

Case Number	21/00266/FUL (Formerly PP-09409975)
Application Type	Full Planning Application
Proposal	Use of hotel (Use Class C1) as 44 social housing dwellings (Use Class C3) (Amended Ownership Certificate received 21.04.2021)
Location	Quality Hotel Sheffield North Lane End Sheffield S35 3UH
Date Received	21/01/2021
Team	West and North
Applicant/Agent Communities	Erimax Land, Planning and
Recommendation	Refuse

Refuse for the following reason(s):

- 1 The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development, which lies in a residential suburb of Chapeltown, would result in instances of anti-social behaviour and a fear of crime that would undermine the quality of life of residents that live close to and adjacent to the site to the detriment of the amenities of the locality. As such, the development would be contrary to UDP Policy H14 part k) and government policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 91 b), 92 b) and 127 f).
- 2 The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development, by reason of its layout and location within a residential suburb of Chapeltown, would not provide the level of support and services needed by residents with complex needs, either within the facility or in the locality, as a result of its isolated location (and in relation to existing support networks). As such, the development would be contrary to UDP Policy H8 and government policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 92 b) and 127 f).

- 3 The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development does not provide suitable facilities for people with disabilities, making the flats inaccessible for people with impaired mobility. As such, it is considered that the development would be contrary to UDP Policies H6 c), H8 b) and H15 a) and government policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 127 f).

Attention is Drawn to the Following Directives:

1. Despite the Local Planning Authority wishing to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, the application is considered contrary to policy requirement(s), and, there being no perceived amendment(s) that would address these shortcomings without compromising the fundamental intention of the scheme the Local Planning Authority had no alternative but to refuse consent.
2. The applicant is advised that this application has been refused for the reasons stated above and taking the following plans into account:-
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-001 Revision PL1 (Location Plan, and Existing Basement and Ground Floor Plans)
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-002 Revision PL1 (Existing First Floor Plan)
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-003 Revision PL1 (Existing Second Floor Plan)
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-004 Revision PL1 (Proposed Basement and Ground Floor Plans)
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-005 Revision PL1 (Proposed First Floor Plan)
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-006 Revision PL1 (Proposed Second Floor Plan)

 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-007 Revision PL1 (Existing Site Plan)
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-008 Revision PL1 (Proposed Site Plan)

 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-009 Revision PL1 (Existing Elevations)
 - Drawing No. FP 28356-A-010 Revision PL1 (Proposed Elevations)

Across Lane End to the south and south-west of the site are detached houses that front onto Staindrop Close and a series of purpose-built flats, while across Heyhouse Drive to its west are further detached houses on Heyhouse Way.

Approximately 400 metres to the south east and south west of the site are Lound Junior School on Mafeking Place, and Lound Infant School at Sherburn Gate.

The site is situated in a Housing Area as identified on the Sheffield UDP Proposal Maps.

PROPOSAL

Full planning permission is being sought to change the use of the hotel to form 44 affordable self-contained studio units. The units would be occupied by homeless people.

The conversion of the building to form 44 studio flats will involve no changes to the external appearance of the building. All the flats would have kitchens and en-suite facilities.

Fifteen units (15) would be provided on the ground floor, 21 units on the first floor and 8 units on the second floor. The ground floor would include a small communal gym that would be available to all tenants.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Following the closure of the hotel in March 2020, the hotel has been used by Sheffield City Council Strategic Housing department as described above.

Full planning permission was granted in April 2019 (18/03678/FUL) for the conversion of existing buildings on the site of the Former Chapeltown Training Centre to create 3no. dwellinghouses and erection of 11no. dwellinghouses.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was advertised by way of site notices (displayed on 21st February and 5th May 2021), press notices (published on 18th February and 13th May 2021) and 48 neighbour notification letters (dated 17th February 2021).

283 representations were received in relation to the proposed development.

1 representation was received in support but made no comment.

2 neutral representations were received raising the following comments:

- Would like to see support services on site 24/7 to support the tenants, be a contact for concerned neighbours and protect vulnerable people from other occupants of the site.
- Recommend consultation with the police force about what issues have

already been dealt with whilst the building has been used for the homeless due to covid.

- It should be about housing the homeless but also supporting them to move on.
- Query regarding the future of the staff currently working there.

280 objections were received. The material concerns raised by objectors can be summarised as follows:

- The site lies in a quiet residential area that is largely home to families and many elderly residents.

The development is not in-keeping with the character of the area and little consideration has been given to local residents.

There is sheltered accommodation (for the over 55s), schools and a care home in the vicinity.

The hotel is totally surrounded by housing mainly occupied by elderly residents. The proposal contradicts the Core Strategy which states one its priorities is: 'Promoting health and well-being for all. Safeguarding and renewal of the city's neighbourhoods needs to take account of all aspects of the quality of life of those who live there, including safety, health and freedom from disturbance. In particular, Sheffield already has a high proportion of elderly people and longer life expectancy will lead to further ageing of the city's population. Health and well-being mean providing for their needs, which will often benefit other groups as well. The challenge is to design environments that promote safety, health and a sense of well-being for all.'

