
Case Number	20/02409/FUL (Formerly PP-08916372)
Application Type	Full Planning Application
Proposal	Erection of a dwellinghouse with integral garage and associated parking
Location	Land to the rear of 15 and 17 Birch House Avenue Sheffield S35 0FH
Date Received	22/07/2020
Team	West and North
Applicant/Agent	Oakleaf Architecture Ltd
Recommendation	Refuse

Refuse for the following reason(s):

- 1 The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development would constitute an overdevelopment of a site of restricted dimensions which would result in unsatisfactory amenity for future occupants as a result of poor quality external amenity space and insufficient privacy to living accommodation. This would be contrary to Policy H14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Guideline 4 of Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions and Paragraph 127 of the NPPF.
- 2 The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development would constitute an overdevelopment of a site of restricted dimensions which would result in unacceptable overlooking of the gardens of existing neighbouring properties and a resulting unacceptable loss of privacy. This would be contrary to Policy H14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Guideline 4 of Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions and Paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Attention is Drawn to the Following Directives:

1. The applicant is advised that this application has been refused for the reasons stated above and taking the following plans into account:

Plan Number 1 REV C PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
Plan Number 2 REV B SITE SECTIONS
Plan Number 3 003 REV A DETAILED SITE PLAN

2. Despite the Local Planning Authority trying to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner during pre-application discussions, the application still shows such disregard for policy requirement(s), that the Local Planning Authority had no alternative but to refuse consent. We would welcome pre-application discussions on an alternative scheme.

Site Location



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 10018816

Location and Proposal

The application site is located off Birch House Avenue and is accessed via an unmade track that leads to some garages and land which backs on to the rear of the properties of Birch Grove. These properties are located at a higher level than the site. To the north east the land falls and further dwellings are located in this direction on Greeton Drive.

Consent has recently been granted for a single dwelling accessed off this track, on the neighbouring site.

On the application site consent has recently been granted for a garage.

Permission is sought for a detached two storey property.

Site History

89/01261/FUL On land to the Rear of 15-17 Birch House Avenue, the erection of a bungalow was refused on the grounds that the development would result in an unacceptable form of backland development, lacking in road frontage or a satisfactory means of access which would prejudice the amenities of occupiers of surrounding dwellings and occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

00/03055/FUL – Erection of 7 garages at land to the rear of 15 – 17 Birch House Avenue. This application was refused as it would result in an over intensification of an existing substandard access which the LPA would consider detrimental to the safe and free flow of traffic and pedestrian safety on Birch House Avenue, particularly as a result of the potential to increase the number of reversing manoeuvres on to Birch House Avenue, due to the inability of vehicles to pass on the narrow access track.

02/00835/FUL This was a resubmission of the above which reduced the number of garages to 4. This was refused for the same reason as in 2000.

19/02150/FUL Erection of a dwellinghouse with integral garage was granted to the rear of 15 – 17 Birch House Avenue

20/00120/FUL Erection of garage to rear of dwellinghouse was granted on the site subject of this application.

Representations

Objection letters have been received from 15 neighbouring addresses. In addition, the Sheffield Climate Alliance and Bradfield Parish Council have objected. The following points are raised by objectors:

- Concern is raised regarding overlooking to lower dwellings and loss of sunlight
- Overlooking neighbours' gardens and into properties on Birch Grove
- The new house would be overlooked

