

## CITY CENTRE SOUTH & EAST AREA COMMITTEE 29 April 2013

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

#### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. **Application Number:** 13/00724/FUL

**Address:** Plot V, Europa View, Sheffield Business Park

#### **Amendment to Condition 3**

The maximum number of car parking spaces on the site shall be 149 spaces, consisting of 143 standard spaces and 6 disabled spaces

In the interests of limiting commuter car parking and defining the permission

#### **Amendment to Justification**

Paragraph 2 to be amended to refer to "149 car parking spaces **including** 6 disabled spaces"

2. **Application Number:** 13/00383/FUL

**Address:** 135 Dore Road

#### **Additional Representations**

Additional comments have been received from the applicant and various neighbours.

#### **Neighbour Comment**

Since the Officer's recommendation was included on this Committee agenda, 34 additional representations have been received. Of the additional 34 representations that have been received, 9 have been sent from addresses which have already submitted comments. All of the 34 additional representations are presented on a duplicate letter which the majority of the previous correspondents used. These additional 34 representations do not, therefore, raise any further concerns that have not been addressed in the Committee report.

A neighbour residing to the rear of the site has raised concerns with the accuracy of the Officer's report. The e-mail received by the neighbouring resident raises concerns that the report does not mention that the Planning Inspector did not give much weight to the two previous housing schemes and that this proposal has an extraordinary increase in density when compared to surrounding area. He states that the average density of the surrounding properties is less than 7 dwellings per hectare and more generally, Dore Road has less than 9 dwellings per hectare.

Using measurements taken from a former lease document, the neighbour has worked out the density of the site to be 32.94 dwellings per hectare (dph). These figures are not disputed. The figure of 29 dph referred to in the Officer's report was based on a site measurement provided by the applicant that differs slightly from that within the lease document.

### **Applicant Comment**

The applicant has also responded to the Officer's report and gives his opinion that the Planning Inspectors decision was marginal. It states further that the massing has been reduced by significantly reducing the size of the individual units rather than the numbers of apartments. The applicant feels this is clearly shown in the visuals that he has now submitted. The visuals referred to have been attached to the application file and can be viewed.

The applicant also refers to a Unilateral S106 Agreement that he has submitted since the Officer's recommendation was made.

### **Officer Comment**

Residents Comments

Inspector Consideration

The Inspector did give weight to the two previously approved housing schemes, recognising them as extant permissions, but felt they did not weigh heavily in favour of the apartment scheme as their form, scale and massing would be far less, and they would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Density

The difference in the two density figures quoted is not critical to the consideration of the application. The density range of 30-50 dph referred to in policy CS26 is a guideline figure and is subject to consideration of local character. The Council's evidence provided to the Inspector in consideration of the previous appeal was that typical density in the area is 12 dph. The key issue remains whether the form of development produces an impact that reflects local character, and is not harmful to it.

Applicant's Comments

Inspector Consideration

Officers' consider that the Inspector's decision on the previous application was a very clear rejection of the previous proposals in terms of their impact upon local character, and do not therefore agree that this was marginal.

S106 Agreement

A s106 agreement has now been received. It should be noted, however, that the figure used is that which was calculated in 2011 and not the current figure of

£11,340.30. Accordingly, an agreement that satisfies the requirements of UDP policy H16 has not been submitted to satisfy the concerns originally outlined in the Officer's recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank