

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Application Number: 12/02771/FUL

Address: Europa Link

The coated roadstone plant adds to the ground level concentrations of nitrogen dioxide in Brinsworth. If the plant were to operate to its maximum capacity the emissions in Brinsworth would be considered to be too high. Therefore a limit on the throughput of the coated roadstone plant has been agreed with the applicant, this will ensure emissions are maintained within acceptable levels.

Additional Condition.

C Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority the output from the coated roadstone plant shall not exceed 370,000 tonnes per annum in any calendar year.

R In order to ensure the Air Quality Impact of emissions from the coated roadstone plant in Brinsworth remains within acceptable levels in order to protect human health.

2. Application Number: 12/03326/FUL

Address: 29 Thornsett Road

Additional Representations

Four additional representations have been made.

One of the representations (received on 10/12/2012) has been made from a neighbouring property. The representation includes information upon restrictive covenants upon the property, plus also a photo showing the on street parking in the evening (no precise time has been supplied), which shows heavy on street parking.

The restrictive covenant is not a material planning matter and refers to private legal matters. As a result, it cannot be taken into account in the main assessment.

With regards to the parking issue, matters have already been discussed in the main assessment. The additional information does raise the issue of on street parking congestion at specific times in the evening, probably when all residents of the street are at home, but officer assessments during the day when most users will be parked up for the premises reveals little on street parking congestion.

A second representation from this neighbour (received on 14/12/2012) comments that they believe that the application should not be determined in the absence of an environmental impact assessment; and independent traffic survey and a risk assessment of the proposal.

However, officers consider that enough information has been received to allow the impact of the application to be fully judged. Officers have, in conjunction with officers from the Environmental Protection Service, considered the noise implications of the development. The officer has carried out an independent survey of the likely traffic movements to and from the site, and the report and assessment presumes a worst case scenario in terms of traffic movements. With regards to a risk assessment, the issue of risk from residents is already covered in the report.

A separate representation from another neighbouring property (received on 14/12/2012) has been received raising the issue of the risk of crime from potential residents, notably pointing out the potential likelihood of violent crime including reference to murders from patients suffering from schizophrenia. The representation calculates that the murder rates from schizophrenic people are 1/6000 compared to 1/62000 in the adult population. The figures are backed up by reports to which the representation refers.

This comment has been noted. The risk of crime has been covered in the main report. It should be noted that schizophrenic patients will not be the sole occupier of the premises and that more serious cases will not be housed in the unit. As a result, the officer's conclusion in the report of recommendation stands.

A fourth representation (received on 11/12/2012) has been made in support of the application pointing out the need for additional facilities of this nature. The representation is not a resident in the local area.

Supporting Statement by the Applicant

Additional supporting information with regards to the planning application has been received from the applicant. The statement responds to several of the concerns raised by representations. Each of the issues discussed has been formally assessed in the report, and the additional information has not altered the conclusions raised by the assessment.

3. Application Number: 12/02245/FUL.

Address: 8, Thornsett Gardens.

Additional Representations.

Two further letters have been received by the applicant in support of the application.

The applicant feels that the difference in height between what has been built at 228 cms and what would be permitted development at 200cms is significant because it provides additional screening when viewing the adjoining development.

The applicant has offered a compromise. The fencing at the southern end could be reduced in height to 200cms, which would comply with permitted development limits, because the building works here are complete. However, the rest of the fence at the northern end facing the remaining development site at 79, Dore Road would remain in place until the site was fully developed.

The front part of the development site has planning permission for 12 houses and work has started on one but now ceased. It is possible that work may not recommence for some time and there is no planning control over this. This would mean that no time limit could be set on the fence remaining at a height of 228cms. In addition, your officers still feel that a reduction in height down to 200cms would provide very similar protection from the impact of building works.

Consequently, there is no change to the recommendation.

4. Application Number: 12/02873/FUL and 12/02874/LBC

Address: Site of Former Jessop's Hospital for Women, Leavy Greave Road

Amended Conditions

Condition 3

Within 6 months of the commencement of development:

- a) Investigations as to whether highway improvements (which expression shall include traffic control, pedestrian crossing and cycle safety measures to Upper Hanover Street) are required, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for review, and;
- b) If those investigations indicate that works are necessary then full details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the approved works shall be implemented before the development is brought into use.

Condition 6

The development shall not be begun until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of arrangements which have been entered into which will secure the reconstruction of the footways adjoining the site before the development is brought into use. The detailed materials specification shall have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of the commencement of development.

In order to ensure an appropriate quality of development.

Condition 8

Within 6 months of the commencement of development, full details of suitable and sufficient cycle parking accommodation within the site shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the shall not be used unless such cycle parking has been provided in accordance with the approved plans and, thereafter, such cycle parking accommodation shall be retained.

In the interests of delivering sustainable forms of transport, in accordance with the Transport Policies in the adopted Unitary Development Plan for Sheffield (and/or Core Strategy).

Condition 10

A comprehensive and detailed hard and soft landscape scheme for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of the commencement of development.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

Condition 14

Prior to the commencement of development, other than enabling and preparatory works, the finalised gas protection measures (in line with the Gas Screening Value CS2) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures will then become part of the approved Remediation Strategy.

In order to ensure that any contamination of the land is properly dealt with.

Condition 21

The surface water discharge from the site shall be limited to 40l/s, utilising two new outfalls, one to the 900 mm diameter public combined sewer recorded in Brook Hill and one to the 300 mm diameter public combined sewer recorded in Leavy Greave Road. The split should be 30l/s to the 900 mm diameter PCS and 10l/s to the 300 mm PCL.

