



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL
Planning and Highways Committee - West and North

Report of: Director of Development Services

Date: 22/01/2013

Subject: Applications under various acts/regulations

Author of Report: John Williamson 2734218

Summary:

Reasons for Recommendations

(Reports should include a statement of the reasons for the decisions proposed)

Recommendations:

Background Papers:

Category of Report: OPEN

Application No.	Location	Page No.
12/03066/FUL	Morehall Fisheries Manchester Road Stocksbridge Sheffield S36 3ZP	11
12/03157/FUL (Formerly PP-02244553)	Land Adjacent Scout Hall Uppergate Road Sheffield S6 6DA	45

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Report Of The Head Of Planning
To The NORTH & WEST Planning And Highways Committee
Date Of Meeting: 22/01/2013

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION OR INFORMATION

NOTE Under the heading "Representations" a Brief Summary of Representations received up to a week before the Committee date is given (later representations will be reported verbally). The main points only are given for ease of reference. The full letters are on the application file, which is available to members and the public and will be at the meeting.

Case Number	12/03066/FUL
Application Type	Full Planning Application
Proposal	Construction of a waste water treatment works
Location	Morehall Fisheries Manchester Road Stocksbridge Sheffield S36 3ZP
Date Received	02/10/2012
Team	NORTH & WEST
Applicant/Agent	Bloor Homes Ltd
Recommendation	Grant Conditionally

Subject to:

- 1 The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

In order to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act.

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

WC-031 Rev P3
WC032-Rev P1
12/317-SK1

JBA 12/371-01 received 15th October 2012

unless otherwise authorised in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

In order to define the permission.

- 3 Details of all proposed external materials and finishes, including samples when requested by the Local Planning Authority, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that part of the development is commenced. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

In order to ensure an appropriate quality of development.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to treat and remove suspended solids from surface water run-off during construction works has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

To reduce the risk of pollution to the River Don to an acceptable level.

- 5 No development shall commence until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, including short, medium and long term aims (minimum of 10 years) and objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall reflect the recommendations made within the submitted Ecological Assessment prepared by ECUS dated July 2011 and shall include

1. Enhancement of the bank-side river habitat adjacent to the site, to include tree management/coppicing and bank-side remediation using coir rolls.

2. Control of invasive species both within the site prior to start of works, and along the bank-side of the river. This should include reference to Japanese knotweed, Himalayan balsam and Australian Swamp Stonecrop (all present).

3. The provision of at least 9 bat boxes within the site to include two creeper boxes, two owl boxes and four general purpose boxes;

4. An up-to-date assessment of water vole survey.

The management Plan shall include details for the implementation of the measures outlined above and it shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

To enhance the bio-diversity of the site in accordance with guidance within the NPPF.

6 The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted by Hyder Consulting (UK) Ltd, report number 5000-UA003515-GDR-01, dated 24 September 2012 and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

1. Finished floor levels are set no lower than 300m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) as stated in Section 6.5 headed 'Residual Risk' (p24).

2. An 8m easement (access strip) is maintained alongside the banks of the River Don. As stated in Section 8 headed 'Conclusions & Recommendations' (p27).

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

7 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme has been submitted to improve the existing surface water disposal system and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.

8 Prior to the development being brought into use, an Odour Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The odour management plan should address the management of odours at each stage of the odour exposure chain and include the following aspects (but not be limited to these):

(i) Details of the site management responsibilities and procedures for reporting faults, identifying maintenance needs, replenishing consumables complaints procedure;

(ii) Odour-critical plant operation and management procedures (e.g. correct use of plant, process, materials, checks on plant performance, maintenance and inspection)

(iii) operative training

(iv) Details of a single point of contact responsible for dealing with, and liaising with Local Authorities in respect of complaints from the public in relation to odour should they arise;

- (v) Maintenance and inspection of plant (both routine and emergency response);
- (vi) Spillage management procedures - record keeping – format, responsibility for completion and location of records - emergency breakdown and incident response planning including responsibilities and mechanisms for liaison with the Local Authority.

Following approval of the odour management plan the approved measures/procedures shall be implemented.

In the interests of minimising the nuisance caused by offensive odours.

- 9 Construction noise shall not exceed 75 LAeq dB at the nearest residential properties between 0700 and 1900 hours. Construction works shall only take place outside these hours if in accordance with a protocol submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the works commencing.

In the interests of the amenities of the locality and occupiers of the nearby residential properties.

- 10 Unless otherwise indicated on the approved plans no tree, shrub or hedge shall be removed or pruned without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

- 11 No development shall commence until full details of measures to protect the existing trees, shrubs, hedge/s to be retained, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved measures have thereafter been implemented. These measures shall include a construction methodology statement and plan showing accurate root protection areas and the location and details of protective fencing and signs. Protection of trees shall be in accordance with BS 5837, 2005 (or its replacement) and the protected areas shall not be disturbed, compacted or used for any type of storage or fire, nor shall the retained trees, shrubs or hedge be damaged in any way. The Local Planning Authority shall be notified in writing when the protection measures are in place and the protection shall not be removed until the completion of the development unless otherwise approved.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

- 12 The approved landscape works shall be implemented prior to the development being brought into use or within an alternative timescale to be first approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the landscaped areas shall be retained and they shall be cultivated and maintained for a period of 5 years from the date of implementation and any plant failures within that 5 year period shall be replaced unless otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

Attention is drawn to the following justifications:

1. The decision to grant permission and impose any conditions has been taken having regard to the relevant policies and proposals from the Sheffield Development Framework and the Unitary Development Plan set out below:

BE22 - Archaeological Sites and Monuments
GE1 - Development in the Green Belt
GE3 - New Building in the Green Belt
GE4 - Development and the Green Belt Environment
GE13 - Areas of Natural History Interest and Local Nature Sites
GE22 - Pollution

Policies BE22, GE1, GE2, GE3, GE4, GE13, GE22 of the Sheffield Adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies CS23 and CS67 of the SDF Core Strategy and guidance within the NPPF.

Although sited within the Green Belt, it is considered that the application demonstrates very special circumstances for the location of the WWTW within the Green Belt. It is also not considered to give rise to any unacceptable consequences to the environment, community or other public interests of acknowledged importance.

The Local Planning Authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with a planning application.

This explanation is only intended as a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission. For further detail on the decision please see the application report at www.sheffield.gov.uk/planningonline or by calling the planning officer, contact details are at the top of this notice.

Attention is drawn to the following directives:

1. The applicant is advised to have due regard to the informative set out within the letter from the Environment Agency dated 8th November 2012 and note the requirement for an Environmental Permit.

Water Treatment Works is a condition of planning permission 03/00020/OUT for the residential and mixed use development of the land at Station Road and Manchester Road, Deepcar, which is to be developed by Bloor Homes.

LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

This application relates to the site of the former More Hall Garden Centre and Fisheries to the east of Manchester Road, close to the junction with More Hall Lane. The site extends to 2.3 hectares and is broadly triangular in shape and tapers to a narrow point at the northern end. It has a circa 270 metre frontage to the A6102 Manchester Road and it has a site depth of 145 metres at the widest point along the southern boundary and 30 metres at the narrowest point at its northern end. It is bounded to the north by woodland that lies adjacent to the road, to the east by the River Don and to the south by a track that runs from Manchester Road over the River Don to a waste tip on the eastern bank of the River. To the south of the track is Ewden Works, which is a Yorkshire Water facility that processes drinking water.

The surrounding area is very mixed in character; the immediate context comprises countryside with isolated residential units in the locality. To the west, the nearest residential properties comprise the hamlet at More Hall Farm; the eastern boundary of these properties is approximately 373 metres from the western boundary of the application site fronting Manchester Road. To the south-west, the nearest residential properties would be the group of dwellings that include The Barn, Millstone Barn, Grove House Farm and Greenwood View that are accessed via Wharnccliffe Avenue, the closest of which is in excess of 300 metres from the southern boundary of the application site. The higher density dwellings on Wharnccliffe Avenue are in excess of 450 metres from the southern boundary. To the south-east, the nearest property is Holme Farm, which is in excess of 250 metres from the southern boundary at the closest point. To the east, the nearest property is Wharnccliffe Lodge, which is to the west of Lady Wharnccliffe's Road at a distance of over 680 metres. To the north of the application site, the nearest residential properties include those at Hollin Edge Farm, which lies over 900 metres to the north-west and the southern boundary of the Bloor Homes site at Deepcar, which benefits from consent for residential development and lies over 1500 metres from the northern tip of the application site.

This application proposes the construction of a new modern waste water treatment works, which includes the construction of a series of tanks and chambers, a kiosk and a distribution chamber. The waste water treatment process comprises the following stages:

Stage 1: Preliminary Treatment: This involves the removal of non-biodegradable materials (e.g. plastic and rags), debris and grit and requires a duty/standby inlet screen(s) and screening handling units, a grit separator and flow measurement and sampling facilities. This equipment will be installed within reinforced concrete structures at the northern tip of the site. The maximum height of the inlet works is proposed at 4 metres above ground level

Stage 2: Primary Treatment: This involves the settlement of organic solids and is achieved in the Primary Settlement Tanks (PSTs) into which a scraper is installed to sweep the settled solids to a central hopper at the based of the tanks. The settled solids are then withdrawn from the hopper and passed to the sludge storage tanks. Two primary tanks are proposed adjacent to the inlet works at the northern tip of the site; these will be constructed in reinforced concrete and extend to a diameter of 15.5 metres. They will be partially constructed below ground with the wall protruding up to 2 metres above the finished ground level. The sludge storage tanks will be constructed above ground in either reinforced concrete or glass-coated steel and will extended to a maximum of 10 metres in diameter and 7 metres in height. They are positioned towards the rear of the site adjacent to the eastern boundary. The application also notes that periodically, sludge will be collected from the tanks via road tanker and transported to Blackburn Meadows for sludge treatment.

