

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

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

- 1. Application Number 15/02771/FUL**
- Address 234 Barnsley Road Sheffield S4 7AG**

**Representations**

One written representation has been received on behalf of the applicant on 25/08/2015 after correspondence from the planning officer was received pointing out concerns with regards to overshadowing and privacy.

The representation argues that they believe that the unit would provide suitable living conditions for residents, especially for people who would not spend much time at home. The representation disputes officer opinions that the property would be overshadowed and that it would overlook apartments in 234 Barnsley Road, and states that they believe that the Supplementary Planning Guidelines (SPG) on 'Designing House Extensions' are not relevant to this application, as it is not for a house extension. They also argue that the proposal would have the benefit of providing a new housing unit that would also be affordable. Suggestions are also made that high level openings facing Scott Road may overcome concerns with regards to the outlook.

A second correspondence from the same representation has also been received on 27/08/2015 repeating that they believe the scheme to be acceptable and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. They ascertain that the SPG is not relevant.

Discussions have also been made by the Local Authority with the representation with regards to inspectorate determinations made elsewhere, whereby the representation has stated that this is inappropriate as an inspectorate determination should not provide a precedent for other decisions.

**Response to Comments:**

The planning officer has re-appraised the application in response to the comments raised by the representation. However, the conclusions with regards to living conditions remain the same, and are detailed in the committee report.

The SPG document on page 4 (paragraph 3.2) does state that the advice within the document does not apply to flats, which are treated on an individual basis, and this is noted and not disputed. As such, members should be aware that the Supplementary Planning Guidelines should not be relied upon directly towards assessing the merits of the scheme. However, it is considered that the guidelines provide a good starting point to form a view regarding the impact of separation distances on living conditions with regards to privacy and overbearing impacts where concerns exist. Looking at the site during a site visit, the officer was aware of the close proximity of the main window of the apartment to the rear windows of 234 Barnsley Road, and also the close proximity of the full two-storey wall of the building to the main aspect of the apartment. In the event of this proposal, where the separation distances achieved are approximately half of that recommended by the SPG to prevent overbearing impacts occurring, and less than a quarter concerning privacy impacts, the assessment concludes that the apartment unit proposed would not provide suitable living conditions. As a result, officer concerns with regards to the site were strengthened when account was given of these guidelines.

Although the representation wishes for separation distances of under SPG guideline recommendations to be disregarded in full, no alternative guidelines have been referred to by the representation. In the absence of these, the above guidelines are clearly the best guide that the Local Authority can use in order to judge the acceptability of the proposal in addition to the information viewed on site.

In looking at alternative proposals to incorporate openings to Scott Road, the assessment concludes that any new window here would be subjected to overlooking from the pavement, and that any measures to overcome this would likely result in unacceptable internal living conditions.

With regards to the benefits of providing a housing unit, this merit has been discussed in the main officer report. With regards to the representation comments that the unit would be affordable, members are advised that this is not the provision of affordable housing in the strictest sense (i.e. below market rent levels), but is a claim that the unit would be cheap, presumably due to its smaller than average size.

With regards to inspectorate determinations elsewhere, it is agreed that each site is specific and, as such, no reference is made by the authority to appeal determinations elsewhere and none are relied upon in determining this application.

<b>2. Application Number</b>	<b>15/02570/FUL</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Of Don Valley Stadium S9 3TL</b>

### **Update to Condition 2 (Approved Plans)**

Condition 2 was missing a reference for the final site plan, which has now been received this section of Condition 2 should now read:

Site Plan Ref: SUTC-ZO-ZZ-DR-L-000001-S2-P9 received via email dated 26 August 2015.

**3. Application Number            15/01794/FUL**

**Address                            Princess Works, Scotland Street**

#### **Report Correction**

The report states that the Community Infrastructure Levy is payable on the site at a rate of £50 per square metre. This is the rate for housing, the rate for student accommodation is £30 per square metre. Using the correct rate the levy is likely to be approximately £304,000.

#### **Amended Condition**

To be added to condition 29

6. Treatment of the exposed side elevation of the retained garage building following construction of the plant room on the Scotland Street frontage.

**4. Application Number            15/01006/FUL**

**Address                            Land between 1 to 3 and Nos.5 & 7 Dover Road  
S11 8RH**

#### **Amended Conditions**

- a. Amended plans have been received clarifying the facing materials on the front and rear elevations (DWGs. 121-P-1.08-Rev D and 121-P-1.07-Rev D)
- b. An amended plan has been received revising the parking layout to include two disabled parking spaces (DWG. 121-P-1.03 Rev D)

The above changes represent positive amendments/clarification with regard to the scheme but will require the following change to Condition 2 (Approved plans)

Amended Condition 2

The development must be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved documents:

121 P 1.07 Rev D  
121 P 1.08 Rev D  
121 P 1.03 Rev D  
121 P 1.04 Rev C  
121 P 1.05 Rev C  
121 P 1.06 Rev C  
121 P 1.01

Reason: In order to define the permission.

### **Amended Condition 9**

Upon reflection it is considered that the wording of Condition 9 lacks precision and should read as follows:

Condition 9

Details of all boundary treatments, including measures to fair face the exposed wall on the boundary with No.6 Wilson Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced, and the flats shall not be used unless such boundary treatments have been provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter such measures/treatments shall be retained.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining property and future occupants of the development

### **Amended Condition 12**

The word 'cars' is missing from the condition, after the number '6' and the condition should therefore read:-

'The flats shall not be used unless the car parking accommodation for 6 cars as shown on the approved plans has been provided in accordance with those plans and thereafter such car parking accommodation shall be retained for the sole purpose intended.'

**5. Application Number      15/01149/FUL**

**Address      Woodseats Library, Chesterfield Road S8 0SH**

### **Amended Condition**

Condition 20 omits reference to the building's use and to vehicle numbers and should read:-

The library, pharmacy and medical centre shall not be used unless the car parking accommodation for 16 cars as shown on the approved plans has been provided in accordance with those plans and thereafter such car parking accommodation shall be retained for the sole purpose intended.

This page is intentionally left blank