The proposed use is incompatible with the local character of the community and only serves to weaken rather than reinforce the community.

- The housing of the current residents was to be temporary during the Covid lockdown period, not permanent. It was promised that the hotel would return to its former usage after the pandemic was under control.

It is concerning that one justification for the proposed use is that the hotel was used by the Council during the exceptional events of 2020. This does not establish its suitability for continuing in that use when life returns to normal. We would expect the council to plan this development as it would plan any new development rather than relying on decisions made during a time of crisis.

- Homeless people have many complex needs and addictions, needing specialist help and support.

There is insufficient infrastructure and support in the local area for the specific needs of the proposed tenants.

Local GP practices are unlikely to cope with the demands that would be placed on them if this proposal went ahead.

The vast majority of specialised services that serve the homeless: Shelter; Cathedral Archer Project; Roundabout Hostel; St Wilford's Centre etc are all in or around Sheffield City Centre.

There is no direct link by bus to Sheffield, where the majority of services are available.

Local medical services, doctors and dentists are all difficult to access.

While it would provide housing for previously homeless people, maximising benefit requires more than just accommodation ... there are often additional factors to consider. There are... no homeless support services, jobseekers or drug/alcohol dependency services in Chapeltown. Although the building is a 15 minute walk from the local train station and there is a bus stop close by, access to transport services incurs a financial cost that may easily prove prohibitive, especially when considering that residents may need to visit different support services on different days of the week. None of this appears to agree with the stated intention of maximising benefits to residents who would gain more benefit from being closer to the services they require.

There are no details of what staffing will be in place. It would need 24/7 staff and security.

There doesn't appear to be any reference as to how this facility fits the vision / planned outcomes and measures for its residents, it seems only to be concerned with putting people into a financially supported unit. All professionals working with the homeless would agree that for the vast majority, simply putting a roof over someone's head, will not result in a successful permanent residence, employment and an independent life.

Appreciate we need more social housing but this is the wrong location.

There are many empty buildings in the city centre which could be converted into housing for the homeless, close to all the amenities and support they may need.

The City centre has a police presence and City Centre Ambassadors who could deal immediately with issues of ASB.

The 'Woodhouse Village Regeneration Project' was developed in an effort to combat the areas huge number of anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents (mainly alcohol related) and its problems between the residents of St Anne's Bevin Court Hostel and the local community and business owners. Bevin Court is supported housing, with resident staff to help and support, but has still not been without a major impact on the community. This resulted in a DPPO (Designated Public Place Order) which was meant to be temporary but

was extended to cover at least 4 years. This joint working with the South Yorkshire Police, SCC's Safer Neighbourhoods Team, Street Cleaning, Street Force, Health Services and GP's, Tenants and Residents Associations, Neighbourhood action Group, Community Form, Local License Watch and the Salvation Army, published recommendations including –

- Comprehensive CCTV
- Additional patrols by South Yorkshire Police
- Supporting Local Businesses as they were suffering from customers avoiding premises because of gatherings of drinkers outside during the day.
- Divert vulnerable people to support services (of which there are none in Chapeltown)
- Shops visited and reminded of responsibilities under the Licencing act regarding alcohol sales to intoxicated people
- St Anne's employed a specialist support worker
- Refurbishment of some street furniture as it had become a focal point for street drinkers to gather and a place to discard rubbish and use as an 'impromptu toilet'.
- Local shops were also asked to remove cheap alcohol and the NISA shop to remove alcohol altogether.

Has Chapeltown has been assessed for all these issues? In light of these recommendations and lessons learned from Woodhouse, it seems incongruous that the site is close to a proposal to build a Lidl less that 300 metres away which will be selling the cheapest alcohol in Chapeltown and will have a large car park with no site security after the shop has closed.

- There have been very many instances of anti-social behaviour as a result of the current use of the site as temporary accommodation for the homeless, including noise and disturbance, harassment, intimidating and drunken behaviour, foul language, fighting, drug use, litter etc.

This anti-social behaviour is a very real source of worry, stress and fear for local residents.

Numerous people now take alternative routes rather than walk on foot past the Staindrop Lodge.

Crime statistics indicate that crimes have increased 675% in the immediate area of Staindrop Lodge (when compared to the same period - March to December – in 2019). It cannot be ascertained if there is a causal link between the current use of the site and the increase in local crime rates without reviewing police records, but there is a significant correlation between the crime rates in the immediate local area, the site's current use and the experiences of the local community.

There has been a significant increase in the amount of police vehicles attending the location at all times of day,

This has and will put pressure on a local police unit that is already stretched

beyond capability.

A violent attacker, recently jailed for seven years, gave her address as the Staindrop Lodge Hotel.