- Standards in the SPG and policy H14 are not adhered to
- The scale and height would be overbearing
- Concern is raised that if existing residents implement their Permitted Development rights the subsequent amenity of residents would be even poorer due to the poor separation distances and this would affect existing resident's enjoyment of being able to implement these rights.
- Overdevelopment. There is a very distinct character of the area in architectural form, road layout and plot types. The typical plot has a 25% ratio of building to plot. The application would allow for a built area of 85m² on a 209m² plot. This creates a 41% building to plot ratio, almost double the current character of the area.
- The internal area of the house is substandard falling below space standards adopted by SCC.
- Externally, whilst there is over 50 sqm garden space, this is poor quality due to the stepped nature of the garden. Issues of substandard light and outlook are raised. There is not a 10 m garden depth which is contrary to Guideline 4 of the Council's SPG on Designing House extensions.
- It does not look as though the design has any consideration to adaptable design, lifetime homes and accessible design policy.
- Typically development in the area is houses acknowledging road frontages with the space afforded between the dwellings creating acceptable amenity standards. This form of backland development erodes the character of the area and space around dwellings and neighbour's privacy and enjoyment of gardens.
- The house style departs from the character of the area.
- Whilst the previously approved dwelling on the site next door does not conform with the above either and is out of character and overdeveloped, this has been granted. It is highlighted though that with this previous application, the plot is larger, as is the proposed garden and greater separation distances exist between the approved and existing dwellings.
- The design and layout contradict the guidance within S1.1/2/3, South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide regarding streets.
- A dwelling would look out of place in this location.
- The scheme would not appear in keeping with other properties and would over dominate and dwarf them.
- Concerns are raised regarding noise, extra traffic noise and pollution
- Loss of wildlife.
- Concern is raised regarding light pollution from any external lights.
- Reduction in house values.
- Existing parking issues would be made worse.
- Concern is raised that the dressing room could become a bedroom in future which would intensify the use e.g. vehicle movements / parking demand.
- Concern is raised regarding the distance of the house from the main highway in terms of bin collection and concern about the blocking of paths.
- Concern about pedestrian safety from vehicles exiting the access point, particularly as the road is a busy route.
- Concern about intensification of access road.
- Just because there is an existing access for garages does not mean that frequent mandatory use by further dwellings is appropriate. It would be approving another increase in the risk to life.

- Access road is narrow, uneven, eroding and unsuitable and excludes inclusive access due to its surfacing.
- No room for pedestrians and a car to pass, properties on Birch Grove have pedestrian access along this track and use it to get down to Oughtibridge. The increase in car movements would create dangerous conflict.
- A vehicle would have to reverse 60m if it were to meet a vehicle coming in of Birch House Avenue.
- The OS map shown on the drawings is misleading and there is not adequate space to turn a vehicle in front of the house. The distance is shorter than shown and the land opposite the small track is vegetated land that falls away. It is not appropriate for vehicle turning. This leads to vehicles struggling to turn around if they cannot access the parking space or reversing 60m back out onto Birch House Avenue.
- Reference is made to Guideline 8 of the SPG on Designing House Extensions, particular concern is raised with regards to cars reversing out due to the one-way track, not having space to turn around if a parking space is not available and reversing from the proposed garage, will cause this to be in contradiction to guideline 8.
- Concern is raised as to who would maintain the track.
- Junction with main road would be a potential traffic accident point where visibility of oncoming traffic is poor on this school route. The area around the access is subject to on street parking which hinders visibility.
- A Garage was approved for No 5. Households in the area have multiple cars. Displaced parking for No 5 will impact on the safety of surrounding roads.
- Concern regarding health and safety as the track does not seem wide enough for emergency vehicles.
- There is insufficient space to pull off the access track to open the garage door and insufficient visibility of the track when existing the garage Sheffield's core planning strategy and design guides state that this is not appropriate and a space of 2.5x5m should be provided in front of garages.
- Concern is raised about subsidence of access road and impact from construction traffic and associated maintenance costs.
- No garden storage is proposed. This could end up being within the garage, reducing onsite parking.
- Highway safety concerns during construction process are raised.
- The section shows the gardens on Greeton Drive at the wrong level.
- Concern about access for bin collection / bins would be left at the end blocking the pavement.
- Concern is raised regarding the amount of other home being constructed in the immediate area and impact on school places and GP services.
- Concern old utilities infrastructure would not meet the demand.
- Concern about potential land subsidence, due to the construction of this property, that might create problems in the back gardens of the properties on this side of Greeton Drive.
- The application for the garages on site was more sensible land use.
- Inadequate access for fire vehicles as the standards set out in The South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide could not be achieved. This would cause danger for the proposed occupiers and also existing residents in the area.
- Concern about access to garages during construction process.
- Loss of view.

