

CITY CENTRE SOUTH & EAST AREA COMMITTEE 18 March 2013

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. **Application Number: 13/00177/FUL**

Address: Meersbrook Garage

Additional Representations.

Five additional letters of representation have been submitted which repeat some of the comments already set out in the agenda report but some additional comments have been made.

This development is a danger to school children especially at the Northcote Avenue junction.

Garage staff carry out dangerous manoeuvres with cars including reversing onto a 4 way junction.

Prior to the unauthorised works, there was hardly any parking at Northcote Avenue.

Numerous vans delivering car spares visit the garage daily.

The new wall disrupts the open aspect of the neighbourhood and restricts visibility, which affects children in particular.

The Noise Survey was carried out when only 4 bays were in use. It is usual for all 6 bays to be in use at the same time.

Air pollution from exhausts is very bad.

The vehicle access from Meersbrook Road is never used.

The comments are noted and the recommendation on the agenda report remains unaltered.

Amended Reason for Refusal (additional text in **bold**)

The Local Planning Authority considers that owing to the increased number of vehicle repair/servicing bays within the building, the

proximity of the building to residential property, the restricted dimensions of the site, **and the impact the 1.8m boundary wall has upon visibility**, the proposal represents an over intensification of an existing inappropriate use within a Housing Area that results in noise and disturbance from vehicle repair/servicing activity and excessive and indiscriminate on street (and footway) car parking to the detriment of the living conditions of nearby residents and to highway and pedestrian safety. As such, the proposal is contrary to the aims of policies H10 and H14 of the Unitary Development Plan for Sheffield.

2. Application Number: 13/00249/FUL

Address: 102A and 102B Harcourt Road

Additional Representation/s

Additional e-mail correspondence has been received from Cllr Wattam. The comments made can be summarised as follows:

- Policy issues already mentioned continue to apply.
- Crookesmoor Methodist Church development will provide a significant number of student places.
- University is concerned regarding the over-supply of accommodation in this area, as applications are significantly down.
- Impact on waste collection, parking and general environment.
- A clause restricting occupation of flats for professionals, and not students, would be welcome.
- Would like to see a restriction on parking permits.

Also three representations have been received from neighbouring occupiers. The comments made can be summarised as follows:

- Two previous applications were refused, and this support was appreciated. Members appreciated pressures of living in an area over-populated by students, and efforts of permanent residents to counter these problems and strengthen community.

- Further housing attractive to students will tip the balance and jeopardise future of community.
- Current application is contrary to UDP policy H5 (a, b and c) and policy CS41 of the SDF-Core Strategy.
- Questioned why it is considered to be unreasonable and unenforceable to impose a condition preventing student occupation, when applicants have indicated willingness to accept such a condition. This is counter-productive to progress made to redress the balance in community.
- Originally a neutral comment was made on understanding that a condition could be imposed preventing student rental. Committee previously rejected the application for 8 student bedrooms due to detrimental impact it would have on character of the neighbourhood. The only real difference is that current proposal is for 6 students

instead of 8, and it will not be significantly less detrimental than previous scheme for 8 students in 6 flats.

-The 3 flats should have own front doors, utility meters and council tax bills, otherwise they would represent a HMO. This would make student occupation much less likely.

-It still involves the loss of 2 family friendly flats, that had long term residents.

-Insufficient off-street parking as required by UDP policy H5(c). The Planning Officer's suggestion that a limit can be imposed on parking permit numbers doesn't take into account details of the parking schemes. Would lead to increased parking congestion and air pollution.

-Scheme conflicts with Department's own Appeal Statement relating to the 6 flat application refusal, which refers to the accommodation as being most attractive, although not exclusively, to young people and students and the lifestyle of young people/students conflicting with families and older people. The increase in the number of small, self-contained flats was referred to as contributing to further reduction in quality of life for families and elderly people in area.

-High numbers of students lead to other problems; increased crime levels, loss of schools, religious institutions and community centres, distorted retail offers, health and safety issues (inadequate drainage capacity, waste, vermin), distorted housing market (by inflated demand from student landlords, and every property that becomes a student residence remains as such) and neglected appearance.

-Two conflicting statements in the Committee Report are made. Under Concentration Issues, it is stated that "The flats would be occupied as separate households, and would not be able to be let to a single group", and later in Response to Representations, it is stated "It would also not be possible to require the tenants to be recruited separately rather than as a single group". This point requires clarification.

-Any consent should include conditions prohibiting rental to students, and prohibiting use of property as a HMO.

-Without a condition preventing occupation by students proposal is contrary to PPS3 clauses 9, 10, 11 20, 21 and 24 and Policy CS41. Part (d) of CS41 requires a greater mix of housing "including homes for larger households, especially families". There are already too many shared, bed-sit and flat housing type units, and it lacks homes for larger households, especially families.

-October Street Party, Spring Street Cleaning event and other regular groups meet. These events help to form community, police itself, manage behaviour and reduce strain on Council services, and enhance street as a place to live. Currently community is on a fine balance, with Policy CS41 preventing conversion of more terraced properties to student HMOs, but current proposal threatens to create more student rental properties and reduce permanent residents.