Stage 3: Secondary Treatment: This phase involves the main biological treatment stage and is based upon a traditional 'trickling mineral filter process' where a biomass of living organisms are harnessed to break down the pollutants by using it as a food source. This stage requires the provision of seven mineral filter tanks; these tanks extend to a diameter of 25 metres with a maximum height of 2 metres above finished ground level. They are positioned within the southern half of the site partly fronting Manchester Road. In addition, this phase requires two 'humus tanks' that are positioned to the rear of the site. These are also constructed in reinforced concrete and extend to 16 metres in diameter with a maximum height of 2 metres above finished ground level with a scraper bridge above this. A pumping station is also required for this stage, which is positioned centrally within the site. This will extend to a height of approximately 7 metres above finished ground level and a width of 2.5 metres.

In addition, two storm tanks are proposed. These are provided to accommodate an event of significant rainfall where flows to the Treatment Works can exceed the capacity of the main treatment process stream; the storm tanks can receive and store these storm flows. Two 16.5 metre diameter tanks are proposed adjacent to the primary tanks towards the northern end of the site. They will also be partially constructed below ground with the wall protruding up to 2 metres above the finished ground level.

There are a series of structures to enclose the plant comprising the following:

- (i) The Main Control Enclosure: this will house the Motor Control Centre, which distributes power and controls the operation of the motor drives on the site. This building extends to 15 metres in width and 8 metres in depth with a maximum height of 5 metres to the ridge of the roof. It is positioned centrally within the site towards the eastern boundary and will be visibly by approximately 1.5 metres above the fence line;
- (ii) The Inlet Works Enclosure: this will house the Motor Control Centre to distribute power and controls to the motor drives at the inlet works. This building is sited at the northern tip and will extend to 10 metres in length, 5

metres in depth with a maximum height of 5 metres but it will not be visible from the road due to the proposed level changes;

- (iii) The Washwater Control Enclosure: this will house control centre that distributes power and controls the operation of the washwater pumps and the pumps themselves. The washwater is used to clean the tanks and other components. This building is sited;
- (iv) A substation will also be provided on site to house the electricity supply transformer. This building will be 8 metres in width and 5 metres in depth with a maximum height of 5 metres.

With regard to outfall, the applicant advises that the discharge from the Treatment Works will pass by gravity via an outfall to the adjacent River Don and the outfall pipe will be constructed below ground with an outlet into the River.

In order to accommodate the above works and minimise the visual impact of the development, the plans indicate that the existing site levels will be dropped across the central and northern sections of the site by between 3 and 6 metres. This will ensure that across the tops of the inlet works, the primary tanks and the storm tanks will not be visible above the road and will be well below the top of the boundary fence. Towards the southern end of the site, it is necessary to raise the levels by up to 2 metres such that the mineral filter tanks will be just visible above the fence level by a maximum of 1.5 metres. This height is necessary to accommodate the flood resilience measures.

The Works will require a new access onto Manchester Road; this is positioned centrally within the site and will provide access onto an internal road to facilitate pedestrian and vehicular access for Yorkshire Water personnel. The application advises that once operational, the site is expected to receive approximately one vehicle per day. During construction, it is also proposed that a traffic management plan be implemented so that the contractors access the site from the North and exit in a northerly direction to reduce the likelihood of heavy vehicle movements being taken through Wharnccliffe Side, Oughtibidge and Hillsborough.

The remainder of the site will be finished in either grass or gravel. Operational lighting will be provided within the site although the applicant advises that it is not intended that the site be illuminated at night. It is also proposed that a new boundary fence be installed comprising a green mesh fence to a height of 2.4 metres.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The most relevant planning history in relation to this site is summarised below:

05/04710/FUL: Erection of building for use as office/staff room.
Refused: 01.03.2006

This application was refused on the grounds that the proposed building was considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would cause

harm to the open character of the area owing to the design, siting, appearance and size of the building and in the absence of very special circumstances to justify a departure from the Green Belt policy.

03/00616/FUL: Erection of a polytunnel and excavation of a coarse fishing pond
Approved: 28.05.2003

00/00835/FUL Use of land for the establishment of horticultural and fishery enterprise with livestock housing.
Approved: 04.07.2000

It is also relevant to note that on land to the east of the application site, on the east bank of the River Don on the More Hall Refuse Tip, planning permission was granted to Yorkshire Water in 2003 (03/00129/FUL) for the construction of a Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) to serve the Stocksbridge Catchment. This permission was not implemented and has now expired.

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

The application was advertised by means of direct neighbour notification as well as by site notice and press notice. A total of 19 letters of objection have been received and 1 letter of comment.

The letter of comment raises the following issues:

There is obviously a need for this improvement to the service infrastructure but there is concern about the disruption caused during the construction phase along the length of Manchester Road. Serious consideration should be given to undertaking the work along the main road outside of normal traffic busy periods; the letter notes that there are no residences along this stretch of road so no disturbance would be caused if the work were to be undertaken between the hours of 22.00 and 06.00 hours, thereby reducing delays and traffic congestion at busy times.

The objection letters raise the following issues:

Amenity

- Loss of civic amenity: the existing fishing ponds are accessible by young people from Wharnccliffe Side and access to the riverbank will be lost;

Visual Impact

- Loss of visual amenity: some parts of the site have become run down in recent years but as the pictures in the Flood Risk Assessment show the fishing lake area is very attractive and these show the potential for the whole site, which is very visible to pedestrians.
- The constrained area of the site and the requirement for an 8m easement adjacent to the River Don means that the nearest tanks would appear to be

located around only 5m from the adjacent pavement. The Elevation plans would seem to indicate that much of the plant would be higher than the 2.4m boundary fence: even with screening this would be an overbearing and unpleasant development;

- This plant needs to be well back from the road and an allowance made to fully cover the area with high-density bushes and trees in keeping with the present surroundings
- Because of the size of the tanks and the chambers the proposed fences and trees will not be sufficient to mask the development and therefore will be visible from the roadside.
- The application states a 2.4m fence will be erected around the site. This will be unsightly and will hardly screen against the 5m high buildings proposed.
- The sludge holding tanks are to be 7 Metres high and very conspicuous by their very size and height. How will a 2.4 metre green wire fence hide all these from public view?

Green Belt

- The scale and industrial appearance of the development does not suit the location;
- As this is in the Green Belt, this application contravenes policy GE4 and GE8. Locating the works further away from the main road would prevent its impact. The desire to locate the works here is driven by considerations of cost only. The cost of cheap available land and the additional cost of extending the sewage rising main a further few hundred yards to limit the potential impacts.
- The objector refers to planning application 05/04710/FUL, which was an application to erect a building for use as office/staff room and indoor sales (More Hall Water Gardens), which was refused on the grounds of being inappropriate development in the Green Belt causing harm to the open character of the area owing to the design, siting, appearance and size of the building and in the absence of very special circumstances to justify a departure from the provisions of the adopted plan". If the planning application for erecting a building for use as office/staff room and indoor sales is not appropriate for this location, then certainly a 2.3-hectare Sewage Treatment Works is even more inappropriate.

Ecology

- Yorkshire Water is going to be destroying a lovely wildlife habitat, which seems totally wrong, especially as there is tipped land nearby;
- The fisheries site provides a much-needed natural habitat for animals, which frequented the site often. The Works on this site will disrupt the natural

balance of the area and will certainly discourage these animals from the locality, which would be a tremendous loss to our community.

Traffic

- Yorkshire Water is intending to take the sewer pipe down the main road from Deepcar, which will cause months of traffic chaos;
- There will be a disruption to the A6102 for an approximated 2-3 months (should the construction not be delayed at all), this poses a huge impact on the area, which should be taken seriously, the road is a major route into Sheffield for Stocksbridge residents, but also for commuters accessing the north of the city from the motorway. This could be very easily mitigated by using the alternate site at More Hall Tip;
- There should be some consideration taken into account that the proposed entrance to the Sewage works is on a 60mph blind corner, where there have been a number of road traffic accidents due to the visibility issues. It is my opinion that to have slow moving, heavily laden lorries gaining access or leaving the proposed site would pose a danger to other road users, especially cyclists and pedestrians;
- Concern for the amount of waste which will be removed from the site; there has been mention of "the site is only expected to receive one vehicle per day", what is not mentioned is the size of the vehicle, and whether this will increase over time should the throughput of the site increase also. Also there is mention of a traffic management plan, which will instruct contractors to access from the north and similarly exit towards the north. But what guarantees do we have that this will be enforced?
- a Yorkshire Water representative claims there will only be one van per day (Mon to Fri) for operator daily maintenance, plus 4 large lorries per week. If this is the case, why is a post box and a bus stop causing a hazard? And judging by the sizes of the 2 sludge tanks at 10 metres in Dia. and 7 Metres high, are we to believe that 1 lorry per day will be able to remove this amount of sludge to Blackburn Meadows?.

