting area in any event, with or without the outbuilding.

In considering this application Members are reminded that in this case the 'designated heritage asset' as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework is the wider conservation area which has a designated status, rather than the individual terrace of houses.

It follows, therefore, that when considering the impact of this development on the significance of the designated heritage asset, it is the impact on the conservation area as a whole that is being considered in this case.

'Conservation' is defined in the NPPF as "the process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset (in this case the conservation area) in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance."

In this case we have given weight to the conservation of the heritage asset as a whole because we are managing the change to it in a way which officers believe sustains the significance of the conservation area. As alluded to earlier, this property can be extended without the need for planning permission and in a way which could potentially be damaging to the conservation area.

In your officers view this development does not result in harm to the designated heritage asset (the Hanover Conservation Area) as a whole. The building itself is a non-designated heritage asset (as it is referenced in the Conservation Area appraisal) and officers have exercised a balanced judgement in the consideration of this application, as required by paragraph 197 of the NPPF.

The proposed development has been subject to strong objections on the grounds of the impact on the Conservation Area and the host building. The proposal is an undoubtedly modern addition to the property and it is considered that this weighs in favour of the proposal in this case, particularly given the fall-back position of a permitted development extension which could be erected up to 4 metres in height, with consequential and damaging adjustments to the window above the extension (also permitted development).

In this case the extension is a maximum height of just under 2.7 metres, falling to 2.3 metres at the front of the extension. This allows the extension to sit underneath the existing window above, thereby preserving the character of the building in a much more sympathetic way.

Your officers (including the conservation team) have considered the proposals in detail and have concluded that the proposal will not harm the conservation area or the host building because it is a well-considered modern addition which will preserve the character of the conservation area. It is an appropriate response to this specific site and results in a development that complies with national and local planning policy.

3. Application Number 18/02224/FUL

Address White Acres Farm, Spout Lane

Submission from Agent

Since issuing the Committee Report the applicant has confirmed that there is an error on the application form. The proposed building would have an external appearance as shown on the plans (rendered finish with a metal roof) and not of natural stone walling with a slate roof as set out on the forms.

The applicant contends that all that is required externally to make the building habitable is for the walls to be rendered and the roofing materials changed. The applicant therefore feels that the development would be in accordance with paragraph 146 of the NPPF which sets out that '*Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:*

d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction'

The applicant also contends that the internal works are not development.

The Local Planning Authority does not accept these arguments. As discussed in the committee report, at the least, the existing cladding would have to be removed and block work walls erected upon to then render. Windows and doors would be added as well as a new roof. No structural report has been submitted to support the application. The works that would be required to turn the building into a dwellinghouse are considered to constitute operational development.

The application has been considered against paragraphs 143 -146 of the revised NPPF and the Officer's recommendation remains the same.

4. Application Number 18/02353/FUL

Address Curtilage of Croft House, 9 Nook End

Additional Conditions

14 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (and any order revoking and re-

enacting the order) no windows or other openings shall be formed in the side elevation facing south of the dwelling hereby permitted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining property.

- 15 No part of the rooflights proposed in the plane of the roof facing South shall extend below a height of 1.7metres from finished floor level of the room the rooflight serves

Reason: In the interests of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

5. Application Number 18/01760/FUL

Address Sylvester Street, Sheffield

Affordable Housing Update

Members will be aware that the applicant had proposed an affordable housing contribution of £51,265, at the lowest end of the range that followed viability sensitivity testing. This low offer was considered to be a negative aspect of the scheme.

We can now confirm that the applicant has made a revised offer of £322,235 towards affordable housing, which is at the top end of the sensitivity testing range.

The revised offer is welcomed and the affordable housing offer is no longer considered to be a negative aspect of the scheme (which is now limited to the less than substantial harm to the character and appearance, and thereby the significance of the CIQ Conservation Area).

The HEADS OF TERMS have been revised to reflect the new offer:

1. To pay a financial contribution of £322,235 to the Council towards affordable housing.
2. Covenant to secure the option of 3 year tenancies and the provision of all of the private market rental units for a minimum of 15 years.
3. Clawback arrangement, should the covenant be breached, to compensate for the loss of private market rental units based upon viability at the point of sale.

Amended conditions

In **conditions 3, 4 and 5**, reference to the *Detailed Remediation Strategy Report* has been replaced with *Detailed Remediation Method Statement* in order to align with the language used in the Outline Remediation Strategy.

3. Any remediation works outlined in the approved Outline Remediation Strategy (ref: WIE13067-100-S-2-3-2-RS, Issue 2-3-2, dated September 2018 (Waterman)) shall be the subject of a Detailed Remediation Method Statement which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the

Local Planning Authority prior to the development commencing. The Statement shall be prepared in accordance with Contaminated Land Report CLR11 (Environment Agency 2004) and Sheffield City Council policies relating to validation of capping measures and validation of gas protection measures.

Reason: In order to ensure that any contamination of the land is properly dealt with.

4. All development and associated remediation shall proceed in accordance with the recommendations of the approved Detailed Remediation Method Statement. In the event that remediation is unable to proceed in accordance with the approved Detailed Remediation Method Statement, or unexpected contamination is encountered at any stage of the development process, works should cease and the Local Planning Authority and Environmental Protection Service (tel: 0114 273 4651) should be contacted immediately. Revisions to the Detailed Remediation Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved revised Detailed Remediation Method Statement.

Reason: In order to ensure that any contamination of the land is properly dealt with.

5. Upon completion of any measures identified in the approved Detailed Remediation Method Statement or any approved revised Detailed Remediation Method Statement, a Validation Report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be brought into use until the Validation Report has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Validation Report shall be prepared in accordance with Contaminated Land Report CLR11 (Environment Agency 2004) and Sheffield City Council policies relating to validation of capping measures and validation of gas protection measures.

Reason: In order to ensure that any contamination of the land is properly dealt with.

In addition, **condition 7** has been amended to allow details relating to some specialist areas of detailed drainage design to be submitted following the commencement of development.

7. No development shall commence until full details of the proposed surface water drainage design, including calculations and appropriate model results, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of any phasing of the development and phasing of drainage provision **including any agreed limited identified specialist areas of detailed drainage design that will be made available within the construction period.** This shall also include 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 a phase shall be brought into use until the drainage works approved for that part have been completed.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development and given that drainage works are one of the first elements of site infrastructure that must be installed it is essential that this condition is complied with before the development commences in order to ensure that the proposed drainage system will be fit for purpose.

6. Application Number 18/00266/FUL

Address Land adjacent 270 Handsworth Road

Additional Representation

An additional representation has been received, stating that the business premises have been operating later into the evening and the tannoy system has been used regularly (and during October), with music being played. Photographs have been submitted showing cars parked along the frontage, on the public highway where there is a single yellow line and other photographs suggesting that the premises have been operating beyond 1800 hours.

In your officers view this does not change the assessment of this application although it is recognised that enforcement action may well be necessary in the future.

Amended condition

Condition no. 2 has been revised to include an amended location plan, showing the extent of land ownership, which is denoted also by a blue line.

02 the use must be operated in complete accordance with the following approved documents:-

- Amended Location Plan, Scale 1:1250 (Amended Red/Blue lines)
- Site Layout Plan Rev A, emailed 03.09.2018
- Photo images showing floodlighting

Reason: In order to define the permission.

This page is intentionally left blank