

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

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

**1. Application Number 13/03495/FUL**

**Address Site of Former St John's Church, Sharrow Lane**

**Additional Representations:**

23 additional representations have been received objecting to the proposal. The representations reflect the concerns already reported, with particular emphasis on road safety, questioning the viability of the proposed servicing arrangements and the impact on the local economy.

A representation from a local resident has been forwarded by Councillors Jillian Creasy and Mohammad Maroof. The Ward Councillors have been contacted to ensure that they are aware of the scale of local objection as the objector considers that not enough weight has been given by officers.

A further 282 signatures have been added to the petition against the proposals.

Councillor Mohammad Maroof has objected to the proposals on the grounds of increased traffic congestion, road safety, noise, pollution, adverse effects on air quality in a residential area and extra pressure on available parking spaces in an area where there are serious parking problems. He questions the independency of the supporting submissions on the grounds that the author is paid by the applicant and must have followed the applicant's instructions "to cater the report in a way that can serve the purpose." He also refers to the author having no connection with the area and the applicant profiting from the misery of the local people. Councillor Maroof also refers to the proximity of other convenience stores and the impact on local small businesses which are already struggling.

Paul Blomfield MP has also objected on the grounds of traffic implications, the parking situation and the potential impact on existing small businesses and wider local community. He states that the area is already well served by shops and supermarkets and the need for another large retail unit is questionable at best.

1 additional representation has been received in support of the proposal. The supporter feels the proposal will benefit the local community in many ways. The representation also makes reference to the support of a number of other residents who are unable to express their views and/or do not wish their details to be published on the website. (Please note that weight should only be given to written representations)

**2. Application Number 13/02433/FUL**

**Address Hollin Edge Farm, Common Lane, Deepcar**

### **Representations**

3 additional representations in support of the application have been received including the following additional matters:

If only two, will be vastly less than the impact from climate change;  
Despite location on edge of an area of high landscape value it will add an additional economic resource to the area;  
There is a need to judge the siting of wind turbines on the basis of which are the least worst locations.

7 additional representations objecting to the application have been received (6 of which are from existing objectors) including the following additional matters:

Application documents out of date as they were not determined in accordance with current planning policy;  
Photomontages not robust evidence, best practice standard should be adopted;  
Difficult to see how the two turbines proposed would not have a significant impact on the fabric, character and quality of the landscape and would not become a significant or defining characteristic of the landscape, assess cumulative landscape impact;  
Seek to ensure recent Government policy, impact on local heritage assets, cumulative visual impacts, impact on Peak District National Park, and the concerns of local communities are properly heard as stressed in recent PPG and offered significant weight,  
Does not address current planning policy issues set out in July 2013 PPG.

Stocksbridge Community Forum have objected to the proposal. Whilst they have no objection to the principle of renewable energy or even wind turbines, they consider that these wind turbines are not purely for domestic use, they would be conspicuous, dominating the local area. They have a place but not in an area of unspoilt beauty. This would create a precedent for other turbines in inappropriate locations and do not want to end up with turbines all around the hill tops.

### **Cumulative Landscape Impact Assessment**

The officer's report assesses the cumulative visual impact. In accordance with the Government's planning practice guidance the cumulative landscape impact is to be assessed separately.

In this regard it is the view of your officers that the two proposed turbines will have a significant impact on the immediate upland pastoral hills and ridges landscape and the adjacent river valleys landscape and the landscape of the nearby Peak District National Park. Whilst there are no other significant wind turbines in this immediate landscape the two proposed turbines would be a defining feature and have an adverse cumulative landscape impact in this immediate landscape.

However, within the wider landscape of the Southern Pennine Fringe encompassing the various settlements and western suburbs of the city it is considered that the two proposed turbines would have little significant impact on the fabric, character and quality of this general landscape and would not become a defining feature of this much wider landscape.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

Page 85, Second paragraph - Delete “constitutes” and replace with “may constitute”

Page 86, fifth paragraph – Delete “very special circumstances” and replace with “regeneration benefits”

### **Recommendation**

Reasons 1 add “and Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (2013)” to end of the reason.

Reasons 3, 4 and 5 add “and the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (2013)” to end of the reasons.

**3. Application Number 13/03282/FUL**

**Address 1-3 Dover Road**

### **Amended Conditions and Directives**

Condition 1 can be removed as the development has already commenced.

Given the proximity of the excavation to the highway a further directive should be added to any permission as follows:

Where a structure may affect the highway, a highway structure or the safety of the highway user, technical approval in accordance with Design Manual for Road and Bridges, Volume 1, Section 1, Part 1, BD2 Technical Approval of Highway Structures, shall be sought from the Technical Approval Authority (TAA) prior to the design commencing. For non-trunk roads in Sheffield the duties of TAA are carried out by Structures, Highway Maintenance Division, Sheffield City Council. No works shall be started until full design and check certification in accordance with BD2 has been accepted by the TAA.

### **Representations**

A further 6 representations have been received (all from persons who have previously commented).

Summary of points raised:

The proposal will de-stabilise boundaries.  
Site location plans between this application and 13/02847/FUL are inconsistent  
No indication is given of the intended use of the land.  
Work has taken place before the application was submitted.  
Details of a retaining wall for the west boundary should have been submitted with the application.  
A guarantee should be provided that any damage caused to neighbouring properties be accepted as the responsibility of the developer.  
Replacement planting should be included to replace those trees and shrubs that were removed on the Dover Road frontage.  
A condition should be included to exclude this area from the licence for the Former Polish Club.

The majority of these points have been addressed in the main body of the report. The Local Planning Authority cannot require the developer to make guarantees regarding damage to adjacent property. These matters would be covered by the Party Wall Act and would be a civil matter. There is no requirement on the part of the developer to provide information regarding the sites future use. However, the Local Planning Authority is currently registering a planning application seeking to develop this site with a residential scheme. The removal of vegetation on the Dover Road frontage did not require planning permission. The area in question would not be covered by the conditions of 13/02847/FUL since it is not included within the red line boundary for that application.

- 4. Application Number            13/02847/FUL**
- Address                                1-3 Dover Road**

#### **Amendments**

A revised red line boundary plan has been submitted which correlates with that of 13/03282/FUL.

#### **Conditions**

Condition 1 can be removed as the development has already commenced.

Condition 10

The wording of the condition should be amended to read 'external doors' rather than 'opening doors'

Conditions 11 & 12

Despite the comments in the report relating to a requirement for noise limiters being considered retrospective further consideration and a consultation with Environmental Protection Officers has concluded that the change in the external fabric of the building justifies the addition of these conditions.

#### **Representations**

A further representation has been received (from a person who had previously commented)

Summary of points raised:

Site location plans between this application and 13/02847/FUL are inconsistent.

No indication is given of the intended use of the land.

The nature of the boundary treatment is not specified in either application.

If the parcel of land covered by 13/03282/FUL were to be sold on the conditions relating to 13/02847/FUL would no longer apply. The two applications should therefore be heard together.

There is no requirement on the part of the developer to provide information regarding the sites future use. However, the Local Planning Authority is currently registering a planning application seeking to develop this site with a residential scheme.

There is not considered to be a requirement for a boundary treatment between the sites given the nature of the two applications. Should the site covered by 13/03282/FUL be subject of re-development proposals which created a new planning unit then a boundary treatment would undoubtedly be sought for any appropriate development receive permission.

A typographical error in the report makes it appear that the Green Party have a significant list of objections. It should be noted that the fourth item on the list is a new heading for reasons for objection from all other parties.

This page is intentionally left blank