The safety of children in the area should be paramount, it is completely unacceptable with a Junior and Infant School in close proximity and a Secondary School also around two miles away from the premises.

There have been problems with the temporary residents in the Quality Hotel over recent months. This has caused friction within local residents and the antisocial behaviour of the people at the hotel has spread further than the confines of the property. The lives of the mainly fair-minded residents in the locale has been blighted by this behaviour, counter-acting any sympathy for people needing community aid.

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that 'Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which...'are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion...'. The Framework also sets out that 'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments...'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience'. It is difficult to see how this planning application can proceed in light of the evidence that is provided on the contrary to this policy.

SCC's Core Strategy Policy CS41 sets out that 'Mixed communities will be promoted by encouraging development of housing to meet a range of housing needs including a mix of prices, sizes, types and tenures, and...(d) limiting new or conversions to hostels, purpose-built student accommodation and House of Multiple Occupation where the community is already imbalanced by a concentration of such uses or where the development would create an imbalance'. There is already a great deal of social housing and supported living in the immediate local area, and an additional 44 social housing dwellings would create an imbalance by condensing a large number in one area.

The Council must consider the demographic of the local population in terms of vulnerability to increased rates of crime. Directly opposite the site in question is a large block of supported living apartments for elderly residents.

- The hotel and restaurant were a valuable asset to the communities of High Green and Chapelton and permanently losing them would be a great disadvantage.

The Hotel (as was) made a significant contribution to the well-being of the local community. We need a hotel/restaurant where we can meet with family and to celebrate big events such as Weddings.

This would be a loss to the area in terms of jobs for local people and it will reduce the facilities available to the local community

Where can friends and family stay if the only hotel we have is changed to social housing?

Business visitors stayed at the hotel. It is easily accessible from the Motorway.

We have already lost many other such facilities over the last few years including The Phoenix, The Cart, The Market, The Rose and Pickwicks.

- There has been enough scope to add affordable housing in new developments in the area yet the lack of this is appalling.

If the hotel isn't a viable business, turn it into apartments for the local people, first time buyers and affordable housing for young people to get on the housing ladder.

- This was a beautiful building and brought business to the Chapeltown/High Green area. It now has broken windows, broken doors and the signage has been ripped down. It is an eyesore and causes many residents to feel a sense of shame about their neighbourhood.

This is an attractive building of historical value to the Chapeltown/High Green community.

The removal of 'several prominent advertisements' and 'large-scale ventilation and related paraphernalia' may constitute an improvement but it would only provide a small, rather than the significant, benefit claimed by the applicant.

- The proposal will have a harmful impact on the amenities of local residents.

Permission was refused in January 1986 to extend the hours of use of the function room until 1am based on the noise and inconvenience this would have caused to the local residents. Are you now going to allow anti-social behaviour as highlighted by Councillors and residents to go on? Most of which will continue well past 1am.

Loss of privacy to neighbouring properties as the building's windows overlook private gardens.

Overlooking wasn't a problem when it was a hotel because hotel guests don't spend a lot of time in their rooms and the hotel wasn't always fully booked. With permanent resident's privacy will be compromised.

Since they've cut all the trees down to make way for the new houses that will back onto Bridle Crescent, I am now totally overlooked by the Staindrop Lodge and its residents.

- Planning permission has been granted for new housing and a supermarket in the vicinity. The extra traffic will be substantial, without another 44 people moving in along with the required staff and frequent attendance of the emergency services.

There will be a cumulative increase in traffic noise traffic levels.

The applicant claims that the proposed development will result in a significant reduction in the number of vehicle movements. There may be a reduction in traffic but there is insufficient evidence presented in the application to substantiate the claim that it is significant.

There will be an increase in traffic congestion on the existing junction of Heyhouse Drive and Lane End leading to highway safety issues.

As a result of drinking and substance misuse, local drivers have narrowly missed colliding with the current residents as they often stagger from the pavement into the road. There have been near misses on Lane End and Loundside.

- The development of the site next door, after many years of abandonment, has just started.
- The development is for 44 social housing dwellings and the proposed plans show a single bed in each room, but they could accommodate more beds and therefore more occupants.
- The plans show 44 bedrooms with bathroom and cooking facilities but no common rooms or communal areas, apart from a very small gym. What will residents do with their time during the day and/or night. There is no indication in the proposal how this will be managed.
- The application has been described incorrectly, this is not social housing.
- Insufficient advertising/notification of the application was undertaken.

The code of practice for publicity and consultation on all planning consultations states 'Wider neighbour notification will be appropriate where the development proposed is considered to have the potential for widespread impacts, such as a major development leading to significant traffic increases or the proposed development being widely visible and potentially visually obtrusive'. The code of practice has not been followed.

Non-Material concerns raised include:

- Devaluation of property.
- Question regarding how many C3 Use Class planning applications have been submitted in the last 5 years, how many have been approved, and how many

of the approved and refused applications fall within a 1 mile radius of city councillors' properties past and present over the same time period.

- The applicant's circumstances or motives.

In addition, representations were received from Miriam Cates MP, Ecclesfield Parish Council and the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods at Sheffield City Council.

Miriam Cates MP

Miriam Cates, MP for Penistone and Stocksbridge, wrote on behalf of a number of her constituents who had raised the following concerns:

- Crime statistics indicate that crimes have increased 675% in the immediate area of Staindrop Lodge (when compared to the same period – March to December – in 2019). The most prevalent crimes being anti-social behaviour, violent and sexual offences, criminal damage and arson. Residents have raised their concerns that this rise may be attributed to those residing at Staindrop Lodge.
- The hotel is situated in a neighbourhood that is inappropriate for the intended use. Its remote location means that there is an absence of specialist support for vulnerable residents.
- The development would add additional pressures on already stretched resources in terms of welfare; schooling, doctors, police and social care.

Under emergency coronavirus legislation, the use of Staindrop Lodge as housing for rough sleepers offered a short-term, practical solution. However, this does not automatically deem the site suitable for the establishment of long-term accommodation for the homeless on such a scale, where their avenues of support are not readily available.

Prior to the approval of a planning application such as this, it is vital that we have established the availability of sufficient support for the residents it would serve – this has not been done in this case.

Ecclesfield Parish Council

Ecclesfield Parish Council expressed their strong opposition to the planning application which they considered at their Planning and Environmental Meeting on 4th March 2021 and recommended it be refused. Whilst recognising that the proposal has some benefits, they say that these are outweighed, by a wide margin, by the harm it would cause to the residential amenity and character of this residential area and resulting increase in anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder and highway and pedestrian safety. In particular they note:

- Errors and inaccuracies in the application, including stating that the building is vacant when in fact it is not.
- Insufficient detail is provided to consider the planning merits and impacts.

- There are already unacceptable crime and anti-social behaviour issues associated with the site, a crime hot spot as reflected in the number of police calls to the building. The development will increase crime, security risks and anti-social behaviour.
- The development is inappropriate in a mainly residential area with a high number of elderly residents, many of whom are already scared.
- The development is an overdevelopment and housing 44 people in the building is too many. A smaller scheme may have been acceptable but to house 44 people in the building is too many. Not only will this have an unacceptable impact on the proposed residents of the development but also the wider area.
- The welfare and support provided to the proposed residents is grossly inadequate. For example, no framework is included within the planning application to support the people being housed.
- There are no support facilities in Chapeltown and High Green for the homeless.
- Inadequate details on how the use of the building (including security, litter, ground maintenance) will be managed/addressed.
- Effect on the local school nearby, businesses due to anti-social behaviour in the local area and school children have been approached by the people that are currently housed in the building.
- There is also a significant level of public objection from local residents as reflected in the number of objections the City Council has received to it and the number of people who spoke at the Council's Planning and Environmental meeting.

Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods

The Director of Housing with lead responsibility for the development of the Council's Housing Strategy and for its statutory homelessness services raised concerns on behalf of Sheffield City Council Housing and Neighbourhoods Service. She stated:

In summary, I do not consider the proposed development, as detailed in the application, to be suitable either for the area or to provide the level of support and services needed for the intended residents. I am also concerned that included in the application are a number of statements that indicate Sheffield City Council is providing a similar service at the same location and will make referrals to the proposed scheme. Neither of these statements are true.

With respect to the Design & Access Statement (Appendix 4, page 3), it is stated that "The Staindrop Lodge Hotel's previously established use as hotel accommodation means that the property can easily be adapted to the change of use proposed without harm to local character, without harm to the living conditions of occupiers or neighbours and without any harm to highway safety" and "...the suitability of the Staindrop Lodge Hotel for the use proposed has effectively already been established by Sheffield City Council itself." (A5, p.3)

In my view, the concentration of 44 studio apartments/bedsits for people who have been or are at risk of being homeless, including some with multiple and complex needs, could have a significant impact on the living conditions of the occupiers and

local community. A commercial hotel will attract a range of customers that do not require support and do not impact on each other or the local community.

Since March 2020, Sheffield City Council has placed homeless people who have been rough sleeping at Staindrop Lodge in response to the Government's directive to offer everyone a place to stay as part of the COVID19 measures. This is a maximum of 36 people and residents are not allowed to have non-residents into the accommodation. These are short-term placements with daily on-site support from specialist Council housing staff and partner agencies including care, voluntary, mental and physical health, and drug and alcohol services. Each person has an agreed support plan and is rehoused as soon as possible into a suitable supported or general needs housing property. In addition, in recognition of the vulnerability of the residents, we provide 24 hour on-site officer and a security presence.

The submitted planning application does not include any proposal to provide similar staffing or support for the intended 44 occupiers of the building or any details of impact on the local community. The proposed design of the building doesn't include areas that could facilitate multi-agency support work or intensive housing management. Other than a very small gym the plans do not appear to include any communal facilities that provide shared spaces or office space for officers to enable support to be provided to vulnerable residents.

Therefore, residents would be placed without the wrap-around support in an area of Sheffield not equipped to meet their needs, or close to their own support networks. This is likely to result in challenging behaviours impacting on residents of the building, the local community and placements being abandoned. Whereas the Council has put in place arrangements with local policing teams to respond to any community safety concerns including anti-social behaviour.

Sheffield City Council would expect any provider of accommodation for vulnerable people to ensure there is an adequate level of officer support with 24/7 services.

The planning application does not consider the impact on local infrastructure, for example local doctor surgeries and pharmacies who may not be equipped to support a concentration of this client group with high and multiple needs.

The application also states "The proposed development would transform Sheffield City Council's hostel facilities into high quality living accommodation, providing people in need with decent, modern housing appropriate to their needs. Crucially, it would do so in a manner fully reflective of Sheffield's adopted and emerging planning policy, which strives to create balanced, inclusive, sustainable neighbourhoods." (E47, p.12)

Staindrop Lodge has not been used as a Hostel by Sheffield City Council. It is a private hotel that was never designed or commissioned to provide a hostel service. The Council has placed people at this hotel for short term accommodation to prevent rough sleeping. The developer needs to clarify if this proposal is to provide hostel accommodation with support (usually short term housing on a licence for 6-12 months) or permanent housing on an assured tenancy basis.

The application contains a number of statements in relation to how the proposed development would meet local needs as follows "...the proposed development also directly addresses local housing needs". (A6, p.4) and "In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS41, the proposed development would help to provide for smaller households in a highly accessible location; and support the creation of a mixed community that would:" ...meet a range of housing needs including a mix of prices, size"" (A8, p.4)

"The proposed development will provide sustainable, affordable, attractive and modern living accommodation..." (E60, p.14)

"Taking the above into account, the proposal will enhance local character and residential amenity..." (E64, p.14)

"The proposal would comprise sustainable development, making effective use of the application site, in harmony with the surrounding area" (E65, p.15)

Studio apartments/bedsits are generally unpopular in general needs housing and not recognised as meeting a particular housing need in most parts of the city, with the possible exception of areas of very high need and/or areas with high numbers of young single people. These circumstances do not apply to Chapeltown. Approximately 90% of the proposed properties fall below the minimum Nationally Described Space Standards for a one bedroom one person unit of 37m², which is likely to further limit their appeal.

The small size and uniformity (100% bedsits) of the proposed units significantly limits their appeal and flexibility, and is likely to result in a concentration of high turnover properties that will become increasingly difficult to let and which could cause significant tenancy management issues in relation to high turnover and vacancy rates.

The application includes an Affordable Housing Statement which states "During a tumultuous 2020, Staindrop Lodge Hotel has been used by Sheffield City Council to house people unable to secure affordable housing. Thus, whilst the proposed development would result in significant additional investment to create attractive, high quality units of accommodation and would be run through a Registered Housing Provider, the suitability of the Staindrop Lodge Hotel for the use proposed has effectively already been established by Sheffield City Council itself."

As stated above, Sheffield City Council was required to find accommodation for rough sleepers at extreme short notice under the direction of the Government through the everyone in initiative and does not consider a concentration of 44 units for vulnerable people without support on this site as suitable.

Demand for social housing in this Housing Market Area is sensitive to type and location. There is a need for additional apartments in this location but we would be looking for a mix of properties with one and two-bedrooms, with good space standards, built to accessible design standards and ideally with a small number of wheelchair adaptable properties. Chapeltown has a slightly older age profile than the city average and, like most parts of the city, would greatly benefit from more age-friendly properties.

The planning application states that “All tenant referrals come through the Local Authority, with the rental income being covered by Housing Benefit.”

I can confirm that Sheffield City Council has no agreements in place with the developer to make referrals to their services or to commission support services from them (which would not be covered by benefits). Neither has it had any communication with my services about this accommodation, including its suitability for housing the homeless or other vulnerable groups. The Council only make referrals directly to supported housing schemes that we have commissioned services from or to registered housing providers who we have agreements in place with to make nominations to social housing.

South Yorkshire Police

From a local Neighbourhood Policing Team (NPT) perspective, South Yorkshire Police have not experienced a rise in crime directly attributed to the location, but have experienced a slight rise in Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) which can be attributed to the current use. Anecdotally residents attribute crime and ASB to the location and have raised concerns to the local team about this.

Our main concern is that whilst it was used as a shelter during the pandemic, support services were on site to work through the complex needs of the residents, this provision of service does not appear to be included as part of the proposal.

The hotel also provided security which managed out some of the incidents and controlled access to the venue, again such safeguarding measures are not in place under this proposal.