- Detrimental impact to a large number of residents. Comments regarding profit being put before residents.
- The previous application on the neighbouring site did not take objections into consideration. Dismay at previous approval.
- 13/01146/FUL was refused and that was better access than this.
- The plans are inaccurate. The streetscene makes the existing houses look bigger and therefore the proposal less dominant. When comparing to the site section it can be seen this is incorrect.
- The proposal does not look to take any steps towards sustainable development. Eg construction type and no cycle storage.
- Comment is made that the Coal Mining Risk Assessment is not specific to the development, it references the old garage application. The CMRA also asks for further intrusive reports and labels the site a high-risk. It is commented that this indicates the site may not be suitable for this type of development and more appropriate sites elsewhere should be pursued.
- Concern is raised regarding increased flood risk to neighbouring properties due to increased surfacing. Query is raised regarding drainage arrangements.
- Request for site visit to assist decision.

Sheffield Climate Alliance:

- There is insufficient evidence of features for tackling climate change - either mitigating the change or adapting to its impacts. The Design and Access statement does not cover this or refer to the climate requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF sections 2 and 14), or the Sheffield Core Strategy climate policies.
- Planning has an obligation to consider climate change.
- The Planning System should therefore be trying to ensure that new buildings do not add to carbon emissions – they should be zero-carbon or even carbon negative. This last would be justified to offset the carbon embedded in building materials, the emissions stemming from the development process, and the fossil fuel emissions associated with the building during its use; it could be achieved by having designs that feature renewable energy and heat, or carbon sinks, in addition to using zero-carbon construction methods.

Bradfield Parish Council:

- Concerns over maintenance of unadopted lane.
- Overshadowing / overbearing to neighbouring properties.
- Concern regarding highway safety particularly egress and access.
- Overdevelopment

Policy Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Council's development plan comprises the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2009 and the saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which was adopted in 1998. The National Planning Policy Framework published in 2018 and revised in February 2019 (the NPPF) is a material consideration (paras 2 and 212 of the NPPF).

Paragraph 213 of the NPPF provides that existing policies in a development plan should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the NPPF and that due weight should be given to existing policies in a development plan, according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

In all cases the assessment of a development proposal needs to be considered in light of paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which provides that when making decisions, a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied and that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date (e.g. because they are inconsistent with the NPPF), this means that planning permission should be granted unless:

- the application of policies in the NPPF which relate to protection of certain areas or assets of particular importance which are identified in the NPPF as such (for example SSSIs, Green Belt, certain heritage assets and areas at risk of flooding) provide a clear reason for refusal; or
- any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

This is referred to as the "tilted balance" and this assessment will have due regard to this.

Key Issues

The main issues to be considered in this application are:

- The acceptability of the development in land use policy terms
- The impact on the visual amenities of the area.
- Whether the site could be suitably developed to enable future and existing occupiers to have acceptable living conditions.
- Whether suitable highways access and off-street parking could be achieved.

Land Use

The site is located in a Housing Area as allocated in the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan. Policy H10 list Housing as the preferred land use in this area.

Policy CS23 of the Core Strategy 'Locations for New Housing' states that in Oughtibridge, housing developments will be limited to suitable, sustainable sites within the existing built up areas. The site is in the existing residential area and

would make use of the existing infrastructure and services. The scheme is compatible with this policy.

Core Strategy Policy CS24 'Maximising use of Previously Developed Land for New Housing' seeks to try and ensure that priority is given to developments on previously developed sites. The site does not appear to have been previously developed and is considered greenfield.

