

## PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE 6 November 2018

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

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

1. **Application Number** 18/01475/FUL

**Address** St Christopher's, 147-149 Langsett Road South

#### **Additional Submission**

The applicant has stated that operating hours of 0700 to 2300 hours 7 days a week are required by the intended occupant of the retail unit.

#### **Planning Assessment**

The existing planning permission for the redevelopment of this site, 15/03235/FUL, conditioned the use of the proposed larger A1 unit to between 0700 and 2300 hours on any day.

The larger unit approved under planning permission 15/03235/FUL had a proposed retail floorspace of 278 sq. m. gross internal area on its ground floor including a front extension, and 93 sq. m. on its lower ground floor. That unit would have 1 disabled person's car parking space in front of it. The main customer car park was on the north-western half of the site.

The current proposal would provide less sales area (232 sq. m. sales area on the ground floor) in the proposed larger unit, and does not include a front extension to the unit. The current proposal utilises the forecourt in front of the larger unit for customer parking and manoeuvring through the site.

In comparison, the development currently proposed is likely to result in greater on-site vehicle activity in front of the larger unit although the sales area of the larger unit will be smaller. In this instance however this is a modest development, and whilst the size of the car park is sufficient for the development proposal the car park is never-the-less small in scale and its use is unlikely to result in significant noise and disturbance to adjacent and nearby residents. Operating hours of between 0700 and 2300 hours on any day would continue to safeguard resident's amenities during the early morning and night-time hours.

It is considered that in this instance the normal day-time operating hours of 0700 to 2300 hours 7 days a week would be acceptable and would not significantly harm the living conditions of adjacent and nearby residents.

An additional condition to clarify that the proposed use of the two new units and the supermarket unit is within Use Class A1 (shops) is also recommended.

#### **Amend Condition**

Replace condition no. 32 with:

The shop units shall be used only between the hours of 0700 and 2300 on any day.

**Additional Condition**

The use of the two new units and the supermarket unit shall be in accordance with Class A1 (Shops) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended.

Reason: In order to define the permission.

2. **Application Number**      **18/02327/FUL**

**Address**                      **Chapelton Baths site, Burncross Road**

**Correction**

Page 76 - Heads of Terms

The financial contribution quoted should read £397,025

3. **Application Number**      **18/00976/FUL**

**Address**                      **Land between 13 and 15 Greenwood Road**

**Correction**

Page 163 - Reference to NPPF para 49 should be para 73  
Last line of the "Policy and Land Use" section. Text should read "...five apartments..."

4. **Application Number**      **18/00845/FUL**

**Address**                      **Land at Welbeck Road and Fern Road**

**Correction**

Page 173 second paragraph The garages on site are accessed from Fern Road.

**Representations**

One resident has submitted a further objection.  
The proposal only provides one additional parking space overall and is therefore contrary to the UDP parking guidelines.

**Additional condition**

No demolition and/or construction works shall be carried out unless equipment is

provided for the effective cleaning of the wheels and bodies of vehicles leaving the site so as to prevent the depositing of mud and waste on the highway. Full details of the proposed cleaning equipment shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before it is installed.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of road users.

**5. Application Number 18/01869/FUL**

**Address: Within the Curtilage of Elmwood, 27 South Street**

**Clarification of finished heights**

The occupier of the neighbouring property has requested that Committee Members are advised of the finished heights of the dwelling and attached flat roofed garage. These are as follows:

Overall height of dwelling to ridge - 8.36m  
Height of dwelling to underside of eaves - 4.92m  
Height of garage to top of parapet wall - 3m

The garage will be 400mm lower than the previously approved swimming pool building on the site.

**6. Application Number: 18/02229FUL**

**Address: Land Between 94 And 98 Wheel Lane, Grenoside**

Updated Section Plan

The approved plans condition has been revised to include and make the required adjustments for an updated section plan and this condition will therefore read as follows:

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

- Street scene and sections A (PL) - 003 Rev H (Published on 01.10.2018) (Street Scene Elevation only).
- East elevation A(PL)-018 Rev A - (Published on 20.09.2018).
- Site sections A(PL)-016 Rev H - (Published on 05.11.2018).
- Amended location plan, site plan, floor plans and elevations A(PL)-001 Rev:P (Published on 01.10.2018).
- Amended wheel wash details A(PL)-010 Rev D (Published on 01.08.2018).
- Amended landscape and surface plan A(PL)-012 Rev D (Published on 01.08.2018).

Reason: In order to define the permission.

Within this updated section plan the section key plan has been altered to correspond with the site plan in reflecting the correct size and position of the neighbouring conservatory at 98 Wheel Lane. On the previous section key plan, published on 01 October 2018, this conservatory is shown as projecting further out

from the rear of number 98 Wheel Lane than is evident on site and being set further away from the common boundary.

