

## PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

27 November 2018

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

#### APPLICATIONS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS / REGULATIONS

1. **18/03472/FUL**

**Disused Public Convenience, Commonside, Sheffield, S10 1GG**

#### **Correction**

Amendment to report and Condition 4 (Proposed opening hours).

The proposed opening hours of the premises has been incorrectly stated in the report (Page67) as up to 1800 hours and in Condition 4 as being between 0800 hours and 2000 hours (Monday to Sunday). This was in error. The proposed closing hours of the premises should be amended to 2100 hours.

These hours of use have been assessed by the Environmental Protection Service and are not considered likely to cause significant harm to local residents or the locality. The wording of the condition should therefore be amended to the following:-

No customer shall be permitted to be on the premises outside the following times:  
0800 hours and 2100 hours (Monday to Sunday);

2. **18/01572/FUL**

**16 Ladysmith Avenue, Sheffield, S7 1SF**

#### **Additional Representation**

An additional statement has been submitted representing views of 33, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51 and 61 Barkers Road, and 21 Edgebrook Road. The comments are summarised as:

-37 objections from 20 different addresses have been received, regarding negative impacts of scheme. The proposal/s and officer's report significantly under represent the substantial negative effects.

-Impacts are more apparent since trees and shrubs are now bare, and after cutting back of shrubbery. This has exposed the dominating impact of bungalow and makes proposals appear as an extra floor of significant increased height.

-Wording of proposals and plans could appear misleading. Officers and Members should see proposal from neighbours' perspective. (Photos submitted on this basis

for circulation at Committee). An impartial decision cannot be made without a Member's site visit.

-Scheme doesn't respect scale, form and details of original building; or preserve or enhance the conservation area or the listed building (14 Ladysmith Avenue). Roof design is alien to surroundings and a modern red brick is different to surrounding properties.

-Report correctly states there are limited views from surrounding roads, but conservation area is also perceived by residents backing onto sites. Backland areas contribute to quality of conservation areas, and inappropriate development of backland areas will harm them.

-Neighbours have tried not to make objections a personal issue, but have been concerned about impact on quality of life.

The main content of these points reflect those already covered in the Officer's report, and no further response is required.