Other

- Planning Permission for a very limited development on this site has been previously refused as "...it would cause harm to the open nature of the area" in accordance with 05/04710/FUL. Furthermore, planning permission for a facility at an alternative nearby location was granted several years ago in accordance with 03/00129/FUL. This is still in the Green Belt but it isn't directly adjacent to the road and has the benefit of utilising land formerly used as a tip and still in need of remedial work;
- The Sheffield Development Framework (June 2010 Draft) shows a much needed walking and cycling route adjacent to the proposed development, which would link the Ewden Valley to the TransPennine Trail and

Wharnccliffe Woods. It would be good if any revised proposal for a facility on the former tip could be updated to include a way of incorporating this – possibly as a shared access route;

- The main reason for re-siting this facility is the new build of 369 proposed homes in Deepcar. This project in itself will put a huge amount of strain on what small amenities & social resources we have in this locality, not to mention the potential traffic impact that will be imposed onto the A6102. The construction of the Ewden WTP has blended in quite well but the WWTP sited next to a clean water source offers the potential of cross contamination despite precautions being designed into the construction;
- Planning permission has been given for another site which would be much better, away from dwellings and out of site, why cant you use that site instead of turving out the fisheries;
- The close proximity of this unsightly development is going to spoil our view and it will greatly devalue our property who if anybody will compensate us for this;
- Is it safe to put a WWTW so close to the Ewden works, which processes drinking water?
- This proposal is great for Deepcar and Stocksbridge who it will benefit for all their regeneration and new building projects but detrimental to Wharnccliffe Side who don't need this facility and definitely don't want it;
- The relocation of the existing WWTW will be detrimental to the environment for existing residents living in close proximity to the development;
- Concern about flies;
- The objector considers that it is bound to put people off moving to the village, thus affecting property sales/prices and having a detrimental effect on local economy (shops, pubs etc.) NOTE: The impact of a development on property prices is not a material planning consideration;
- Wharnccliffe Side has already suffered enough at the hands of Yorkshire Water and its constant encroachment on what used to be a lovely village. There are existing Yorkshire Water installations on Brightholmlee Lane and the treatment works on Manchester Road, adjacent to the proposed site. Residents have persistent issues with Yorkshire Water as once they have built their installations; they often extend the operations, and also fail to maintain them to any decent level;
- There is an alternative site available as planning permission has already been granted conditionally for the use of More Hall Tip (Ref: 03/00129/FUL) to build the works but it is assumed that there is a monetary implication and Bloor Homes/Yorkshire Water do not want to fund the building of the works in this area; this is not a reasonable justification in why this site has not been

utilised, being a perfect “hidden” area, which would not impact on any residential dwellings;

- Planning Application 92/1411P was refused on the grounds that the proposed development lies within 400 metres of Stocksbridge Sewerage Works and the Local Planning Authority consider that the erection of dwellings in close proximity to the sewerage works would be detrimental to the amenities of occupiers of such dwellings, owing to the attendant fly infestation and odour nuisance which would arise” If this is true, then shouldn’t the same rule be applied to a sewerage works being erected within 400 metres of an existing occupied dwelling such as the houses at Grove Wood?
- The money would be better spent modernising the existing Waste Water Treatment Works;
- The resident does not agree with the assessment in the application that the development will have very little environmental impact or little impact on the local area as YW already have two installations at Wharncliffe Side, neither of which serve the community and neither of which are kept maintained in terms of landscaping;
- The WWTW will be situated near to More Hall reservoir, a local beauty spot popular with ramblers, dog walkers, families, cyclists and riders. Will these people have to go elsewhere because they can’t stand either the smell from the plant or the mess, which will be inevitably created during its construction?
- There are livestock grazing nearby which is acknowledged in the Application’s accompanying reports. What impacts will the WWTW have on these animals? Will the owners have to move them? Will the soil be affected by any leakages or spills? There is an outfall pipe on the plans which discharges into the river. What exactly is being discharged into the local environment where people go fishing, and paddling in the summer;
- The application says that there will be no landfill. However, there is something mentioned called “Screenings to landfill”. What exactly are we having on this plant?
- It can be seen on the supporting elevations and maps that there will be a number of “reinforced concrete” tanks ranging up to 25m diameter. What guarantees do we have that these tanks will not leech, leak or crack and contaminate the soil? There are also a number of outbuildings with heights of 5m, and 7m high sludge tanks. This is not the kind of thing you would want in your village, whether downwind or not, and certainly not on a flood plain;
- The supporting reports state that a WWTW cannot be located near to new homes because of “fly infestation and odour nuisance”. So there won’t be any flies or odours at Wharncliffe Side;

- The effect if it were built to service new houses at Deepcar is also unacceptable due to the increase in traffic, school places, policing etc.
- Why do Bloor Homes simply build fewer homes and enlarge the existing treatment works? Will the plant need to be extended when the new housing development on the Steel Works in Stocksbridge proceeds?

The Objector considers that Site 6 remains available for development. he advises that Appendix A of the Team Report of 2002 is not shown within the filed planning documentation that is exhibited on line and the objectors feels it should be as in his view, it is extremely important for the actual document to be made available to the planning committee as the interpretation of this document made in section 3 of the Bloor Design, access & planning does not, in his view, correctly interpret the findings of that report. The "More Hall tip " site was selected as the most suitable on planning grounds and nothing has changed sufficiently to alter this except that Bloor have used their commercial strength to acquire an alternative site which is less suitable from a planning perspective because of the loss of the fishing amenity, that fact that the development is not on non Brownfield land, the screening of the site cannot be as effective as the Tip site, the proposed development is nearer to occupied dwellings which are within 400m and the re routing of the pipeline on to the north side of the river will be less disruptive to the community;

Limitations are placed on developing a WWTW within 400 metres of Stocksbridge or Wharncliffe and yet the application is for the new WWTW to build within 400 metres of dwelling houses at Grove Wood. If the GE23 policy worked for Bloor Homes application to build at Deepcar, should it not now be enforced to protect the dwellings at Grove Wood? (Note: Policy GE23 was a policy within the previous draft version of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan but it is not a policy within the current UDP and there is no reference within the UDP to 400 metres).

- The original site at Deepcar is 30,625 M² and YW insist that the site at Morehall Fisheries is suitable when this site is only 20,170 M². How are they hoping to double the numbers of filtration beds 7/8 at 25 metres in dia. and storm tanks and sludge holding tanks on a site which is one third smaller?

Odours

- The penetration of odours from open tanks is wholly unacceptable. The objector questions whether with modern design techniques this could be housed internally with a fume extraction and odour reduction system installed? Settling Tanks could be 75% below ground level making heights of buildings not un-sitely as it would seem for the present design;
- The objector has worked at the steelworks for many years and whilst travelling Manchester Road in the summer / warm days, he advises that the smell has been overpowering from the existing works;

- Does the policy GE23 ruling work that the erection of a Sewerage Waste Water treatment Works can be built within 400 metres of dwellings is it not contrary to UDP policies, which seek to ensure acceptable living conditions;
- It may be that newer treatment centres do not produce odours to the same extent as older ones but the resident advises that they have seen no written assurances of this and they won't really know until after it is in operation, which would obviously be too late;
- It is totally unacceptable to spoil the air quality of this small village, when there is an alternative solution;
- The odour assessment as carried out by SLR has provided some interesting figures, which mean nothing to the normal reader. There are many on-going cases around the country with residents complaining about odour. There is also the case of the Lundwood Water Treatment Works (Yorkshire Water) where residents have had a number of issues with flies from these works. To the objector's knowledge, flies still swarm around waste these days as they have done for many a year, and what guarantee do we have against these insects invading the village?
- The objector cannot believe that a Sewage works on the scale of what is being proposed for the More Hall Fisheries will not cause an awful stench in the village, which will have an incredible impact on the well-being of residents, pupils at the local school and visitors to our local pub and other businesses;
- The odour report does not show what happens when it is windy?
- The waste products are allegedly "to be stored in a skip prior to removal". Will this be a closed skip? How many skips will there be? How often will the waste be transported? Will it be hazardous? What will traffic transporting waste products be like? Will there be increased waste spillage onto the roads and dust flying if the waste is transported in open top trailers?
- Paragraph 8.12 of the Design and Access Statement states "there will be odours from fresh sewage" but goes on to say that "None of these odours are considered to be highly offensive." Who is trying to pull the wool over our eyes here?

Landscaping

- The resident advises that the topic of the site being landscaped is one of much debate as residents of Wharnccliffe Side are all too aware of the "landscaping" efforts of Yorkshire Water in the past, having other sites already in the village.

Flood Risk

- The objector notes that Hyder Consulting (UK) provided the flood risk assessment, as the proposed site is within a flood zone and has potential to flood. The objector is concerned that the flood event of 2007 was unprecedented, and with the climate changes we are experiencing, there is no guarantee that the flood risk in the future will not change and actually encroach on the Fisheries site, something that would decimate the area should it occur. The alternate site at More Hall Tip would remove this risk completely, hence it should be considered above the Fisheries site.
- If there is flooding in the future to the extent that we have seen in recent years, what guarantees do we have that the sewage being treated will not contaminate the local rivers and surrounding area?

Archaeology

- There has only been a desk-based assessment of the Fisheries site so far, and given the historical importance of the area, including flint scatter, lead mines in local woods, and late Iron Age and Romano-British sites, it is felt that a proper archaeological investigation should be carried out on the site before any further work is even considered. In comparison, there is no archaeological interest in the More Hall Tip site, which again, should be considered over the Fisheries site.

Consultation

- The objector is concerned that the residents of Wharnccliffe Side have been left in the dark about the plans for the More Hall Fisheries site. They note that a public meeting was held in October but the speakers did not seem to recognise the impact to the local community and did not know that much about the plans themselves.

In addition, a petition has been received with 206 signatures, which states that they strenuously object to the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Works. No specific grounds for objection are identified within the petition other than a strenuous objection.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

This application proposes the construction of a new modern waste water treatment works, which comprises the construction of a series of tanks and chambers, a kiosk and a distribution chamber. The scheme will replace the existing Stocksbridge waste water treatment works (WWTW) at Deepcar, which has to be decommissioned and relocated as a requirement of planning permission 03/00020/OUT for the residential and mixed use development of the land at Station Road and Manchester Road, Deepcar, which is to be developed by Bloor Homes.

The key issues to consider in the determination of this application include the following:

- (i) Principle of development;
- (ii) Pollution – Air Quality Odour;
- (iii) Landscape and Ecology;
- (iv) Transport;
- (v) Flood Risk and Drainage.

The Council is also required to consider representations received as a result of the public consultation exercise.

Principle of Development: Policy and Land Use

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF confirms that Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. At Paragraph 12, it is confirmed that the National Planning Policy Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. It states that 'proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise'.

Within the Adopted Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map, which forms the most up-to-date proposals map at the present time, the application site is designated as Green Belt.

The NPPF confirms at Paragraph 79 that the Government attaches great importance to the Green Belt and confirms that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It also confirms that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Paragraph 80 of the NPPF clarifies that Green Belt serves five purposes:

- (i) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (ii) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (iii) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (iv) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- (v) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 87 of the NPPF advises that as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 notes that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. It states that 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green

Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 89 of the NPPF confirms that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt although exceptions to this include buildings for agriculture and forestry, some facilities for sport and outdoor recreation; the extension or moderate alteration of a building, limited infilling in villages, limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use that would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development as well as certain other forms of development including mineral extraction and engineering operations.

