

## **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

### **TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

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

**1. Application Number: 22/00491/OUT**

**Address: Land at Wood Royd Road**

#### **Supplementary Information from 8<sup>th</sup> November**

##### **Additional Representation**

One additional letter of representation was received from solicitors acting on behalf of the owner of 15 Wood Royd Road. The letter revisits matters relating to the ownership of the land in front of number 15, which is considered within the Committee report.

##### **Corrections to the list of Conditions**

Condition No. 16 (Landscape and Biodiversity Enhancement Master Plan).

The reason for this condition refers to paragraph 170 of the NPPF. This is incorrect and should refer to paragraph 174.

Condition No. 21 (No obstruction within 4m of public sewer)

This condition was attached in error as there are no public sewers within the site.

Condition No. 22 (Details of highway improvement works)

This condition relates to highway works being carried in accordance with the details set out in Condition No. 18. It should follow Condition No.18 and be listed as No. 19, with the following conditions renumbered to suit.

#### **Supplementary Information – 6<sup>th</sup> December**

Since the 8<sup>th</sup> November committee meeting, two further representations have been received from local residents in objection to the proposals. One of these representations expresses concern that the committee report suppressed opposing evidence in relation to flooding, biodiversity, highway safety and ownership of the land outside No. 15 Wood Royd Road, with officers misleading and misdirecting the committee in supporting the application.

In terms of flood risk, the objector considers that it is irrelevant that the site falls within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. it is at a low risk of flooding) since the risk from flooding emanates from water cascading down the steep hillside from sources above the site.

They note that the approved Hollin Busk development would also drain surface water into Clough Dyke, and that the cumulative effects of Hollin Busk and the proposed development are not known.

In relation to biodiversity, they query the net gain calculations and suggest the impact of removing drystone walls has been ignored.

In relation to highway safety, it is claimed that the proposed access arrangement does not meet the necessary guidelines of the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide.

The other representation states that there are watercourses underneath the site and claims that the broken culvert from Fox Glen drains under Wood Royd Road, the adjoining cottages and also the fields.

Issues relating to flooding, biodiversity and matters of highway adoption have all been previously recorded and commented on within the committee report.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have no records of an underground watercourse within the site. It is understood that an underground watercourse runs close to but likely outside the southern site boundary. However, proposed condition 5 requires the applicant to carry out a survey to identify the path of the Clough Dike culvert so that the correct buffer zone can be maintained.

As set out within the report, the development would provide biodiversity net gain in the order of 11%. The calculations were carried out using an accepted method and have been considered by the Council's ecologists.

With regards to the stagger distance between the proposed site access and Armitage Road the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide states that, for junctions on the same side of the road, the minimum recommended spacing is 40 metres. On opposite sides, 20 metres is considered acceptable, measured from the centrelines of the two side-roads. The spacing between Armitage Road and the proposed site access is approximately 29 metres.

## **2. Application Number: 20/03766/OUT**

**Address: Land Adjacent to Meadowhall**

### **Late Representation**

Since the publication of the Committee Report an additional representation has been received stating:

*Any improvement to Meadowhall South/Tinsley Tramstop should include the removal of the two chicane barriers either side of the stop. These should be replaced with equality act complaint bollards, spaced appropriately*

This is considered to be a separate issue to the proposed Tram Stop Upgrades relevant to this application and should be raised direct with the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA), who can consider whether there is a need to remove or adjust the chicane barriers in the interests of accessibility.

**Update to S106 Heads of Terms**

Since the publication of the Committee Report further negotiations have taken place between the applicant, SYMCA and Council Officers and it is proposed that S106 Heads of Term (1) and (2), as set out at the end of the Committee Report, are updated as follows to provide more specificity in terms of the required planning obligations for sustainable transportation service and infrastructure upgrades:

*1) Obligation not to occupy more than 5,000 sqm GIA of floorspace within Plot TLH until approval has been secured for: (a) a detailed scheme of public transport service improvements, (b) a financial contribution amount sufficient to subsidise the delivery of those service improvements (subject to a £1,100,000, indexed linked, costs cap) and (c) a payment plan for that financial contribution linked to the phasing of the development (with an overall backstop of the full payment being required prior to the occupation of more than 10,000 sqm GIA of floorspace within Plot TLH).*

*2) Obligation to pay a financial contribution of £297,000 (indexed linked) to deliver works for the improvement and upgrade of the South Tinsley Tram Stop (payment schedule/ triggers to be agreed in consultation with SYMCA); (b) not to occupy any part of the development until the financial contribution of £20,000 (indexed linked) to deliver real time information displays to the 2 identified bus stops on Meadowhall Way has been paid in full.*

The specific contribution figures and triggers referred to above are considered to be necessary to make the proposal site suitably accessible by public transportation, to facilitate modal change and reduce the reliance of visitors to the development on car travel - in the interests of supporting sustainable development and addressing climate change. It is considered that planning obligations securing the above Heads of Terms would be CIL Regulation 122 compliant in terms of being:

- *necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms*
- *directly related to the development; and*
- *fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*

### **Update to Planning Conditions**

Since the publication of the Committee Report the applicant has further reviewed the proposed planning conditions and pointed out that a number of the conditions are not necessarily relevant to the proposed Change of Use of Plot Source and yet (as currently worded) would need to be satisfied before the use of Plot Source could be changed. The relevant conditions are:

- Condition 8 – traffic modelling
- Condition 12 – construction logistics plan
- Condition 13 – CEMP
- Condition 14 – surface water drainage design
- Condition 15 – measures to protect public sewerage and public water supply
- Condition 17 – programme of archaeological work
- Condition 18 – renewable energy/ energy efficiency
- Condition 19 – ground conditions and remediation
- Condition 20 – biodiversity enhancement scheme
- Condition 21 – green/biodiverse roofs
- Condition 22 – lighting scheme

- Condition 23 – employment and training implementation schedule

To address this, it is proposed to amend the first sentence of each of these conditions from:

*'No development within any part or phase of development shall begin until'*

To:

*'With the exception of the change of use of Plot Source (as identified on drawing ref. TLH-BDP-00-00-DR-A-000004 H), no development within any part or phase of development shall begin until'*

**3. Application Number: 22/03685/FUL**

**Address: Land Opposite Holme Head Wheel Dam, Rivelin Valley Road**

**Amendment to condition 2 to read:**

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

Red Line Site Location Plan (UK Planning Maps) published 07.11.22

**Proposed Site Layout Drawing Number 22.35.03 Rev D published 02.12.22**

Additional Information email published 23.11.22

Reason: In order to define the permission.

**Additional conditions:**

A: No fixed or moveable structures or agility equipment shall be sited within the dog walk area at any time.

Reason: In the interest of the openness of the Green Belt, the visual amenities of the locality and Area of High Landscape Value.

B: Prior to the dog walk being brought into use all items currently stored externally within the curtilage of the site (redline boundary) shall be removed and thereafter, there shall be no external storage on the site.

Reason: In the interest of the openness of the Green Belt, the visual amenities of the locality and Area of High Landscape Value.

**4. Application Number: 22/02768/FUL**

**Address: 218 Wortley Road, High Green, Sheffield, S35 4LX**

**Amended Condition**

**Condition 13 amended to include reference to net gain calculation:**

The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations set out within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prepared by Whitcher Wildlife Ltd. Ecological Consultants and shall include the submission of a Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation using the DEFRA 2.0 metric prior to the commencement of development. Works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of enhancing the biodiversity of the site. It is essential that this condition is complied with before any other works on site commence given that damage to existing habitats is irreversible.

- 5. Application Number:**  
**Address:**

This page is intentionally left blank