Health and Safety Executive

The proposed development site does not currently lie within the consultation distance of a major hazard site or major accident hazard pipeline

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

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

The relevant development plan for the site is the Sheffield Local Plan which includes the Sheffield Core Strategy and the saved policies and proposals map of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

The Government’s planning policy guidance on Green Belts and other matters is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Government has also published planning practice guidance (NPPG’s) on various categories including advice on the role of the Green Belt in the planning system. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

The Council's Development Plan (UDP and Core Strategy) substantially predate the Framework. However, paragraph 12 of the NPPF makes it clear that its presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.

Furthermore, the policies of the Development Plan should not simply be considered out-of-date because they were adopted (as is the case in Sheffield) or made prior to the publication of the NPPF (paragraph 213). Weight should be given to the relevant Development Plan Policies, according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. The closer a policy in the Development Plan is to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight it may be given.

Assessment of a development proposal also 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.

On 16 December 2020 the Government published an update to planning practice guidance 'Housing and economic needs assessment'. The update introduces a change to the standard method for calculating the local housing need figure.

Paragraph 004 provides the steps used to calculate the local housing need figure as well as the specific data inputs to be used in terms of demographic baseline and adjustment for affordability. The most recent publication now includes an additional step 4 – the 'cities and urban centres uplift'. This requires a 35% uplift to be applied to the local housing need figure for the 20 largest cities and urban centres, including Sheffield.

The effect of the urban centres uplift is to increase Sheffield's local housing need figure for 2021 to 2,923 new homes per annum.

The Council's most recently published position in relation to the deliverable 5 year housing land supply situation is set out in the '5 Year Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report', December 2020. The monitoring report sets out the position as at 1 April 2020, with respect to the period 2020/21 to 2024/25. The monitoring report provides evidence of a 5.4 year deliverable supply of housing land.

Until an update is produced with a base date of 1 April 2021, the monitoring report remains the Council's stated position.

Therefore, the most important policies in the determination of this application are not automatically considered to be out of date.

The most important local policies in the determination of this application relate to land use matters and residential amenity issues.

Set against this context, the development proposal is assessed against all relevant policies in the development plan and government policy contained in the NPPF.

It is considered that the main issues relevant to this application are:

- The principle of development – policy and land use;
- Loss of a community facility;
- Highway matters;
- Design and effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- Residential amenity matters and effect on the living conditions of neighbouring Properties and future residents of the studio flats; and
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The Principle of Development – Policy and Land Use

The application was accompanied by a Design and Access Statement (D&A), which sets out the scope of the proposed change of use. In summary, the statement says that there is a requirement for new affordable housing to meet the needs of homeless people in Sheffield, with the established use of the building as a hotel allowing it to be easily adapted without the need for significant alteration. It also states that the applicant (Fairhome Group PLC) will work closely with the Registered Housing Provider, to use this brownfield site to provide affordable living accommodation in an attractive and appropriate living environment.

In addition to the D&A Statement, the application includes a supporting statement prepared by Midland Living CIC that sets out the management and operational aspects of the proposed development. This document identifies how the proposal would be delivered, background information on the operator, the need for such accommodation and the day-to-day management of the properties.

It details that, in advance of the building being brought into use, a number of criteria would be agreed with Sheffield City Council and include six strategic objectives that amongst other things would help tackle rough sleeping, improve housing options and access to employment, education and training.

The intention of the applicant is that the proposal would be delivered between a Registered Provider (the landlord), Midland Living CIC (the Support Provider) and SCC. The statement says that Midland Living are a not-for profit community interest company that has been set up specifically to work with other Support Providers, Housing Associations and Local Authorities and other statutory partners. They say that they provide high quality homes for people who are in housing need and work

proactively to reduce housing need, including homelessness, and provide the highest standard of accommodation and support across its services. They state that Midland Living has a proven track record of working in partnership with local authorities, commissioners and voluntary agencies, including Birmingham Council, where they currently provide a range of accommodation services for vulnerable single homeless people.

The submission references the increasing numbers of rough sleepers and the need to provide new homes. It also references the Sheffield Homeless Prevention Strategy 2020-2022, which aims to minimise homelessness in Sheffield. The use of the hotel, it says, would help support the objectives of the strategy and provide single/couples occupancy, while offering intensive management and support.

In terms of management, the statement says that a mix of Intensive Housing Management, Night Support/Concierge and Housing Support would be provided with assistance and support available to residents 24 hours a day (7 days a week).

The application site is situated in a designated Housing Area, and therefore the application is assessed against UDP Policies H5, H6, H7, H8, H10, and H14. Assessment is also made against Core Strategy Policies CS23, CS24, CS32, CS41, CS63 and CS74.

UDP Policy H5 relates to flats, bed-sitters and shared housing. This policy states that planning permission will be granted for the creation of flats, bed-sitters and multiple sharing of houses only if:

- a) A concentration of these uses would not cause serious nuisance to existing residents; and
- b) Living conditions would be satisfactory for occupants of the accommodation and their immediate neighbours; and
- c) There would be appropriate off-street car parking for the needs of the people living there.