Within the Unitary Development Plan, which remains part of the Development Plan Documents, Policy GE1 of the UDP relates to development in the Green Belt and advises that in the Green Belt, development will not be permitted, except in very special circumstances, where it would:

- a. Lead to unrestricted growth of the built-up area; or
- b. Contribute towards merging of existing settlements; or
- c. Lead to encroachment of urban development into the countryside; or
- d. Compromise urban regeneration.

The justification for the policy advises that the use of land in Green Belts has a positive role to play in preserving areas of open land extending into the urban areas, which have existing or potential recreational value. It is also intended to preserve easy access to open countryside for outdoor recreation.

Policy GE2 of the UDP relates to the protection and improvement of the Green Belt and states that in the Green Belt, measures will be taken to:

- a. Maintain and enhance those areas with a generally high landscape value; and
- b. Improve poor landscapes in priority areas.

The justification for this policy is that much of the Green Belt looks very attractive and should be protected and enhanced. However, the UDP acknowledges that there are certain areas where the landscape is spoilt by land dereliction, waste disposal, river pollution and fly tipping. Policy GE2 is therefore proposing that priority is given to those.

Policy GE3 of the UDP relates specifically to new building in the Green Belt and advises that the construction of new buildings will not be permitted except in very special circumstances.

Finally, Policy GE4 of the UDP advises more generally on development and the Green Belt environment and states that the scale and character of any development which is permitted in the Green Belt, or would be conspicuous from it, should be in keeping with the area and, wherever possible, conserve and enhance the landscape and natural environment. The justification to this Policy makes it

clear that the visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt.

In assessing this proposal, the first consideration is whether the development comprises appropriate development within the Green Belt in accordance with the definitions provided within the NPPF. In this regard, it is acknowledged that the application does comprise the redevelopment of a previously developed site (brownfield land) as it has formerly been used as a fishery and garden centre; however, many of the structures associated with the garden centre have since been removed such that it is difficult to determine the impact of the waste water treatment works and whether it would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, it is noted that mineral extraction and engineering operations can both be deemed appropriate development in the Green Belt despite the potential impact on the openness of the Green Belt that such development may have. Yet National Planning Policy makes no reference to infrastructure works such as waste water treatment. Accordingly, for the purpose of this assessment it is concluded that the waste water treatment works must be considered as inappropriate development within the Green Belt that should only be approved in the Green Belt in very special circumstances.

To this end, the applicant has submitted a justification for the development of this site, which is summarised below:

The supporting information submitted with this application makes it clear that the need to relocate the existing Stocksbridge Waste Water Treatment Works has been evident for many years in order to facilitate the residential development of the land to the east of the Stocksbridge WWTW, which is now owned by Bloor Homes. An application for the residential development of the Bloor Homes site at Deepcar was originally submitted in outline in 1992 (92/0411P) but it was refused on the grounds that the site was designated for special industry and the impact on future residents as a result of its proximity (within 400 metres) of the Stocksbridge Sewage Works. A subsequent application was submitted in 1994 with a new link road to Manchester Road; the applicant advises that this proposal was recommended for approval but was subsequently refused by the Council's Planning Committee on the grounds that it lay adjacent to the Stocksbridge Sewage Works. Both decisions were subsequently appealed and dismissed by an Inspector who concluded that as operated at that time, odours from the WWTW would harm the amenity of future residents although it was noted that technical solutions may have controlled some of the odour issues.

However, the applicant states that it was accepted by the Inspector and the Council that the only economical use for the Bloor Homes site at Deepcar was a scheme that included a residential end use, which ultimately led to the Bloor Homes scheme in 2003 for the residential and mixed use development of the land at Station Road and Manchester Road, Deepcar in accordance with 03/00020/OUT, which was submitted in January 2003. At the same time, an application was submitted for a new Waste Water Treatment Site at More Hall Tip, which lies immediately to the east of the application site. This was approved in December 2003 in accordance with 03/00129/FUL. The application for the

residential and mixed use development was subsequently approved in June 2007 and as part of that permission, the City Council imposed the following conditions:

Condition 4: No part of the development shall be commenced without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority until details of a scheme of works to relocate the existing waste water treatment works, including a binding legal contract to that effect have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Condition 5: No premises erected on the site shall be occupied without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority prior to the completion of works to close and decommission the existing waste water treatment works in accordance with the approved scheme.

In effect the residential development of the Bloor Homes site at Deepcar is dependent upon the decommissioning and relocation of the Stocksbridge WWTW.

Prior to preparing the application for the WWTW at More Hall Tip, this current application details that Yorkshire Water undertook a detailed appraisal of all site options for the replacement of the Stocksbridge WWTW within the vicinity and it is noted that all possible sites are positioned within the Green Belt. A total of 7 potential sites in the vicinity were identified of which 4 were immediately discounted due to their topography, ecology, the land being unsuitable due to geo-technical issues, access or the complexities of connecting to a transfer main due to site gradients. Three sites remained – the application site, the More Hall tip site and a further site on grazing land closer to Wharnccliffe Side; the latter was considered the least suitable being in proximity to Holme Farm, closer to Wharnccliffe Side and with a greater potential to issues of visual impact. As a result, the application site and the More Hall Tip were identified as the preferred options but at that time, it is understood that the More Hall Nursery had only just opened and displacing an existing and new business was not thought to be achievable or desirable as the land owner was unwilling to sell. There were also concerns about screening the site appropriately hence the decision to progress the replacement of the WWTW onto More Hall Tip, as per the 2003 permission.

Clearly, the applicant, Yorkshire Water, is now seeking to develop the application site rather than the site at More Hall Tip and their submission provides reasons for this change. Both sites are within the Green Belt but Yorkshire Water advise that there have clearly been changes to the ownership of the former garden centre site, which is now in the ownership of Bloor Homes and has been since 2007; the recent fisheries business leased the land on a short term lease, which has since expired. It is also the case that the garden centre developed the landscaped boundary to the A6102 Manchester Road to create a substantial screen to the site. Furthermore, Yorkshire Water advise that the location of the WWTW on the application site would avoid the need to cross the River Don with the transfer main being located on the same side of the river as the existing WWTW. Finally, it is noted that the application site has the benefit of immediately adjoining the highway network, which avoids the need to construct or improve existing bridges or highways with their existing facility at Ewden Works also being close by. It is for

these reasons that the applicant advises that the application site is now deemed to be more suited to their requirements.

The justification for preferring the application site in comparison to the previously selected site at More Hall Tip is understood. The requirement for Bloor Homes to relocate the Stocksbridge WWTW is a significant condition on the implementation of the planning permission that has an obvious financial implication. In order to deliver the housing on their site, which will assist in the objectives of Policy CS22 of the SDF Core Strategy, to meet the Council's requirement for new housing in the plan period, particularly given the status of the Council's 5-year housing supply, the relocation of the Works must be achievable and relocation to the application site will in principle achieve that objective. However, it must then be assessed in accordance with the Green Belt policy outlined above.

With regard to guidance within the NPPF and Policy GE1, the WWTW must be considered in terms of the potential harm to the Green Belt. The justification for Policy GE1 is the positive role of the Green Belt in preserving areas of open land; this application proposes the installation of infrastructure for waste water treatment with ancillary enclosed structures rather than buildings per se. Overall, it is considered that there are very special circumstances for the development of this WWTW within the Green Belt on the grounds that the principle of allowing a waste water treatment works in the Green Belt was effectively agreed when the application for housing development at Deepcar was approved in accordance with 03/00020/OUT. Furthermore, on the basis that it is essentially infrastructure, it is not considered to lead to the unrestricted growth of the built up area nor contribute towards the merging of existing settlements. It is also not considered to be urban development as such but rather an essential facility to serve the surrounding residential communities and the approved expansion of housing within the Deepcar and Stocksbridge area on sites that already benefit from planning permission, including the Bloor Homes site at Deepcar. To this extent, the provision of the WWTW will not in itself lead to encroachment of urban development into the countryside nor will it compromise urban regeneration but rather the development of this WWTW will encourage urban regeneration by enabling the re-development of the Bloor Homes site, which will contribute towards the City's housing supply in both the short and medium term. On this basis, it is concluded that very special circumstances do exist for the proposed development and it can therefore be deemed to accord with Policy GE1.

With regard to Policy GE2, in terms of protecting and improving the Green Belt, as noted above, there are very special circumstances for the development of this site but it must also be acknowledged that it has been previously developed. It is also proposed to enhance the landscaping around the edges of the site such that it will maintain the appearance of the site and to some extent, improve upon its presently unmanaged appearance such that it is not considered to conflict with the objectives of Policy GE2.

With regard to Policy GE3, in relation to new buildings within the Green Belt, it is considered that the only 'buildings' on the application site are enclosures to areas of plant such as a pumping station and an electricity sub-station. Given that the very special circumstances for this development are accepted, in principle, the

proposal can be considered to accord with Policy GE3. Moreover, it is noted that the application site will be well-screened by both existing vegetation to the boundary and by the proposal to reinforce the boundary with further hedge planting. The tallest structure is the 'intermediate pumping station' at approximately 7.5 metres in height but the elevation plans indicate that this will appear only 1.5 metres above the height of the proposed boundary fence such that it will not be unduly visible from the adjoining Manchester Road.

Finally, with reference to Policy GE4 of the UDP, which seems to ensure that the visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt, it is determined that the site is well screened from the surrounding area and it is proposed to further enhance the boundary planting to Manchester Road with native hedge planting such as Hawthorn, which will provide a good screen to the site from the main public view of the land. The eastern boundary to the river is also bounded by trees and planting, which will soften views of the site from the wider Green Belt area. Furthermore, the elevation plans indicate that the majority of plant will not be visible above the boundary fence fronting Manchester Road with only the tops of the mineral filter tanks towards the southern end of the site and the distribution chamber and part of the intermediate pumping station visible such that the scale and character of development is, in this instance, considered acceptable in accordance with Policy GE4.