-This instability and lack of support from planning officers to reduce number of additional student properties suggests there is not the

political will to keep sustainable, mixed communities. Without support from planning process, demand for student housing will erode critical mass of permanent residents. This would conflict with aim of “Standing up for Sheffield: Corporate Plan 2011-14”, which seeks a mix of housing reflecting needs and aspirations of local community.

-Demand for student housing on street relates to its location, and not overall student numbers which are significantly decreasing. PPS3 Clause 21 states local planning policy should have particular regard for “current and future demographic trends and profiles”. Resulting impacts on area is not warranted by real housing need.

-Given proximity to Hospitals and University there is a demand for permanent housing in area, which is ideal for families.

-PPS3 supports aim of maintaining mixed communities; para 9 and 10 require planning systems to support a variety of households in all areas and para 11 says planning authorities to engage with local communities and to work closely with developers to achieve this objective. There is no evidence that the planning officer engaged with the developer to achieve a design to achieve a design of flats which would be suitable for families or elderly.

- Design has not changed, and includes internal stairs in each unit, bizarre circulation routes, no baths for young children, inadequate parking, narrow corridors and stair landings which do not meet building regulations.

-Community has offered to engage with developers, but have had no response.

Response to Additional Comments

In regards to the additional comments which have not been previously addressed in the main report, the following comments can be made:

-Regarding the suggestion that contradictory statements have been made in the main report it can be confirmed that the 3 flats would need to represent separate households in order to sit within the terms of the planning permission if granted, however, there would be no power to control the way which the property was marketed or how it was let.

-PPS3 has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework, so references to this document cannot be given any weight. Para 50 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. The proposal is not considered to conflict with these aims.

-Policy CS41(b) of the Core Strategy is aimed at proposed housing developments for a number of properties, and the need to provide a mix of housing types within such schemes; rather than dealing with conversions of single property proposals which are covered by policy CS41(d).

-The proposal is not considered to conflict with the particular aim of the Corporate Plan.

- The additional activity arising from one extra flat would not be considered to lead to detrimental impacts upon neighbouring occupiers.
- The additional parking from the additional flat, with a condition limiting the number of parking permits, would not be considered to have a harmful impact upon on-street parking levels or air pollution. It should also be noted that the proposal would re-instate an on-street parking bay.
- A verbal comment has been made by a member of the public about the issue of Council Tax bills, picking up on a point made in the report's Response to Representations section. It can be confirmed that the 3 flats would be assigned separate addresses in Council Tax records.
- On the matter of a condition preventing student occupation, officers consider that this would not meet the six tests of a valid planning condition, as set out in Circular 11/95. In particular such a condition would not be considered enforceable, as it would be extremely difficult to monitor.

Amended Description (Additional text in **bold**)

Alterations to 2 self contained flats to form 3 self contained flats (**Use Class C3**)

Additional Conditions

-Before construction works commence full details, including material samples, of the bin store area shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and be made available for use prior to the occupation of the accommodation hereby approved. The bin store shall thereafter be permanently retained.
Reason- In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

- The accommodation shall not be used unless all redundant accesses have been permanently stopped up and reinstated to kerb and footway.
Reason- In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the locality.

3. Application Number: 12/03953/FUL

Address: Castle College

Amended Conditions

Condition 9:

- A comprehensive and detailed hard and soft landscape scheme for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that part of the development is commenced. This shall include final details of the design (including furniture and play

features) and the future management and maintenance of the open space area located between Units 36 and 39. Thereafter, the landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and in an agreed timescale.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

Condition 13:

- Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, within 3 months of works on site commencing, full details of the design and specification of the pedestrian footpath and/or cycleway (the path) to be created within the landscape banking situated along the western elevation of the site, intended to run between Shrewsbury Road and the public realm adjacent to Units 36 and 39, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:

- The final proposed position of the path;
- The final gradient of the path (including cross-sections, where appropriate);
- The design and specification of the path;
- Proposed method of safety protection measures (e.g. barriers);
- Proposed lighting details; and
- Proposed management and maintenance strategy for the path.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the path shall be installed prior to the occupation of the first dwelling on site, or an alternative timescale to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the site and to ensure that the path represents a high quality and safe addition to the existing and proposed network on the Sheaf Valley hillside.

Additional Conditions

- Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, the design of the side elevations at units 4, 35, 38, 39, 58 and 61 are not approved. Before that part of the development is commenced, final design details of these elevations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the development and to reduce the amount of blank elevations overlooking key spaces.

- No development shall commence until a construction management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of:

- Construction vehicle routes;
- Means of ingress and egress for construction vehicles;
- Parking and turning areas for vehicles involved in construction;
- Provision on contractor parking; and
- Confirmation of dilapidation survey of the highways immediately adjoining the site, which shall have been carried out and agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the locality.

- Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, no trees, vegetation or rock outcrop shall be removed from the south-west corner of the site (in front of units 39 – 43) until full details of the proposed landscape works within this area have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the development.

- Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, final details of the garden levels and retaining wall structures/boundary treatments to the elevations facing Granville Street and Granville Road shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant phase of development is commenced. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the development

Additional Directives

- The Applicant is advised that units 4, 35, 38, 39, 58 and 61 currently have blank elevations fronting onto key elevations and spaces. It is considered that window openings should be incorporated to reduce the amount of prominent blank gables and, overall, improve both the appearance and levels of passive surveillance on the site.

This page is intentionally left blank