An adjustment has also been made to one of the section drawings (Section 2) to show the south west corner of the neighbouring conservatory slightly closer to the common boundary than the previous section plan did. The previous section plan failed to properly reflect the angle of the western elevation of the conservatory.

Whilst the site plan is accurate, it is accepted that these alterations to the section plan do show a poorer relationship between the proposed dwellinghouse and 98 Wheel Lane in respect to residential amenity.

As this relationship is a matter that has already been raised as a significant issue within the numerous representations received from surrounding residents, it was not considered necessary to undertake an additional round of public consultation on these changes, given the issues it raises and concerns of residents are known to officers and the implications of these alterations are assessed below.

#### Correction within the Committee Report

The Committee report contains an error on Page 95 when it states that the single-storey element of the development would project approximately 4.2 metres beyond the rear of the conservatory at number 98. This distance is in fact appropriately 5.4 metres.

When considering this impact it is noted that at this point there is also change in land levels between the properties of approximately one metre, with the application site being set on higher ground. In addition, number 98 Wheel Lane is set to the east.

However, it is considered that this proposed relationship remains within tolerable limits in respect of over shadowing and overbearing for the following reasons:

- The closest element of the conservatory (the south west corner) will be approximately 3.3 metres away from the side elevation of the single storey element of the dwellinghouse.
- The side elevation of this conservatory facing the application site only has high level windows within it and there is an approximate one metre brick work return, again with only high level windows, on the south west corner of this conservatory. This results in the closest full height window within this conservatory that would offer reasonable outlook being approximately 4.3 metres from the single storey element of the dwellinghouse.
- The single storey element will have a flat roof which reduces the height in comparison to a more traditional pitched roofed structure.
- When you are standing in the garden of 98 Wheel Lane close to the common boundary your main view would be of the boundary wall and fence, owing to the change in land level, and as the single storey element would be approximately 1.7 metres from the common boundary. The top of the single storey element of the new dwellinghouse would only start coming into view as you moved away from the boundary, at which point the impact would be reduced.

It is for the above reasons the projection of the dwellinghouse beyond the rear conservatory at 98 Wheel Lane is considered to be acceptable from a shadowing and overbearing perspective.

**7. Application Number: 17/04741/FUL**

**Address: Brincliffe Towers Former Old Peoples Home , Brincliffe Edge Road**

Approved Plans Condition

We had been waiting for the plans to be altered to reflect the reduction in the scale of the extensions on the coach house. These plans have now been received and we can now confirm the approved plans condition would read as follows:

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

- Red Line Plan published on 29 October 2018 (Ref: A16-23(100)01/P2).
- Site Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(200)02/P6).
- Site Levels Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(200)09/P6).
- Mansion Floor Plans published on 17 April 2018 (Ref: A16-23(200)06/P2).
- Mansion Elevations published on 17 April 2018 (Ref: A16-23(300)03/P2).
- Coach House Floor Plans published on 29 October 2018 (Ref: A16-23(200)07/P3).
- Coach House Elevations published on 29 October 2018 (Ref: A16-23(300)04/P3).
- Dwellinghouse Floor Plans and Elevations published on 02 August 2018 (Ref: A16-23(200)05/P4).
- Section A-A Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(400)08/P3).
- Section B-B Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(400)09/P3).
- Section C-C Plan published on 22 October 2018 (Ref: A16-23(400)10/P2).
- Section D-D Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(400)11/P3).
- Section E-E Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(400)12/P4).
- Section F-F Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(400)13/P4).
- Section G-G Plan published on 05 November 2018 (Ref: A16-23(400)14/P4).
- Landscape Masterplan published on 02 August 2018 (Ref: 520/BTS02D).

Reason: In order to define the permission.

Additional Representations

Three additional representations have been received from two members of the public and the Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group. These are summarised and responded to as follows:

- The alterations from the previously refused scheme are minor when compared to the original refusal.

In response, the officer report has detailed a number of alterations that have been made to specifically address the reasons the previous scheme was refused. This includes lowering the height, revisiting the siting and adjusting the design of the new properties, and employing a more sympathetic approach to the extensions and renovation of the coach house.

- The renovation of Brincliffe Towers is welcomed but the mansion is such a valued asset that its position and status must be maintained. This means that any proposed development within its grounds should be of a scale and a style that do not conflict with it.

In response, the committee report identifies why the proposed houses are viewed as being suitably sympathetic to their setting. This includes generous separation distances from Brincliffe Towers and the removal of the existing large extension from this principal main building.

- The flat roof architecture is completely at odds with that of the mansion and does not present a happy blending of architectural styles. Any new houses must be substantially smaller than the mansion, built of sympathetic materials and of a style that mirrors the mansion's Gothic appearance.