In summary, it is concluded that very special circumstances exist for the development of this previously developed Green Belt site as a Waste Water Treatment Works on the grounds that its location within the Green Belt was effectively agreed when the application for housing development at Deepcar was approved in accordance with 03/00020/OUT. Furthermore, the relocation of the Stocksbridge works to this site will enable the commencement of the housing development at Deepcar, which will in turn promote the regeneration of a contaminated site and contribute to the 5-year supply of housing within the City in accordance with Policy CS22 of the SDF Core Strategy. It is also considered that the site will be appropriately screened with soft landscaping and is of a scale and character that is appropriate given the very special circumstances and it will not lead to the unrestricted growth of the built up area nor contribute towards the merging of existing settlements. Overall, it is concluded that the proposed WWTW will not cause undue harm to the Green Belt but this is, in any event, outweighed by the very special circumstances. On this basis, the principle of development is considered to accord with Policies GE1, GE2, GE3 and GE4 of the Adopted UDP and guidance within the NPPF.

Pollution – Odour

One of the primary concerns of local residents in relation to the provision of this WWTW is in relation to odour. There are no specific policies within either the UDP or SDF Core Strategy that relate to the provision of infrastructure such as Waste Water Treatment Works although Policy GE22 of the UDP does note that development should be sited so as to prevent or minimise the effect of any pollution on neighbouring land uses or the quality of the environment and people's appreciation of it. In this case, the nearest residential property is identified to lie to

the south-east at Holme Farm, which is in excess of 250 metres from the southern boundary at the closest point. The properties at Wharncliffe Side, Carlton Rise and Bitholmes Gate lie more than 450 metres to the south of the southern boundary of the application site with the properties at Grove Wood view slightly closer at a distance in excess of 300 metres. To the west, the closest property is at More Hall, which is at a distance of circa 373 metres

To address the matter of odour, the applicant has submitted an Odour Impact Assessment, which is a technical assessment of odour exposure. The Assessment determines that like Air Quality standards, exposure to odour is given in terms of a percentile of averages over a course of a year.

It notes that there are no statutory numerical standards for assessing the acceptability of predicted odour impacts from odour impact assessments in the UK such that the criteria used within the Assessment is based on research from outside the UK, case law and research to avoid significant detriment to amenity. However, the exposure criteria most accepted in the UK is given in terms of European Odour units as a 98th percentile (C98) of hourly averages. This essentially allows for 2% of the year when the impact may be above the limit criterion. The report also notes that recent planning appeal judgements have accepted a criterion of C98 1-hour 3 ouE/m³, which is essentially a measure of odour concentration. Guidance prepared by CIWEM (Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management) determines that a concentration of C98 10-hour 3 ouE/m³ would mean that odour complaints would be highly likely; at C98 1-hour 5 ouE/m³ they consider that complaints may occur and depending on the sensitivity of the locality and nature of the odour, this level may constitute a nuisance whilst at C98 1-hour 3 ouE/m³ it is determined that complaints are unlikely to occur and exposure below this level is unlikely to constitute significant pollution or significant detriment to amenity and the locality is highly sensitive or the odour highly unpleasant.

The Odour Assessment advises that the anticipated odour emissions has been estimated using those given in published literature for similar facilities in the UK and emission measurements from Stocksbridge WWTW as well as values derived from the design. It also uses summer odour emission rates as a means to test the worst case scenario such that the odour emissions will be lower during periods of high rainfall and low temperatures. The outcome of the assessment is that the predicted odour impact for all nearby residential receptors, which include the closest properties at Wharncliffe Lodge, Wharncliffe Farm, The Barn (Main Road), Holmes Farm, More Hall and More Hall Farm, Bitholmes House, Wharncliffe Avenue and Main Road at Wharncliffe Side all fall below an odour concentration of C98 1-hour 1.5 ouE/m³ with the majority falling well below C98 1-hour 1 ouE/m³ – only Holme Farm and The Barn exceed C98 1-hour 3 ouE/m³ at an average of 1.37 C98 1-hour 3 ouE/m³ and 1.20 C98 1-hour 3 ouE/m³ respectively. On this basis, the report concludes that complaints arising from the proposed WWTW are unlikely to occur and the predicted impact is unlikely to constitute significant pollution or significant detriment to amenity.

In addition, the applicant has proposed further details as to how the proposed WWTW compares to the existing Stocksbridge WWTW. It is advised that the

original works date back as far as 1905 and they were subsequently extended onto the northern part of the current site and developed to its current configuration during the 1960s. It is advised that the new Works will be different from the existing in respect of odour due to several factors. In general terms, odour issues tend to arise when sewage sludges are exposed to air. At the existing Works, the plant was not designed to minimise such events whereas the new WWTW includes such designs as standard. Similarly the existing plant does not have odour control technology employed on the site whereas the proposed works will employ such technology.

A key difference is that the sludge holding tanks will be covered and fitted with odour control units whereas the existing tanks are open and have no odour control. The primary tanks on the new Works are also fitted with automatic de-sludging pumps, which pump sludge directly to the new sludge holding tanks, whereas the existing are manually de-sludged. It is also advised that the new Works primary tanks and storm tanks are to be circular whereas the existing are rectangular; circular tanks evidently perform better on desludging and the storm tanks will be cleaned after every storm events by its half bridge scraper. The existing storm tanks are again manually desludged.

Thus, overall, this application will deliver a modern WWTW with new technology and the submitted odour assessment indicates that there will be no undue impact on the amenity of the nearest residential occupiers. As such, it is considered to comply in principle with Policy GE22 of the UDP.

Landscape and Ecology

The application site lies adjacent to the River Don. Policy GE 13 Local Nature Sites advises that development affecting Local Nature Sites (which includes as the River Don) should, wherever possible, be sited and designed so as to protect and enhance the most important features of natural history interest. It adds that where development would decrease the nature conservation value of a Local Nature Site must be kept to a minimum and compensated for by creation or enhancement of wildlife habitats elsewhere within the site or local area.

In this case, the application site was latterly occupied by a fishing lake business, which operated on a temporary lease and the tenant has subsequently left the site following the expiry of the lease. The fish within the lakes were subsequently removed and destroyed following an outbreak of disease such that the lakes are now empty of carp. However, the application does include the submission of an Ecological Assessment, which was based upon a habitat survey and a walkover of the site. The Ecological Assessment confirms that there is no direct connectivity between the existing ponds and the River Don.

In terms of species present on site, the Ecological Assessment considers that it is highly likely that the ponds on site and the River Don will support common frog and common toad although it is noted that there is an abundant alternative wetland habitat for these species along the River Don such that they should not be unduly disturbed by this proposal. There are no records of reptiles and the site is deemed unsuitable for adders. Records of numerous birds were found but all species found

were considered to be common and unthreatened with the exception of the mallard; whilst the site does provide foraging and a nesting resource, it is considered that the abundance of adjacent farmland and woodland will provide an extensive alternative habitat for these birds, this includes Kingfishers, which the Assessment notes may use the site occasionally.

With regard to bats, there are records of bats in the area and the site is deemed suitable for foraging. Within the buildings on site, no evidence of roosting bats was found. It is also considered likely that the River Don is a commuting corridor and foraging resource for bats but again, there is an abundance of other suitable foraging habitat within the local area. It is also the case that the WWTW will be a low activity use that will not necessarily deter wildlife in the long term.

The Ecological Assessment advises that no records of water vole were found although it is acknowledged that the ponds have the potential to support water voles and a detailed assessment is recommended, prior to works commencing which will form a condition of this recommendation. It is noted, however, that water voles are, in any event, fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). There are also two records of otter along the River Don at Stocksbridge and anecdotal evidence of otter on site by staff but no holt was present on site at the time of the survey and the site itself is not considered to be of importance to otters. No other protected species were evidence on the site.

The Ecological Assessment concludes that the existing ponds are actually of low ecological value, due in part to the presence of some invasive plant species such as Australian Stonecrop, which out-competes native vegetation and forms a dense mat of planting. Nevertheless, it is normally best practice to encourage the retention of pond habitat such that it is recommended that enhancement of the River corridor is undertaken as a condition of this approval to compensate for the loss of the ponds. This may include the installation of an artificial otter holt, tree management works to encourage a more diverse understory to the trees or bank protection measures and nest boxes, which will form a condition of this recommendation.

The Ecological Assessment also recommends that any soft landscaping incorporated within the scheme comprise native Nevertheless, it is normally best practice to encourage the retention of pond habitat such that it is recommended that enhancement of the River corridor is undertaken as a condition of this approval to compensate for the loss of the ponds. This may include the installation of an artificial otter holt, tree management works to encourage a more diverse understory to the trees or bank protection measures and nest boxes, which will form a condition of this recommendation. species to enhance the nature conservation of the site. Indeed, the submitted landscape plan does illustrate the introduction of native hedge planting behind the proposed fence along the length of Manchester Road and further details of this planting will be secured by means of a planning condition.

Overall, it is concluded that given the low ecological value of the ponds, their removal does not give rise to any significant ecological concerns but it is recommended that the enhancement of the River corridor within the boundary of

the application site is undertaken as a condition of this approval to compensate for the loss of the ponds. This may include the installation of an artificial otter holt, tree management works to encourage a more diverse understory to the trees or bank protection measures and nest boxes, which will form a condition of this recommendation. In addition to the proposed additional native hedge planting, it is thus concluded that the proposed development will not decrease the nature conservation value of the Local Nature Site and the development can therefore be considered to accord with Policy GE13 of the Adopted UDP.

