

## **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

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

**1. Application Number: 22/04338/FUL**

**Address: Dore Moor Nursery, Brickhouse Lane, Sheffield, S17 3DQ**

#### **Additional representations:**

3 further objections have been received since the agenda has been published. These raise the following issues:

- The application is not compatible with the local and national planning policies regarding Green Belt, which is contrary to Dore Neighbourhood plan.
- The site would not be compatible with local infrastructure nor would it be an amenity for local residents.
- The garden centre is a lovely asset to the community, and an attractive and useful addition to Dore.
- The location is not ideal for the elderly, up a steep hill from Dore, removed from regular bus services into the City and Dore and Totley Station.
- It would be better to demolish / convert some of the enormous houses in the urban areas.
- There are lots of supporting statements from outside of the area, submitted by a third party company. These should be disregarded by the Council.

**2. Application Number: 22/00877/FUL**

**Address: Land Between 5 and 21 Holmhirst Road, Sheffield S8 0GU**

#### **Amendment to Conditions**

##### **Condition 5**

This condition is listed as a Pre-Commencement Condition (True Condition Precedent) when it should be listed under the Pre-Occupancy Category. The conditions will need to be re-ordered and re-numbered accordingly before any decision notice is issued.

#### **Report Update**

The report identifies Sheffield falls short of achieving a 4-year housing supply, with the figure on p.131 reported as being 2.86 years. This should in fact read 3.01 years.

- 3. Application Number: 23/00777/FUL**  
**Address: Within Curtilage of KFC, 236 Queens Road, Highfield, Sheffield, S2 4DL**

**Additional Representation:**

The Sheaf & Porter Trust have written following the decision to defer determination of the application at the previous Committee meeting, reiterating the concerns expressed at the meeting in relation to:-

- The proximity of the bin store and associated litter to River Sheaf Walk;
- Uncertainty over relationship of KFC bins to the proposal;
- Customer seating on Queens Road frontage exposed to noise and poor air quality rather than adjacent to attractive river setting;
- Absence of consideration of UDP policy GE17;

The Trust also consulted with the River Stewardship Company and their own River Rangers about the issues they face in maintaining the river and concluded drew conclusions which led to the following requests:

- i) The applicant provides a new safe access for stewardship and maintenance in the form of a lockable gate and ring protected steel down to the river with keys held by the site managers, the Environment Agency and the River Stewardship Company;
- ii) The extension of mesh panels along the full extent of the railings to minimise blown litter from the site;
- iii) Installation of River Sheaf Walk historical and waymarking signage.

**Officer Response**

The matters which led to the deferral of the application have been the subject of discussions with the applicant and amended proposals form the basis of the assessment and recommendation as set out in the agenda.

The bin store proposed serves both the existing KFC operation and the proposed Dunkin Donuts unit.

Policy GE17 states that:

As part of the development of the Green Network, all rivers and streams will be protected and enhanced for the benefit of wildlife and where appropriate, for public access and recreation. This will be done by:-

- a) Not permitting the culverting of any river or stream unless absolutely necessary and encouraging the re-opening of culverted watercourses where opportunities arise; and

- b) Requiring that any development involving alterations to the channels of rivers and streams be designed in a way which is sympathetic to nature conservation and archaeological interests; and
- c) Expecting the setting back of new development to an appropriate distance from the banks of major rivers and streams to allow for landscaping; and
- d) Encouraging the creation of a continuous public footpath along one bank of major rivers and streams, except where this would conflict with important nature conservation interests or public safety.

The proposals do not conflict with the aims or requirements of the above policy. Parts a) to d) set out how the rivers and streams will be enhanced and protected, and a) and b) are not relevant to this proposal, with regard to c) the development has been set back from the river bank/wall and has allowed for landscaping and seating, and in respect of d) the footpath has already been created.

The applicant has committed to enhancing the mesh panels within railings to minimise blown litter and also to a litter strategy for the whole site, which is considered a proportionate response.

**4. Application Number: 23/03216/FUL**

**Address:** The Coach House, No.306 Dobbin Hill, Sheffield, S11 7JG

**Additional Representation:**

A further objection has been received from the Millhouses Ecclesall & Carter Knowle Community Group (MECK CG) since the agenda has been published. This objection raised the following issues:

- Visual impact goes beyond the wall, fencing and trees. It is also measured by the reaction of those experiencing it including the impact of the loss of the open and public accessible nature that was previously experienced, as opposed to the impact of a space would be both closed off and publicly inaccessible;
- the CGI image is 'misleading' and suggests the road and verge will be wider and less enclosed than is evidenced by other photos;
- Stopping-up the highway 'impinges on public freedom' which should be balanced against the presumption that the application should be granted unless where the impact would be unacceptable including safety and impact on road network;
- the officers report 'makes no attempt to assess the impact of granting permission on the potential precedent value for the hundreds/thousands of such pieces of land in similar situations. Such a precedent impact should be considered at committee just as much as in the case of a major development;
- no compensation proposed for loss of the space as there would be for a major development and as such the scheme should be refused;
- Committee members should visit the site to fully assess the proposal and potential impact on the highway and on the neighbourhood.

## Officer Response

Many of the above points were made in the original objections and have been responded to within the officer's report. The use of the CGI image is as a guide and not an approved plan or used for assessment. Each planning application must be considered on its individual merits and against relevant policy. One decision does not therefore create a precedent for another.

### **Highway Closure (Report Amendment)**

The report identifies at p107 that the implementation of the proposals would necessitate a highway closure and requests that Members confirm they raise no objections to that.

However, closures under Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, fall under the remit of the Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure.

Accordingly this section of the report (set out below) should be deleted:

*Accordingly, if Members are minded to approve this application, they are also requested to confirm that: a. No objections are raised to the proposed stopping-up of the area of highway shown hatched on the plan 23/03216/FUL/Stopping-Up, subject to satisfactory arrangements being made with Statutory Undertakers with regards to such of their mains and services that may be affected. And that an agreement is reached, between the City Council's Property Services Division and the applicant, that, on successful completion of the process to stop up the highway, that transfers ownership of any of the land that is currently occupied by the highway and in the ownership of the City Council. Page 107 b. Legal Services are authorised to take all necessary action on the matter under the relevant powers contained within Section 247 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.*

And replaced with:

*If this application is approved, it would then require separate decisions regarding the Section 247 closure process and whether to sell any SCC owned land to the applicant to be made in accordance with ordinary council processes.*