Multiple sharing is defined in the UDP as being where seven or more non-related people are living in a single dwellinghouse, and a bed-sitter is defined as a single room where the household does not have exclusive use of bath or inside toilet.

The site of the hotel is not in an area where there is a concentration of shared housing or flats. An assessment carried out of house types within a 200m catchment area of the site found that of 471 identified residential properties, no residences (0%) are in multiple person housing, such as hostels, purpose-built student accommodation or Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). The proposal would also benefit from a high level of off-street parking spaces that would cater for the likely parking needs of staff and residents of the building. The proposal would therefore satisfy parts a and c) of this policy. The policy requirements relating to living conditions for both the occupants of the accommodation and its immediate neighbours are covered below.

UDP Policy H6 relates to short-term accommodation for homeless people. This policy sets out that the development of good quality short-term accommodation for

homeless people will be permitted where it would:

- a) Be within easy reach, by foot or bus of a shopping centre; and
- b) Be within easy reach of existing or proposed housing; and
- c) Have facilities for people with disabilities; and
- d) Comply with UDP Policy H14.

The supporting text to this policy states that the problem of homelessness has been steadily getting worse, which is partly due to lack of adequate and secure rented accommodation. The policy aims to provide security and support for homeless people and states that it is important that homeless people get to know an area and make friends while they are in short stay accommodation.

Development plan policy is generally supportive in terms of social housing and hostels in Housing Areas. As set out above, UDP Policy H6 allows for short-term accommodation for homeless people in Housing Areas, subject to the development being within easy reach, by foot or bus of a shopping centre and within easy reach of existing and proposed housing. The nearest local centres are at Wortley Road and Greengate Lane, and the nearest District Centre, which has a range of retail, leisure and community facilities, is Chapeltown District Centre approximately 1km away. The nearest shops are on Lane End, consisting of a hair salon, beauty salon and a Chinese takeaway.

UDP Policy H7 relates to mobility housing and states that in all new or refurbished housing, the provision of a proportion of mobility housing to meet local need will be encouraged except where the physical characteristics of a site or existing buildings make it impracticable.

UDP Policy H8 relates to housing for people in need of care. This policy states that new and refurbished housing in the form of supportive accommodation will be permitted in suitable locations provided that a number of conditions are met. This includes at part a) that it would be within easy reach of a shopping centre and public transport, be suitable for people with disabilities, and at part c) it would be provided with a reasonable and attractive area of accessible private open space or be immediately next to an area of public open space.

Although consistent with the spirit of the NPPF, policy H7 carries very little weight as it does not reference the Government's optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing (as required by footnote 46 of the NPPF).

UDP policies H5 to H8 are broadly consistent with the aims of the NPPF in relation to the promotion of housing delivery and catering for specific housing needs.

In relation to UDP Policies H6 and H8, the site is located approximately 1km from the District Centre at Chapeltown. Whilst not easily accessible by foot, it is nevertheless on a bus route into Chapeltown and the city, with a bus stop situated within 80m of the site along Lane End. The development would also include an external amenity area within the grounds of the building and it is located less than 200m from Charlton Brook Woods. It is therefore considered that the development

would not conflict with UDP Policy H6 (parts a-b) or Policy H8 (parts a and c). The development however fails to provide any accessible flats for people with disabilities, and therefore would fail to meet the requirements of part c) of Policy H6 and part b) of Policy H8.

The change of use of the hotel to housing to provide short-term accommodation for the homeless would also be an acceptable use under the terms of UDP Policy H10. This policy relates to development in Housing Areas and details that in these areas, housing is the preferred use, with residential institutions and hostels listed in the menu of acceptable uses. The supporting text to this policy does however state that large developments are more likely to cause problems of noise that could harm neighbouring properties and could be better suited in alternative locations such as business and leisure areas.

The promotion of housing in policy H10 is consistent with paragraphs 59 and 67 of the NPPF which seek to ensure the delivery of new homes to meet need.

UDP Policy H14 sets out a number of conditions that developments in Housing Areas are required to meet. These include at part k), that the development would not lead to air pollution, noise, smell, excessive traffic levels or other nuisance, or risk to health and safety for people living nearby, and at part i) it would only occupy only a small area and not lead to a concentration of non-housing uses, which would threaten the residential character of the Housing Area.

This policy is considered to be broadly in line with government policy contained in the NPPF. At paragraph 91 part b) it states that decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive safe places which are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion, and at paragraph 127 part f), that decisions should ensure that development create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

The relevant Core Strategy Policies in respect of this application include CS23, CS24, CS32, and CS41.

Core Strategy Policy CS23 relates to locations for new housing and states that, in Chapeltown, housing development will be limited to suitable, sustainable sites within the existing built-up areas.

In its approach to meeting the need for new homes in built-up areas, policy CS23 is consistent with the NPPF, which gives substantial weight to using brownfield land for housing (paragraph 118).