Transport

The Design and Access Statement advises that following the construction of the WWTW, the site is expected to receive approximately one vehicle per day, which can readily be accommodated on the adjoining highway network. However, it is proposed that the entrance be relocated approximately 85 metres to the north of the existing access to provide improved visibility for vehicles accessing and egressing the site both during construction and during the operation of the works to provide an improvement on the existing situation. It is also proposed that a Traffic Management Plan be introduced for construction traffic to direct heavy goods vehicles via Deepcar towards the M1 to reduce the likelihood of HGV traffic through Wharnccliffe Side and Oughtibridge, which will be secured by means of a planning condition.

Overall, the level of traffic generated by a WWTW once operational is likely to be less than that generated by the fisheries or the previous garden centre use such that it is not considered give rise to any impact on the adjacent highway. The relocation of the access is also acceptable in principle with regard to highway safety.

It is noted that the application includes the need for a sewer connection between the existing WWTW and the new site, which will be transferred to this site via an extension of the existing pipework system with the preferred route running beneath Manchester Road; this will have to be partially closed to facilitate the excavations with a signal controlled operation in place for a period of 2-3 months during the construction period. The applicant advises that close liaison with the highways department and the community will ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum. The alternative option would have been to run the transfer main across the river and run via the waste refuse tip, which is considered problematic due to the stability of the tip and rights of access on private land such that the route along Manchester Road is preferred. It is not considered that the Local Planning Authority can reasonably insist on the option via the tip as statutory undertakers do have the authority to undertake works within the adopted highway. However, a condition is proposed to require the applicant to submit a strategy for the proposed highway works in terms of commencement of the works and the proposed mechanisms to ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum, which may include the timing of the works within the year and liaison with the community in terms of the length of time of the works.

On the basis of the above, the application is not considered to give rise to any undue highway concerns with regard to highway safety or traffic impact.

Flood Risk and Drainage.

Policy CS67 of the SDF Core Strategy relates to flood risk management and seeks to reduce the extent and impact of flooding through a range of measures including (a) requiring that all developments significantly limit surface water run-off; (b) the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems or sustainable drainage techniques on all sites where feasible and practicable.

The NPPF advises at Paragraph 100 that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. This is achieved by applying the Sequential Test and taking measures to reduce the causes and impact of flooding. Paragraph 101 of the NPPF confirms that the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. Paragraph 103 that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

In this case, the site is identified on current published flood maps as falling mainly within Flood Zone 2, which is a site at a medium probability of flooding. There is a thin strip adjacent to the River Don that lies within Flood Zone 3a (high probability of flooding) but no development is proposed within this area such that the application is considered in the context of the site falling within Flood Zone 2, which is an approach that has been agreed with the Environment Agency. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF confirms that water transmission infrastructure and pumping stations and sewage transmission infrastructure and pumping stations are water compatible development that are appropriate uses within Flood Zone 2 and are even considered to be acceptable within Flood Zone 3b (Functional Floodplain) if they are designed and constructed to remain operational in times of flood. As such, the proposed use is appropriate within Flood Zone 2.

It is acknowledged that the aim of guidance within the NPPF is to steer development towards areas with the lowest probability of flooding. In this case, the application site falls within Zone 2 and it is therefore appropriate to consider whether a site at a lower risk of flooding is reasonably available. Clearly, the geographical area of search over which the Sequential Test can apply in this case is limited due to the nature of the proposal and the need to be in relatively close proximity to the existing WWTW at Deepcar and the catchment area that the WWTW will serve. To that extent, the analysis of alternative sites previously undertaken by Yorkshire Water is still considered relevant with the only reasonable alternative to the application site being on the More Hall Tip site, which does lie within Flood Zone 1. However, as noted in the report above, whilst this site is deemed to be technically available, it is accepted that there are constraints to the delivery of the WWTW on this site primarily due to the viability of delivering the WWTW on a site that is not within the ownership of the applicant. As noted in the report above, the location of the WWTW on the application site would avoid the need to cross the River Don with the transfer main being located on the same side

of the river as the existing WWTW and it has the benefit of immediately adjoining the highway network; the omission of such constraints ensures that the WWTW is deliverable on the application and will enable the upgrade of sewage treatment facilities in the Deepcar area and it will also enable the residential development of the Deepcar site. Furthermore, as noted in the FRA, the provision of a new WWTW provides the opportunity to improve both the provision of sewage treatment and the mitigation against flood risks.

Given that a water compatible use is appropriate within Flood Zone 2 in any event, it is accepted that the site does provide a suitable location for the works with due regard to guidance within the NPPF.

With regard to the Flood Risk Assessment, it identifies a series of recommendations to ensure that the future designs of the proposed development take account of flood risk. These include designing of the facilities to avoid the 1 in 1000 flood extent; whilst the Environment Agency stipulates the 1: 100 climate change flood extent as the design event for the development, the FRA advises that the 1:1000 flood extent can be achieved with almost no additional loss of development land and this will minimise any risk associated with flood level predictions. An 8 metre easement will also be required along the River Don and finished floor levels of the structures set no lower than 300mm above AOD to afford protection against both fluvial and surface water. A surface water management scheme will also be necessary with details to be submitted by means of a planning condition.

Members are advised that the Environment Agency have been consulted on the FRA and they have no objection to the development subject to a number of conditions relating to bio-diversity and flood risk, which form part of the recommendation. In addition, the EA advise that the applicant will be required to apply for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2012, which will include the effluent quality standards that the works will be required to achieve. This process is undertaken independently of the planning process.

On the basis of the above, subject to adhering to the findings of the FRA, it is considered that the development is appropriate within the Flood Zone in which it lies and will not give rise to flooding elsewhere in accordance with Policy CS67 of the SDF Core Strategy and guidance within the NPPF.

Archaeology

Policy BE22 of the UDP advises that development will not normally be allowed which would damage or destroy archaeological sites and their settings. The applicant has submitted an archaeological desk based assessment for the site, which identifies that the main archaeological potential within the site is associated with the pre-historic flints historically found at the site whilst it was still part of a field. However, it is concluded that the creation of the ponds and landscaping that presently exist on the site will have had a significant impact on any sub-surface archaeological remains and there is therefore deemed to be low potential for the survival of buried archaeology; notwithstanding that there may be pre-historic

remains at depth below the alluvial deposits. The South Yorkshire Archaeology Service has reviewed the submitted desk based assessment and confirms that the proposed development has no archaeological implications such that it is not considered contrary to Policy BE22.

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

In response to the representations, the above report fully addresses the representations in relation to Green Belt policy, visual impact, landscaping, highway impact, amenity and odour but in relation to the outstanding representations, the following is advised:

(i) Loss of civic amenity: the existing fishing ponds are accessible by young people from Wharnccliffe Side and access to the riverbank will be lost; the fishing ponds were only permitted by the owner of the site on a temporary lease and that lease subsequently expired such that the fishing ponds have now closed in any event.

(ii) The Elevation plans would seem to indicate that much of the plant would be higher than the 2.4m boundary fence: even with screening this would be an overbearing and unpleasant development; as noted in the report above, the majority of plant will not be visible above the boundary fence; only the plant towards the southern end will be visible above the fence by a maximum of approximately 1.5 metres.

(iii) Planning application 05/04710/FUL was refused on the grounds of being inappropriate development in the Green Belt causing harm to the open character of the area. If the planning application for erecting a building for use as office/staff room and indoor sales is not appropriate for this location, then certainly a 2.3-hectare Sewage Treatment Works is even more inappropriate? As noted in the report above, it is considered that very special circumstances exist for the provision of the proposed WWTW.

(iv) A Yorkshire Water representative claims there will only be one van per day (Mon to Fri) for operator daily maintenance, plus 4 large lorries per week. If this is the case, why is a post box and a bus stop causing a hazard? And judging by the sizes of the 2 sludge tanks at 10 metres in Dia. and 7 Metres high, are we to believe that 1 lorry per day will be able to remove this amount of sludge to Blackburn Meadows? The application confirms 1 vehicle movement a day with some periodical sludge tanker movements and there is no reason to doubt the submission within the application. However, the anticipated periodical sludge tanker movements are being queried with the applicant and Members will be updated at the Committee in this regard.

(v) The Sheffield Development Framework (June 2010 Draft) shows a much needed walking and cycling route adjacent to the proposed development, which would link the Ewden Valley to the TransPennine Trail and Wharnccliffe Woods. It would be good if any revised proposal for a facility on the former tip could be updated to include a way of incorporating this –

possibly as a shared access route; this application will not affect the proposed cycling and walking route.

(vi) Is it safe to put a WWTW so close to the Ewden works, which processes drinking water? Both sites will be managed by Yorkshire Water and there is no reason to conclude that the proximity of the sites will be of detriment to one another;

(v) Concern about flies; It is understood that the presence of flies within a sewage works is typically as a result of the management and type of works – however, a response from the application in relation to the issue of flies is being sought and will be reported directly to Members.

(vi) There is an alternative site available as planning permission has already been granted conditionally for the use of More Hall Tip (Ref: 03/00129/FUL) to build the works but it is assumed that there is a monetary implication and Bloor Homes/Yorkshire Water do not want to fund the building of the works in this area; this is not a reasonable justification in why this site has not been utilised, being a perfect “hidden” area, which would not impact on any residential dwellings; The matter of the availability of More Hall tip is considered fully in the report above.

(vii) Planning Application 92/1411P was refused on the grounds that the proposed development lies within 400 metres of Stocksbridge Sewerage Works and the Local Planning Authority consider that the erection of dwellings in close proximity to the sewerage works would be detrimental to the amenities of occupiers of such dwellings, owing to the attendant fly infestation and odour nuisance which would arise” If this is true, then shouldn’t the same rule be applied to a sewerage works being erected within 400 metres of an existing occupied dwelling such as the houses at Grove Wood? The 400 metre rule is not enshrined within current planning policy; indeed, it is understood that the 400 metres distance criteria originally evolved from experiences with intensive pig rearing units in Humberside. In this instance, the application must be assessed on the basis of current planning policy and on the basis of the submitted documents, particularly in relation to odour, which is fully set out in the report above.