The policy seeks that no more than 12 % of dwellings are completed on greenfield sites between 2004/05 – 2025/26. This would be the case and the scheme would satisfy additional criteria within this policy that allows for the development of greenfield sites within existing urban areas where it can be justified on sustainability grounds.

The site is regarded as being in a sustainable location, within a well-established urban area, with amenities and public transport links.

The policy approaches of CS23 and CS24 in regard to prioritising brownfield sites is considered to broadly align with the NPPF paragraphs 117 and 118, which promotes the effective use of land and the need to make use of previously-developed or 'brownfield land'. Given the strong alliance with the NPPF, in this regard it is concluded that these policies can be offered substantial weight. Whilst this site is not brownfield this is a small site and could be developed in light of this.

Paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires the Local Planning Authority to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement. At present, Sheffield can identify a 5.1 year supply, and the subject site would contribute towards housing provision in a small way.

Visual Impact

Policy H14 of the UDP relates to conditions on development in housing areas including matters of design, amenity and highway safety. H14(a) states that new buildings should be well designed and be in scale and character with neighbouring properties.

Policy BE5 seeks to ensure good design and the use of good quality materials in all new and refurbished buildings and extensions.

Core Strategy Policy CS74 sets out the design principles that would be expected in all new developments. It details that high quality development respect and take advantage of and enhance the distinctive features of the city, its districts and neighbourhoods.

The plot is not located within a prominent location and would be located immediately adjacent to a plot approved for residential development in recent years.

The majority of the houses in the area enjoy larger plot sizes. The application site is a smaller plot with a large house foot print proposed, and whilst this has amenity

implications as discussed later in this report, this is not really apparent in the streetscene so it does not significantly harm the character of the area in this regard. The site is not in a Conservation Area or an Area of Special Character and the development of the plot for residential purposes would not compromise the visual appearance or character of the area.

The dwelling would be two storey, which is compatible with the scale of properties in the area.

The property is designed with a pitched roof and is shown to be constructed from brick and render. Within the vicinity of the site, whilst the prevailing house style is the two storey semi-detached, there are also dormer bungalows and a detached property has been approved on the plot next door. Both brick and render are present in the area. The proposed materials palette would therefore be acceptable and, given the mixed character of the area, the design approach would be acceptable.

Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2019) requires good design, while paragraph 124 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The local development plan policies described above are considered to align with the NPPF in relation to design. The scheme complies with both the local and national policy design aims.

Amenity Concerns

Policy H14 c) seeks to ensure sites are not over developed and do not deprive residents of light, privacy or security.

The guidelines found in the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions, whilst not strictly applicable in this instance owing to them relating to house extensions, are of relevance. These suggest detailed guidelines relating to overbearing and overshadowing, privacy and overlooking, and appropriate garden sizes.

Amenity of future occupants:

Guideline 4 of Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions sets out that in most circumstances the Council considers a garden size of 50sqm. the minimum for a two or more bedroomed house. A minimum distance to the back boundary from the rear elevation of 10m is normally required for reasons of neighbour's privacy as well as amenity.

Whilst in excess of 50 square metres of garden space is shown (the back garden is approximately 70 sqm), the proposed dwelling is sizable and does not have sufficient depth of garden to provide good quality amenity space for future occupants. The rear garden depth of approx. 5.5 m falls well short of the 10m standard. In addition, the garden is shown on two different levels, which further reduces the amenity value. The plot is therefore considered to be overdeveloped.

The substandard garden depth means that neighbouring gardens are close to the house and there would be views from these existing elevated gardens directly into the rear facing bedrooms of the new property.

The proposed dwelling would have sufficient quality internal amenity space which would not be over dominated or overshadowed by neighbouring property.

Amenity for surrounding occupants:

The openings are proposed to be confined to the front and rear elevations of the dwelling.

