

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

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

**1. Application Number: 20/03110/FUL**

**Address: 8 Springfield Glen**

**Additional Information Received From Applicant:**

In response to representations from neighbours highlighting perceived errors in answers to questions on the application form – relating to trees and hedges, parking, and whether the applicant is an employee of Sheffield City Council – the agent for this application has provided clarification since the finalisation of the Officers' report.

The agent states that no trees are to be removed as part of the proposals, although a few small shrubs will be lost to make way for the extension. Officers consider that this small loss will not have any adverse effect on the landscape or wildlife in the area, neither will it significantly impact upon living conditions for the applicant or neighbouring occupants.

Regarding parking, whilst the driveway to the side of the property is to be replaced by the side/rear extension, the existing driveway to the front of the dwelling, will be retained, as will an additional driveway to the right-hand side of the dwelling when viewing it from the front. This provides for 2 spaces which officers consider is sufficient.

With respect to the applicant's employment status with Sheffield City Council, it has been confirmed that the applicant was employed in the Parks and Countryside Service until October 2020. At the time of submitting the application the agent believed the service to be a private contractor of the Council, rather than an internal service, hence mistakenly stating that the applicant was not a member of staff at the Council. Since leaving full-time employment with Parks and Countryside, the applicant remains a casual employee of the Authority as a Ceremonies Assistant. However, due to Covid-19 restrictions on weddings etc. the applicant has not undertaken any work in this role for some time. Officers assert that this information does not alter either the assessment of, or the appropriate procedure for, this application. An application made by a member of staff working closely with the Planning Service, would be decided at Committee, as part of ensuring a fair and transparent process and outcome. As this application is now before the Committee for other reasons, it is not considered that this new information regarding the applicant's employment is a material factor in reaching a decision.

**Additional Representation:**

An additional representation has been submitted in response to the publication of the Officer's report from the occupiers of no. 10 Springfield Glen. It is summarised as follows:

- The paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that the neighbour believes are most pertinent to assessment of this planning application are highlighted.
- The proposals would change the character of the street scene due to the height, width, depth, and proposed use of materials to give a contemporary appearance.
- It reduces the existing gap between the buildings (no. 8 and no. 10) and will cause a terracing effect, and a sense of enclosure for occupiers of no. 10.
- It is asserted that officers show inconsistency in their interpretation and application of the adopted planning policies, which ultimately leads to inconsistent decision-making. This claim is made with reference to two other applications and associated appeal decisions.
- A request that Members defer the decision make a site visit.
- There is no evidence of the actual height (eaves and ridge) of the proposed development in the report.
- The extension would be a little over a metre from the main door of no. 10, presenting a blank façade with no architectural interest.
- The report states there is a glazed roof on no. 10's rear extension – this is incorrect.
- The development would have a significant negative impact on highway safety.
- The report is incorrect in stating that the distance between nos. 8 and 10 will be no smaller than between nos. 10 and 12. The gap between 8 and 10 will be 1.07 metres, and the gap between 10 and 12 is approximately 2.5 metres, sufficient to drive a car through.
- Attached with the written response are some photographs of the application site and no. 10, and annotations to the existing and proposed plans showing approximate dimensions of features and the relationship between the two dwellings.
- In several places the representation questions what evidence the Local Authority has used to substantiate its claims.

### **Officer Response**

- The claims regarding inconsistent decision-making are made with reference to two other applications and their associated appeal decisions. Although these applications had similar descriptions to no. 8 Springfield Glen, they both relate to semi-detached dwellings with very different site contexts which mean that they are not directly comparable with the site at no. 8 Springfield Glen.
- It was not considered necessary to the officer's account of the planning assessment to state the proposed height of the development. This is because scaled drawings have been provided that demonstrate the relationship of the proposed extensions to both the original dwelling and to no. 10, and Committee Members have sight of these.
- An apology is offered for the incorrect claim in the report that there is a glazed roof on no. 10's rear extension. This is not considered to have a material impact on the assessment made thereafter.

- The report does not state that the distance between nos. 8 and 10 will be no smaller than between nos. 10 and 12, it states that there will be “similar separation distances” between neighbouring dwellings and that the overall impact of these on the appearance of the host dwelling in the street scene, taking into account the block plan or grain of the road, will be minimal.
- In response to the questioning of the Local Authority’s evidence, or claims of a lack thereof, officers are familiar with the site, having carried out a visit to the site and to no. 10 at the request of the occupiers on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2020. Photographs were taken as a record of the visit and these were used alongside other resources at officers’ disposal in reaching the decision.

All other matters are considered to have been addressed within the main agenda report.

**2. Application Number: 20/02057/FUL**

**Address: Land Between 94 And 98 Wheel Lane**

Report correction on page 69 of the agenda with regard to the ridge heights of house 1 referenced against applications ref: 18/02229/FUL and 19/03073/FUL.

Members are advised that under planning ref: 18/02229/FUL the ridge of house 1 was 3.915 metres higher than the corresponding ridge of No.98, not 3.6 metres as quoted in the report.

Under application ref: 19/03073/FUL the ridge height of house 1 was 3.6 metres higher than the ridge of No.98, not 3.195 metres as stated in the report.

**3. Application Number: 20/01667/FUL**

**Address: Waggon and Horses, 57 Abbeydale Road South and Park Land Adjacent.**

**Additional Representations**

Two additional representations have been received. One supports the scheme without offering reasoning and the second states that:

It will bring a very underused piece of the park into use and be an invaluable community asset. The only place to sit outside at the moment is by a busy road. Covid restrictions are likely to be with us for some time and have proved how much healthier it is to be outside.

**Parks and Countryside Consultation**

Officers have been advised that Parks and Countryside, in their potential role as future landlord should the development proceed, have now completed a consultation exercise. We are aware that the purpose of that exercise was to inform the development and the lease conditions should this application be granted and is not a material consideration in respect of this application.

## **Public Sector Equality Duty**

The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

As provided in the main body of the report, concerns have been raised regarding park members who are Muslim and the impact this proposal may have on their enjoyment of the park due to being able to observe alcohol consumption. The report advises it is a small part of the park which can be largely avoided by using alternative entry and exit points.

To comply with the duty the Council must, in the exercise of its function (including planning decisions), have due regard to the need to:

- (a) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
- (c) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.