(viii) There are livestock grazing nearby which is acknowledged in the Application’s accompanying reports. What impacts will the WWTW have on these animals? Will the owners have to move them? Will the soil be affected by any leakages or spills? There is an outfall pipe on the plans which discharges into the river. What exactly is being discharged into the local environment where people go fishing, and paddling in the summer. Any discharge into the river will be controlled by the Environment Agency and will be controlled by the Environmental Permit that the applicant will need to apply for directly to the Environment Agency. With regard to livestock, it is unclear why the WWTW should have any detrimental impact on animals nor is there any evidence to give rise to concerns about leakages or spills, particularly as the tanks are typically constructed in reinforced concrete.

(ix) The application says that there will be no landfill. However, there is something mentioned called "Screenings to landfill". What exactly are we having on this plant? This application is a WWTW to replace the existing works at Stocksbridge as a sewage treatment works.

(x) The original site at Deepcar is 30,625 M² and YW insist that the site at Morehall Fisheries is suitable when this site is only 20,170 M². How are they hoping to double the numbers of filtration beds 7/8 at 25 metres in dia. and storm tanks and sludge holding tanks on a site which is one third smaller? The submitted layout plan indicates how the site can accommodate the proposed equipment and this plan will form part of the approved documents;

(xi) The odour report does not show what happens when it is windy? The Odour Assessment does use meteorological data as part of the analysis and notes that based on the Sheffield City Observation Station, the predominant wind direction is from the western sector with very infrequent wind from the north or south-east and this is built in to the odour predictions.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

This application proposes the construction of a new modern waste water treatment works, which comprises the construction of a series of tanks and chambers, a kiosk and a distribution chamber. The scheme will replace the existing Stocksbridge waste water treatment works (WWTW) at Deepcar, which has to be decommissioned and relocated as a requirement of planning permission 03/00020/OUT for the residential and mixed use development of the land at Station Road and Manchester Road, Deepcar, which is to be developed by Bloor Homes.

The application site lies within the Green Belt and it is determined that whilst it does comprise the redevelopment of a previously developed site as it has formerly been used as a fishery and garden centre, many of the structures associated with the garden centre have since been removed such that it is difficult to determine whether the WWTW will have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the garden centre. Accordingly, the application has been assessed as inappropriate development within the Green Belt that should only be approved in the Green Belt in very special circumstances. As set out fully in the report above, in this instance, it is concluded that very special circumstances exist for the development of this Waste Water Treatment Works on the grounds that its location within the Green Belt was effectively agreed when the application for housing development at Deepcar was approved in accordance with 03/00020/OUT. Furthermore, the relocation of the Stocksbridge works to this site will enable the commencement of the housing development at Deepcar, which will in turn promote the regeneration of a contaminated site and contribute to the 5-year supply of housing within the City in accordance with Policy CS22 of the SDF Core Strategy. It is also considered that the site will be appropriately screened with soft landscaping and is of a scale and character that is appropriate given the very special circumstances and it will not lead to the unrestricted growth of the built up area nor contribute towards the merging of existing settlements. It is therefore concluded that the proposed WWTW will not cause undue harm to the Green Belt

but this is, in any event, outweighed by the very special circumstances such that the development is considered to accord with Policies GE1, GE2, GE3 and GE4 of the Adopted UDP and guidance within the NPPF.

With regard to odour, the applicant has prepared a detailed Odour Impact Assessment and whilst there are no statutory numerical standards for assessing the acceptability of predicted odour impacts from odour impact assessments in the UK, the criteria used within the Assessment is based on research from outside the UK, case law and research, including standards produced by the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management. The odour assessment concludes that complaints arising from the proposed WWTW are unlikely to occur and the predicted impact is unlikely to constitute significant pollution or significant detriment to amenity. The applicant has also confirmed that the proposed WWTW differs from the existing works at Stocksbridge in a number of respects, including the fact that the existing plant does not have odour control technology employed on the site whereas the proposed works will employ such technology, the sludge holding tanks will be covered and fitted with odour control units whereas the existing tanks are open and have no odour control and the primary tanks on the new Works will be fitted with automatic de-sludging pumps whereas the existing are manually de-sludged. Based upon the information submitted, it is therefore concluded that there will be no undue impact on the amenity of the nearest residential occupiers by virtue of odour such that it complies with the principle of Policy GE22 of the UDP.

The application includes the submission of a detailed Flood Risk Assessment, which demonstrates that this is an acceptable site in relation to flood risk and the works will be designed to avoid a 1 in 1000 flood extent in excess of the 1.100 flood extent required by the Environment Agency. Subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions to require the scheme to be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the FRA as well as further conditions relating to surface water management and bio-diversity, it is considered that the development is appropriate within the Flood Zone in which it lies and will not give rise to flooding elsewhere in accordance with Policy CS67 of the SDF Core Strategy and guidance within the NPPF.

With regard to ecology and landscape, the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any ecological implications subject to a condition requiring the enhancement of the River corridor within the boundary of the application site in accordance with Policy GE13 of the Adopted UDP and the proposed landscape enhancements comprising further native hedging to the boundary to Manchester Road is also acceptable.

Finally, the proposed development will not generate any significant traffic movement, estimated at an average of 1 vehicle per day once operational such that it is not considered to give rise to any undue highway concerns with regard to highway safety or traffic impact nor are there any archaeological implications arising from the proposal in accordance with Policy BE22 of the UDP.

On the basis of the above, it is concluded that the proposed development accords with an up-to-date Local Plan such that in accordance with guidance within the

NPPF, it should be approved. It is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Case Number 12/03157/FUL (Formerly PP-02244553)

Application Type Full Planning Application

Proposal Erection of a detached dwellinghouse and garage

Location Land Adjacent Scout Hall
Uppergate Road
Sheffield
S6 6DA

Date Received 11/10/2012

Team NORTH & WEST

Applicant/Agent Cero Architecture

Recommendation Grant Conditionally

Subject to:

- 1 The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

In order to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act.

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

09-0912-sk3.1

unless otherwise authorised in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

In order to define the permission.

- 3 Samples of the following materials:

- (i) Facing materials
- (ii) Roofing materials
- (iii) Heads and cills
- (v) Boundary wall

Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that part of the development is commenced. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

- 4 Details of a suitable means of site boundary treatment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced, or an alternative timeframe to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the dwelling shall not be used unless such means of site boundary treatment has been provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter such means of site enclosure shall be retained.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008, Part 1 (Classes A to H inclusive), Part 2 (Class A), or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no extensions, porches, garages, ancillary curtilage buildings, swimming pools, enclosures, fences, walls or alterations which materially affect the external appearance of the building shall be constructed without prior planning permission being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining property, bearing in mind the restricted size of the curtilage.

To ensure that the traditional architectural character of the building is retained and there is no visual intrusion which would be detrimental to the amenities of the locality.

- 6 The dwelling shall not be used unless 2.0 metres x 2.0 metres vehicle/pedestrian intervisibility splays have been provided on both sides of the means of access such that there is no obstruction to visibility greater than 600 mm above the level of the adjacent footway and such splays shall thereafter be retained.

In the interests of the safety of road users.

- 7 The dwelling shall not be used unless the car parking accommodation as shown on the approved plans has been provided in accordance with those plans and thereafter such car parking accommodation shall be retained for the sole purpose intended.

To ensure satisfactory parking provision in the interests of traffic safety and the amenities of the locality.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of development details showing how surface water will be prevented from spilling onto the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

To ensure satisfactory drainage arrangements.

- 9 The dwelling shall not be used unless the hard surfaced areas of the site are constructed of permeable/porous surfacing unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved permeable/porous surfacing material shall be retained.

In order to control surface water run off from the site and mitigate against the risk of flooding.

- 10 The windows on the front elevation of the dwelling facing UpperGate Road shall be fully glazed with obscure glass to a minimum privacy standard of Level 4 Obscurity and no part of it shall at any time be glazed with clear glass without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority.

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

Attention is drawn to the following justifications:

1. The decision to grant permission and impose any conditions has been taken having regard to the relevant policies and proposals from the Sheffield Development Framework and the Unitary Development Plan set out below:

H10 - Development in Housing Areas

H14 - Conditions on Development in Housing Areas

BE17 - Design & Materials in Areas of Special Character or Historic Interest

BE18 - Development In Areas of Special Character

CS24 - Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land for New Housing

CS26 - Efficient Use of Housing Land and Accessibility

CS74 - Design Principles

The principle of housing development is deemed to be acceptable and accords with relevant policies. The dwelling has been designed to reflect the semi-rural character of the area and the use of high quality natural materials will ensure that a well detailed development which does not detract from the Area of Special Character. The development will not have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents and will not be detrimental to highway safety. The scheme complies with Unitary Development Plan Policies H10, H14, BE17, BE18 and Core Strategy Policies CS24, CS26 and CS74

The Local Planning Authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with a planning application.

This explanation is only intended as a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission. For further detail on the decision please see the application report at www.sheffield.gov.uk/planningonline or by calling the planning officer, contact details are at the top of this notice.

Site Location



© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 10018816

LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

The application relates to a piece of land 19 metres wide and 19 metres deep located on the southern side of Upper Gate Road on the edge of the suburb of Stannington. The site slopes down gently from north to south with properties to the rear on Well Green Road being set at a lower level than the application site.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a varied character. Traditional stone cottages and farm buildings are located on the opposite side of Uppergate Road whilst a modern detached building used as a Scout Hut is located to the west of the site and semi-detached dwellings dating from the 1950s-1960s are to the south of the site. The site itself falls within a Housing area as allocated in the adopted Sheffield Unitary Development Plan and also within an Area of Special Character.