There is a 21 metre separation distance between the rear elevations of the bungalow properties directly fronting Birch Grove, which are at a higher level, and the proposed dwelling. No 5 has a small glazed extension to the rear which reduces this separation to 19m in this area, this however appears to be in use more as porch than a habitable room. In light of this, the impact on the internal amenities of these neighbouring properties is acceptable.

The properties on Greeton Drive are significantly lower. The separation distance between the properties is over 27 metres, which is acceptable.

Guideline 4 of Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions states a minimum distance to the back boundary from the rear elevation of 10m is also normally required for reasons of neighbour's privacy.

The distance from the rear wall of the proposed dwelling to the rear boundary is shown at approximately 5.5m. The outlook from the rear windows at ground floor would be screened somewhat by the level change, but the outlook from the upper floor windows would be directly onto the neighbours' gardens at the rear. There are three windows proposed at first floor. One could be obscured as it serves a dressing room however the remainder would serve bedrooms. This distance is insufficient and would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy of the gardens of properties on Birch Grove.

The distance from the front of the proposed dwelling to the rear boundary of properties of Greeton Drive varies slightly with the closest point being approximately 8.10m. Whilst this is below the 10 metres referred to in Guideline 4, there is intervening land formed by the access track and the resulting distance is closer to the guidance.

The dwelling would be located at a lower level than the neighbours on Birch Grove and the dwelling would be set back sufficient distance from the rear boundary so that unacceptable overbearing issues would not arise. The site is to the north east of these houses, consequently significant overshadowing issues would also not arise.

The proposed dwelling is shown to project beyond the rear of the approved dwelling on the adjacent site. The degree of projection is not however to the extent that unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing would raise. This aspect of the scheme

would be compatible with the aims of the Guidance contained in Guideline 5 of Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions.

The access road is immediately adjacent to the side wall and conservatory of 15 Birch House Avenue. There is existing activity associated with the garages within the site and also that which would arise from the recent approvals off this track. Given the established nature of this access significant additional noise and disturbance through would not arise as a result of the development.

In terms of the approval on the neighbouring site, whilst there are some similarities, the key differences are that the neighbouring plot is more generously sized. The distance from the rear elevation to the rear boundary is greater and the amount of clear glazing at first floor is less. This had an acceptable relationship to neighbours to the rear and also provided more and better quality outdoor amenity space.

Overall the scheme is considered to be an overdevelopment which would result in unsatisfactory living conditions for both the future occupants of the dwelling and existing neighbours. This is contrary to H14 (c) and the guidance contained in Guideline 4 of the SPG.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that the planning system should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The aims of the local and national policy align. The scheme would not comply with the aims of paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Highways

Policy H14 d) seeks to ensure that developments provide safe access to the highway network, appropriate off-street parking and to not endanger pedestrians.

The dwelling would be accessed via a narrow, unmade track off Birch House Avenue. Birch House Avenue is on a steep gradient and is well used. The nature of the access is such that a hedge associated with a neighbouring property restricts visibility down the hill, particularly for pedestrians. On street parking on the hill also takes place.

The existing access is not ideal, however it is well established and currently serves 14 garages. A further garage has been granted this year, but not yet constructed, on the application site which is associated with No 5 Birch Grove. The approved dwelling on the neighbouring site would also use this road. This later application was granted as it made use of existing parking that previously served 21 Birch House Avenue, with No 21 having replacement parking served from the front.

The most recently approved consent, on this site, allows for a sizable garage and parking for numerous vehicles that could cater for No 5. This previous consent has accepted the principle of some minor intensification of the use of this access.

The current application proposes 2 off street parking spaces and if implemented would be instead of the approved garage. The associated number of vehicle and pedestrian movements along this track would be slightly increased over what could

be associated with the approved garage however it would be difficult to argue that this would be significantly greater.

The previous garage consent has not been implemented and parking is not taking place on this site at present, therefore there would not be any implications resulting from displaced parking from the host dwelling (No 5 Birch Grove).

Two parking spaces are acceptable for a dwelling of this size. Whilst there is some risk that the garage could be used as storage, the absence of alternative parking close to the site reduces this likelihood.