In response, flat roof contemporary architecture if executed well has a place within historic conservation areas as is seen across the city. In addition, these houses have a footprint approximately 45% smaller than the mansion house and have a smaller footprint and are lower in height than the coach house, which by its nature is designed to be a subordinate building on the site. These houses will also be built in natural stone, as is the case with the historic buildings on the site.

- The likely sale of this development, if approved, would far exceed the cost of renovation to the mansion and coach house.

In response, officers are satisfied that the benefits of the proposals, such as the renovation of the existing buildings, along with the steps taken to address the specific reasons the previous scheme was refused, result in an acceptable proposal.

Furthermore, while there is an enabling aspect to the proposed new houses with respect to renovating the existing buildings, a development of this nature would include an element of profit for a developer; otherwise it would not go ahead.

- The new access road stated in the report does not appear on the plans. If this is within the site only it should not be called an access road and this can lead to confusion going forward.

In response, this access road is within the site and leads to the new dwellinghouses and the coach house car park. This is not considered to create confusion and has been clarified in this response in any case.

- Suggesting the previous use is comparable to the proposed use in terms of traffic impacts is not appropriate, traffic will be greater along the access lane and the chances of cars meeting one another greater. This will lead to safety issues.

In response, this is not considered to be the case with the potential traffic generated by the established and proposed use being comparable, as was accepted within the previous scheme.

- The access point at Brincliffe Edge Road is poorly designed and dangerous.

In response, this is a point that has been noted and addressed in the report.

- Covenants exists on the land registry deeds for Brincliffe Towers that makes it clear the owners of this site are responsible for the maintenance and repair of Brown Lane (the access lane) and the provision of 'traffic aids' as reasonably required to reduce vehicle speeds. However, no maintenance has been taking place. Assurance is needed that this access lane will be kept in good shape and traffic aids will be put in place as required.

In response, the enforcement of covenants sits outside the planning system and the maintenance of this lane will be the responsibility of the owner (the council in this case) or the person who has assumed liability through an enforceable covenant.

**8. Application Number: 18/00655/FUL**

**Address: 229 Derbyshire Lane, Sheffield, S8 8SB**

**ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

Three additional representations have been received, which can be summarised as follows:

-Present Derbyshire Lane Co-op store and all local Co-op stores receive deliveries with articulated vehicles. This has continued despite complaints and the need for on-road deliveries. Queried what will prevent this from happening at new development.

-Unclear whether deliveries will take place at day or night. Daytime deliveries would be unsafe for vehicles and pedestrians accessing site, in-turn affecting traffic and pedestrian safety on Derbyshire Lane. Night-time deliveries would involve various noise impacts and cause harmful impacts to residents at site's perimeter.

-Acoustic Report doesn't give details of when survey was carried out, and doesn't include any specific details about the plant equipment to be used.

-Scheme is over-development of the site.

-Committee Report includes errors, as it states deliveries will be done at day-time, and the vehicles will not be able to get to rear of site, whereas people have heard that they will take place at night-time using reversing vehicles.

-Proposal should be considered in light of resident's interests, not commercial interests. Site is in a Housing Area in UDP and Preferred Options Proposals Map.

-Queries about different sets of site notices and photos of them as shown on Planning On-Line.

-Queries about the Planning Committee arrangements.

## Response to Additional Representations

-Condition 29 states deliveries within the site are to be restricted to vehicles of a maximum 10.4metres in length, and Condition 21 states the store is not to accept deliveries from a vehicle parked on public highway.

-Confirmation provided by Agent that deliveries will be during daytime hours. Condition 30 states deliveries are to be between 07:30-18:00hrs (Mon-Sat) and 09:00-18:00 (Sun & Public Holidays).

-The Acoustic Report survey took place over a 24 hour period. No details of proposed plant equipment are required to be provided at this stage, however, Council Officers have an understanding of the likely equipment and noise outputs and consider the proposed measures to satisfactorily mitigate impacts to ensure neighbours' living conditions are safeguarded.

-Whilst the site is located in a Housing Area in the UDP, the proposal is considered to be an appropriate redevelopment of the currently commercial site, having acceptable impacts on the area's character, and living conditions of surrounding occupiers.

-Site notices were erected regarding the initially submitted proposal and amended drawings. This is in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.

-The date of the Committee Meeting is published on the Planning On-Line, along with the report.

### **ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION**

All the existing site perimeter walls would be retained/re-built as part of the scheme. Condition 16 to be reworded to "Details of a suitable means of site boundary treatment **to include retention and re-building of existing stone boundary wall/s unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority** shall be submitted to and approved...", to reflect this.