R067 In order to mitigate against the risk of flooding.

Condition 22

Full details of proposals for the inclusion of public art within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall then be implemented prior to the occupation of the development unless otherwise authorised in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

In order to satisfy the requirements of Policy BE12 of the Unitary Development Plan and to ensure that the quality of the built environment is enhanced.

Additional Conditions

DR7 No piped discharge of surface water from the application site shall take place until surface water drainage works including off-site works have been completed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

R038 To ensure satisfactory drainage arrangements.

Additional Representations

118 further representations have been received in connection with the applications to demolish the Edwardian Wing of the former Jessop Hospital and erect the new Engineering Building. These include 110 objections and 8 in support of the proposals.

Objectors to the scheme largely raise the same issues as covered in the report as follows:

- the need for the New Engineering Building is not exceptional enough to warrant the demolition of the listed building.
- the University has failed to properly investigate alternative sites.
- I do not accept that the Edwardian wing cannot be modified to suit present needs. It is a challenge good architects should be able to deal with. The mind set of the University has to be changed to avoid the loss of an outstanding building.
- The Edwardian wing is an important part of our past. If it was done up to its potential it would still be here for future generations to enjoy and learn from.
- The proposed building looks like lazy design rather than a great iconic building.
- The University should respect the views of local people, preserving the city's heritage whilst promoting progress.
- The Jessop complex is a single listed building – you can't pick and choose which elements are worthy for retention and condemn those it is deemed desirable to remove.
- It is imperative that we retain the old buildings that still stand in Sheffield in order not to lose the original character of the city. History is what makes a city interesting for its inhabitants and visitors. Whilst new buildings can enhance a city's existing architecture, it can in no way replace the character and memories these buildings possess.
- This project should have been treated as an exemplar to students of the engineering department, demonstrating how an exciting construction of architectural and engineering merit can be achieved whilst restoring and preserving an adjacent grade II listed building.
- The proposed demolition undermines the whole concept of protecting valued buildings.
- The University of Sheffield values its own heritage and should give equal value to this iconic building which not only marks a period of rapid social change and medical progress but holds great significance for many women and their families.
- The destruction of historically important buildings, the degradation of the unique and special character of an area, damage to the settings of numerous listed buildings – these are actions which cannot be justified on the basis of economic convenience.

- To allow the University to demolish this building would make a mockery of all those organisations and individuals in Sheffield who abide by the restrictions of listed building and conservation area status.

Supporters of the scheme made the following points:

- The Faculty of Engineering and wider University have a vital role to play in supporting economic development in Sheffield and the City region. The demolition of the Edwardian wing is a small price to pay to enable Sheffield, its universities and the world class manufacturing companies based in the area to remain at the forefront of manufacturing and engineering in an increasingly competitive global market place.
- The success of many local companies depends on being able to innovate and develop new products to compete with the low cost economies of the world. The academic and research support of the Universities achieves this aim.
- The building which will have to be demolished to realise this development has little architectural merit and the new building will enhance the urban landscape.
- The growth of the Faculty will bring many more students into the city, offering both the immediate benefit of their contribution to the local community and economy, as well as the future benefit of a growing supply of highly skilled professionals.
- Urge the Council to think strategically for the city and not let this opportunity to lift the whole city go to waste.

5. Application Num. 12/03456/FUL.

Address. 102 Harcourt Road, Sheffield, S10 1DJ.

Additional Representations.

Following completion of the Committee Report a further 10 representations have been received from 7 different addresses, and can be summarised as follows:

- Design Statement incorrectly states that the area has mostly been converted to student HMOs, but there is approximately 40% student housing within 200m of the site, and application property is primarily surrounded by family homes. Statement also refers to house having been used to accommodate students, but no proof offered, and was used during South Yorkshire Housing Association's ownership (for over 10 years) as C3 accommodation.
- Already sufficient student housing in area. Proposal would conflict with mixed nature of current population.
- If developer is not aiming to create more student housing, a condition should be accepted stating that flats must not be rented to students for duration of development.
- Existing issues with bins, litter, fly tipping, noise and anti-social behaviour will be made worse.
- Potential increase in number of parked vehicles.
- Small living spaces would attract short term residents/students.
- Impact on drainage problems.
- Would set precedent for more HMOs, and would threaten the tenuous nature of the current sustainable community.

- Contradicts covenants placed on properties previously owned by the University, preventing re-use as HMOs.
- Proposal represents over-development.
- Proposal conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS41 (d). Proposal does not address core issues raised in relation to the previous application, includes as many students as the previous scheme.
- The previously existing two flats would attract professional renters / buyers, or families.
- Aim is to maximise profit.
- The Council's Corporate Plan "A City of Opportunity" prioritises stronger communities, and as part of this the concerns of residents should be heard.
- Scheme would conflict with UDP Policy H14 (c) by including too many people, and Core Strategy policy CS74(e) due to overflowing bins, drainage problems and increase in cars.
- UDP Policy H5 requires multiple sharing of houses to not cause a serious nuisance to existing residents, for living conditions to be considered acceptable, and for there to be appropriate off-street parking.

In addition Cllr Dunn has commented that the community have been working hard to improve relationships between varying demographics, and the situation has improved.

The proposal would not attract working professionals or families, but rather students, and is essentially a HMO meaning that all of the previous objections still apply. The comments made by the community and Cllr Wattam are supported within Cllr Dunn's representation.

Comments on Additional Representations

The additional comments have been responded to in the main report.

This page is intentionally left blank