The area of surfacing in front of the house is sufficient to enable residents to turn and would allow 2 cars to pass at this point before the track narrows.

Due to the distance from Birch House Avenue (approximately 50 m) there may be an issue in terms of access for the fire service. The applicant has been asked to pursue this with the fire service, but it is likely that a sprinkler system could be installed that would adhere to safety requirements.

On balance it is considered that there would be adequate parking within the site to cater for the new dwelling and the minor nature of intensification of the use of the access would not cause significant highway safety implications to the extent that a refusal could be justified.

The NPPF seeks to focus development in sustainable locations and make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'

The local and national policies align, with the NPPF being very clear as to the circumstances where a scheme could be refused. In this instance whilst not ideal, the impact of this development would not cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in impacts that would be severe on the road network.

Drainage

The site does not fall within a high or medium risk flood zone that would affect the principle of the development, and as such does not require a Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out.

Policy CS67 'Flood Risk Management' of the Core Strategy states that the extent and impact of flooding should be reduced as far as feasible by design measures such as permeable paving. Such details could be controlled via condition.

The development complies with Policy CS67 which is compatible with the aims of the NPPF.

Coal Mining Legacy Issues

The application site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area. Coal Authority records indicate that the application site may be underlain by probable unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth. The applicant submitted a Coal Mining Risk Assessment which has been examined by the Coal Authority. They are satisfied that issues can be controlled by a condition requiring further investigations and any required remedial works.

CIL

In this instance the proposal falls within Zone 3. Within this zone there is a CIL charge of £30 per square metre, plus an additional charge associated with the national All-in Tender Price Index for the calendar year in which planning permission is granted, in accordance with Schedule 1 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.'

Response to Neighbour Representations

- Concern is raised that if existing residents implement their Permitted Development rights the subsequent amenity of residents would be even poorer due to the poor separation distances and this would affect existing residents enjoyment of being able to implement these rights.

The standard separation requirement in Sheffield is 21 metres for house construction. Neighbours implementing PD rights would reduce this distance, however residents have a choice whether to do this. Whilst the concern raised is noted, it would not be a justifiable reason to refuse the application.

- The internal area of the house is substandard falling below space standards adopted by SCC.

The internal accommodation is acceptable and accords with the technical standard guidance set out in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide.

- The design has not had any consideration to adaptable design, lifetime homes and accessible design policy.

This is not a policy requirement.

- The design and layout contradict the guidance within S1.1/2/3 of the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide regarding streets.

This guidance relates to larger schemes. This development does however front an access route and takes reference from the approval on the adjoining site.

- Concern is raised regarding noise and extra pollution.

Vehicle noise has been discussed above. The use of the site for residential purposes is compatible with the nature of the area and is not associated with harmful noise generation or notable pollution.

- Loss of wildlife.

The site is predominantly cleared. No specific habitat is apparent or has been highlighted. The impact on wildlife would be negligible.

- Concern is raised regarding light pollution from any external lights.

The nature of the use would not raise any concerns regarding the use of lighting that would be incompatible with the residential nature of the area.

- Concern is raised that the dressing room could become a bedroom in future which would intensify the use eg vehicle movements / parking demand.

The approved development on site already has potential for a similar amount of vehicle movements to the proposed, this and the limited space for parking within the site means that significant intensification in terms of vehicle movements and parking demand would not arise.

- The access road excludes inclusive access due to its surfacing.

There is no planning requirement to make the site accessible in this regard.

- There is insufficient space to pull off the access track to open the garage door and insufficient visibility of the track when exiting the garage. Sheffield's Core Strategy and design guides state that this is not appropriate and a space of 2.5x5m should be provided in front of garages.

Given that this is an access track rather than an adopted highway, the available space to pull in and visibility is adequate.

- Highway safety concerns during construction process are raised.

A suitable condition could be attached to ensure the control of parking of site vehicles and deliveries etc.