Planning permission is sought to construct a detached dwellinghouse with associated garage, parking and landscaping.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

16 letters of representation have been received; the main points made are detailed below:

- Property is too large
- Proposed building is oversized for the plot, development will dominate the area and will be out of keeping
- Lack of amenity space
- Development will make the oldest part of the village appear very built up
- The design and location of the dwelling will dominate the skyline and be out of character with this section of the road
- Ridge height is 9 metres, this measurement has not been included in drawings but is of great importance (this measurement is not correct)
- The heights of the buildings reduce as you go down Uppergate Road, the proposal is 1 metre higher than the scout hut and so will appear out of scale
- The land is unstable
- It will block out light to properties on Well Green Road and result in overlooking to habitable rooms and gardens
- The proposal does not comply with CC UDP 4.32 iii) "provide adequate private garden to ensure basic standards of daylight, privacy and outlook are met for all residents"
- It will result in loss of views from house opposite on Uppergate Road
- It will result in loss of light to dwellings opposite, particularly the conservatory at No.136 which has not been shown on the plans
- Loss of privacy to neighbouring properties
- Proposal appears to be elevated in relation to 136 Uppergate Road, this will increase overlooking
- Devaluation of surrounding properties
- The drains are already full to capacity and are not adequate for the houses already in place
- Experience from owner of adjacent land suggests that water often finds its way through the site and onto the gardens of houses to the rear

- Land is very unstable, building would require large foundations which may not be suitable for this site and the instability could be dangerous for residents to the rear of the site
- Road is very narrow and busy and used by lorries
- There is no footpath adjacent to the proposed site
- Proposed development is on the narrowest, most dangerous section of road at which point it is not possible for two cars to pass simultaneously and views are already restricted by adjacent buildings and walls
- Property will cause safety issues for residents and visitors to the Scout Hut. Safely existing the garage and parking spaces will be extremely difficult as clear visibility of oncoming traffic will be virtually impossible
- Many children use the road
- Site will become an accident black-spot
- Farm opposite and has large farm equipment which will make highway safety worse
- When the scout hut was proposed permission for a two-storey building was declined, nothing has changed since this
- When the scout hut was built advice was given that the drains were at the limit of their capacity
- Ongoing viability of the Scouts should be considered
- Scout headquarters is a well used local facility
- Scouts use this land for parking, the loss of this will result in greater congestion and safety issues
- People using the scout hut will have to park further away and use a very narrow footpath on a congested part of the highway, this will be dangerous, the application should include a financial contribution towards traffic calming
- Concerned that if the development is allowed future residents may object to noise disturbance from the scout hut which could affect its operation
- A previous application on adjacent land was made in the 80s and refused, nothing has changed
- No planning notice has been displayed on the site
- Land should be given to the Scout group as they provide a valuable community service
- The plans indicate that some matters have already been agreed with Sarah Hull, is it correct procedure for officers to agree points before planning has been agreed
- Protected species have been identified in the surrounding area
- Trees shown on the plans have already been cut down

Representation from Scout Group:

- A notice has not been posted on site and the Scout Group have not received any consultation documents
- It appears that the council are trying to push this potentially contentious application through without the opportunity for consultation
- The Scout group have used the land for over 40 years, it should have been offered to them as sitting tenants for a sensible cost
- When the Scout headquarters were built it was highlighted that the drains on Uppergate Road were at capacity, the resulting building was like for like and did not put extra pressure on the drains.

- Concern was also raised about the stability of the ground and as a result of this the Scouts were only allowed to build a single-storey building
- Concerned that the proposed dwelling could add to the potential instability of the ground
- The Scout Group in Stannington is very successful and caters for approximately 110 young people aged 6 - 18 at no cost to the council.
- At peak times there can be up to 60 people using the site. The proposal will increase traffic and increase the risk of accidents

An additional representation from the Loxley Valley Protection Society has been received in respect of the amended plans. With the exception of the removal of the wings from the design, the previous comments still stand. The removal of the east wing would allow for the retention of a tree. Bat activity has been reported by residents so provision should be made for bats within the new design if the tree is to be removed.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Policy

Principle of Development

The site is located within a housing area as allocated in the adopted Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Policy HI0 "Development in Housing Areas" is relevant and defines housing as the preferred use. Therefore, the principle of using the site for housing is acceptable subject to it complying with other relevant criterial policies.

Policy HI4 "Conditions on Development in Housing Areas" sets out criteria which development must comply with. These criteria will be outlined in more detail in the relevant sections of the report below.

The site falls within an Area of Special Character and therefore will be assessed against UDP policy BE17 "Design and Materials in Areas of Special Architectural or Historic Interest" and BE18 "Development in Areas of Special Character". Details of this are discussed in the "design" section.

The site is void of development, currently being used informally for parking in association with the adjacent Scout Hall with the remainder comprising overgrown landscaping. The site is classed as Greenfield in accordance with the definition in the National Planning Policy Framework. Core Strategy Policy CS24 sets a target of no more than 12% of dwelling completions to be on greenfield sites between 2004105 and 2025126. The policy states that allowing some development on sustainably located small (fewer than 15 units) Greenfield sites is unlikely to prevent this target being met. The site is in close proximity to local amenities, including shops and schools and is close to public transport routes. As such the site is seen as being sustainably located and the development of a single dwellinghouse will therefore not conflict with the objections of Policy CS24

Policy CS26 of the SDF Core Strategy relates to the efficient use of land and

accessibility and advises that housing development will be required to make efficient use of land but the density of new housing should be in keeping with the character of the area. For the majority of the urban area (which includes the application site), Policy CS26 recommends a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. In this case density is just 20 per hectare but this is not considered to be out of keeping with the character of the area.

Design

Policy HI4 (a) requires development to be well designed and in scale and character with neighbouring buildings. Policy BE5 "Building Design and Siting" also requires good design and the use of good quality materials.

Core Strategy Policy CS74 is also relevant and seeks to ensure development respects "...the scale, grain and context of the places in which development is proposed".

The site falls within an Area of Special Character. Accordingly, Policy BE17 requires a high standard of design and the use of traditional materials whilst Policy BE18 'Development in Areas of Special Character' requires (as relevant to this application):

- (b) The retention of buildings, walls, trees, open spaces and other features that contribute to the character of the area;
- (c) New development which respects the appearance and character of the Area'

The section of Uppergate Road immediately adjacent to the application site has a semi-rural character and is characterised by a mixture of farm buildings and stone cottages with some later redbrick dwellings and a modern single-storey scout hut immediately next to the site.

The proposed dwelling has a simple appearance and has been designed to reflect the appearance of dwellings in the locality. The development is wide and thin and reflects the footprints of the cottages in the locality, particularly the dwelling directly opposite, No. 136 Uppergate Road. The proposal is set back from the pavement by approximately 5 metres and will be set along a similar building line to the adjacent Scout Hut, which given the varied building lines in the locality the siting is deemed to be acceptable. The height of the building is greater than the Scout Hut but as this is a single-storey building it is not directly comparable.

The proposal is well designed and has a simple cottage like appearance. The scale of the front elevation will be broken up by setting part of the dwelling back slightly and including a step in the ridge height. The use of narrow slits alongside windows will add variation to the front elevation. A detached garage is proposed to the side of the dwelling, this will sit comfortably adjacent to the main house. It is proposed to construct the dwelling and garage from natural stone with a slate roof, the use of high quality natural materials is of paramount importance and will be the key to ensuring the

development sits comfortably in the street scene and does not detract from the Area of Special Character.

Amenity

Policy HI4 (c) states development should not result in over-development, deprive residents of light, privacy or security, or cause serious loss of existing garden space which would harm the character of the neighbourhood.

Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions is also relevant. Although the proposal is not for an extension, the principles of this document are relevant to new housing development and provide detail over and above that found in the Unitary Development Plan.

The dwelling will be separated from the front elevation of the dwelling opposite (No.136) by 12 metres. This distance complies with guideline 5 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions which states that "A two-storey extension should not be placed nearer than 12 metres in front of ground floor main windows of a neighbour". As such it is considered that the dwelling will not be unreasonably overbearing or overshadowing to occupiers of No. 136. Windows in the front elevation of the dwelling have the potential to cause a loss of privacy to occupiers of No.136, as such those in the front elevation will be conditioned to be obscurely glazed.

A distance of between 9 and 10 metres will exist between the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse and the back garden boundary whilst a minimum of 25 metres will separate the rear elevation from the rear of properties on Well Green Road. These distances generally comply with guidance which requires 10 metre long gardens and 21 metres between main facing windows for privacy reasons. As the distance between windows is greater than the recommended distance it is considered that unacceptable overlooking will not occur even when taking into account the level differences between sites.

The scout hall lies to the west of the site and a garage to the east, the proposal will not have a harmful impact upon these sites.

The internal arrangement of the dwelling is such that all main rooms have adequate natural light and outlook. Furthermore a rear amenity space of approximately 200 metres will be provided, this is ample for a dwelling of this size.

Highways

Policy HI4 (d) requires development to provide safe access to the highway network and appropriate off-street parking and not endanger pedestrians.

The development will benefit from a garage and two off-street parking spaces. The level of parking proposed is adequate for a dwelling of this scale. A low stone boundary wall will be provided along the site frontage this will allow for adequate visibility splays from the site and therefore it is considered that the

development will not result in highway safety issues.

It is noted that at present the site is used informally for parking in association with the Scout Hall. The development of the land may therefore lead to increased congestion when the scout hall is in use as there will be reduced parking. However, the land is not owned by the Scouts and therefore it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the basis of this informal parking. Furthermore given the proximity of a large residential population it is anticipated that many people could walk to the site.

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

The main points raised through neighbour representation have been addressed in the above report

The issue of drainage and land stability will be addressed through the building regulations process.

Concern has been raised in objections that the planning officer has "agreed" certain issues prior to an application being submitted. Pre-application advice has been given on the scheme and this in itself is not unusual. It is highlighted that any pre-application advice is informal only and will not prejudice the outcome of a formal application.

The site is not considered to offer a habitat for roosting protected species

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

The principle of housing development is deemed to be acceptable and accords with relevant policies. The dwelling has been designed to reflect the semi-rural character of the area and the use of high quality natural materials will ensure that a well detailed development which does not detract from the Area of Special Character. The development will not have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents and will not be detrimental to highway safety. The scheme complies with Unitary Development Plan Policies H10, H14, BE17, BE18 and Core Strategy Policies CS24, CS26 and CS74 and is recommended for approval.