- Concern is raised regarding the accuracy of the sections, streetscene and OS plan.

The site has been visited and the level differences inspected. The dwelling would be constructed at a similar level to the track. Officers are satisfied that there is sufficient detail to assess the impact of the scale of the dwelling. The width of the access track is sufficient to accommodate the dwelling and associated vehicle movements.

- Concern about access for bin collection / bins would be left at the end blocking the pavement.

Servicing arrangements for all houses in the area take place from the pavement. The addition of a further household would not cause significant issue.

- Concern is raised regarding the amount of other homes being constructed in the immediate area and impact on school places and GP services.

This is a single dwelling and does not generate the need for education contributions. Its impact on local services would be minimal. The Community Infrastructure Levy is however a requirement as referred to above.

- Concern is raised about potential land subsidence during the construction of this property that might create problems in the back gardens of the properties on this side of Greeton Drive.

The applicant would be required to seek Building Regulations approval.

- Concern is raised as to who would maintain the track.

The construction area is at the opposite side of the track from the properties on Greeton Drive. The tracks maintenance is a private issue.

- The construction of the development causes significant concern with regards to noise impact, site management, access and parking.

There will always be an element of noise and disruption associated with new building. This is controlled by legislation outside the planning process.

- Application 13/01146/FUL was refused and that had better access than this.

The refusal of this application did not relate to highway safety grounds.

- Comments are made regarding the previous approval of the house on the neighbouring site.

This was fully assessed at that time and approved by committee decision. The adjoining plot is larger in terms of footprint.

- Comments regarding alternative uses of the site / design are noted however the application is assessed as submitted.
- The site has been visited as part of the assessment.

Non Planning issues:

- Loss of view, impact on house values, concerns about access to the garages during construction process and the capabilities of utilities infrastructure not meeting the demand are not planning issues or are private matters.

In response to the points raised regarding sustainability by Sheffield Climate Alliance:

With an application for a single dwelling there is no requirement for a sustainability statement. However, the scheme does address climate change in that:

- It is not located in a high flood zone
- It is located within an existing urban environment where there is good access to amenities and public transport links.

Whilst Section 2 of the NPPF relates to achieving sustainable development, paragraph 9 states that the objectives set out are not criteria against which every application should be judged.

Section 14 is clear that planning has a role to play in supporting the transition to a low carbon future. Paragraph 153 sets out that in determining planning applications this involves the compliance with the relevant development plan policies as well as looking at design form.

CS63 to CS65 are the most relevant policies. Policy CS63 is a strategic policy and CS64 and CS65 come into play for development of 5 or more units.

Officers are satisfied that the development at this scale satisfies the criteria of the NPPF and general aims of the Core Strategy and there is no justifiable reason to refuse the scheme on the ground of the points raised.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

The application seeks permission for the development of a single house within a Housing Area under the provisions of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan.

Whilst the principle of residential development is acceptable on this site, the proposed dwelling in this instance is overly large for the size of the plot and would result in a poor quality external amenity area for future residents due to its substandard depth and terraced nature. The proximity of the house to the rear boundary is unacceptable and this substandard distance would result in the proposed dwelling being overlooked from amenity space associated with existing dwellings and also the amenity space of existing properties being directly overlooked from the upper floor windows formed in the proposed dwelling. Consequently, the scheme fails to comply with Policy H14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Guideline 4 of Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions as well as the aims of Paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

The design of the dwelling is acceptable and officers accept that on balance, whilst not ideal, the access and parking arrangements for the site would not cause significant implications over and above what has been previously approved. Despite this the amenity implications remain unacceptable.

As the most important policies align with the NPPF, section d) of paragraph 11 has not been applied in this instance.

For the reasons outlined above the scheme is considered to be unacceptable due to the site being overdeveloped and the resulting unacceptable amenity issues this causes.

It is recommended that Members refuse planning permission for the reasons stated.