The site is situated within the existing built-up area of Chapeltown. It is located on a bus route and within 1km from Chapeltown Railway Station, and Chapeltown District Centre is approximately 1km from the site. While the distance to Chapeltown District Centre is not within easy walking distance, the site is considered to be sustainably located.

Core Strategy Policy CS24 relates to the use of previously developed land for new housing, and states that priority will be given to the development of previously developed sites and that no more than 12% of dwelling completions be on greenfield sites between 2004/05 and 2025/26. The NPPF defines previously developed land as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface.

This policy is also considered to be consistent with the NPPF, which states at paragraph 117 that policies should set out a strategy for meeting need in such a way that 'makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land', and as previously referenced, at paragraph 118, that planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs.

The proposal relates to previously developed land. Therefore, the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policy CS24.

Core Strategy Policy CS32 relates to jobs and Housing in Chapeltown and Ecclesfield. The policy states that new housing will be limited to infilling and windfall sites within the existing residential areas and the surrounding countryside will be protected.

Policy CS32 again reflects the NPPF approach to using brownfield land within existing settlements for homes (paragraph 118) and the proposed development would not conflict with this policy as the proposal relates to the re-use of an existing building within the existing residential area of Chapeltown.

Core Strategy Policy CS41 sets out that mixed communities will be promoted by encouraging development of housing to meet a range of housing needs including a mix of prices, sizes, types and tenures. Part a) of this policy seeks to provide housing for a broad range of smaller households in the City Centre and other highly accessible locations where no more than half the new homes in larger developments should consist of a single house type, and at part d) limiting new or conversions to hostels, purpose-built student accommodation and Houses in Multiple Occupation where the community is already imbalanced by a concentration of such uses or where the development would create imbalance. For the purposes of part d of this policy, this would be achieved, in part, by limiting these type of uses to no more than 20% of all residences within 200m of the application site.

The proposed development does not conflict with this policy as it would secure the use of the building for social housing in support of vulnerable people in need of suitable housing, and it would not lead to a concentration of uses that would imbalance the community as there are no hostels, purpose-built accommodation or registered HMOs within 200m of the application site. While it is noted that the proposed units would be primarily for single occupation, which would conflict with part a) of policy CS41, the specific nature of the development is considered to justify the single house type proposed.

The following part of the report is separated into two sections, the first relating to the

effect of the development on crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB), and the second relating to the suitability of the building as a homeless residence, in this location and taking into account the type and number of units being provided, and whether the development would have appropriate support networks to accommodate the use.

Effect of the development on crime, fear of crime and ASB

A very high number of objections have been received from local residents with the overwhelming concern being the unsuitability of the proposed use in this location and fears that the development would increase crime and ASB. While a number of residents acknowledge that there is a need to provide suitable accommodation to house homeless people across the city, they do not consider this residential suburb of Chapeltown to be an appropriate location, many commenting that there are inadequate support networks in place to accommodate the number of units proposed.

South Yorkshire Police (SYP) have confirmed that, despite the high number of representations received referring to an increase in crime and ASB in the area, their Neighbourhood Policing Team (NPT) have not experienced a rise in crime directly attributed to the application site, and there has been only a slight rise in ASB.

South Yorkshire Police have said that their main concern with the proposal is that its use as a homeless shelter during the pandemic included on-site services to support the complex needs of the residents, a provision which, they say, does not appear to be included under this proposal. Also, the hotel also provided security which managed out some of the incidents and controlled access to the venue. They say that such safeguarding measures do not appear to be in place under this proposal.

During the application, the applicant submitted an additional supporting statement prepared by Midland Living CIC. It states that the proposed development would have a combination of Intensive Housing Management, Night Support/Concierge and Housing Support that would be available to residents 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This would likely address some of the concerns of SYP.

Whilst the number of people who have reported crimes and ASB to the police during the time the hotel has accommodated homeless people has, according to SYP, been low. A very high number of residents have, according to representations, experienced incidents of ASB in the area surrounding the hotel which they have attributed to its recent use. The incidents of ASB experienced include abusive and threatening behaviour, children being approached, begging, drug abuse, increased litter and drunkenness. Local residents are concerned that this type of behaviour would continue if the use of the building to accommodate homeless people become permanent.

Paragraph 91 of the NPPF (parts a and b) states that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction and are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.

The NPPF also states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is what the planning and development process should achieve, with paragraph 127 stating that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: a) function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place; and f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Government policy therefore recognises that fear of crime, as well as actual crime and disorder, is capable of being a factor in decision making. Case law also accepts that fear of crime is capable of being a material consideration, but that fear and concern must be real and have some reasonable basis. The fear of crime has no definition in the planning acts, but it is often referred to as the fear of being a victim of crime as opposed to the actual probability of being a victim of crime.

Many local residents are concerned that the proposed development would increase the likelihood of crime and cases of ASB in the area and it is not disputed that many have experienced ASB and, as a result, question the suitability of the site for the proposed use in this residential suburb of Chapeltown.

Bearing in mind the increased scale of the proposal, from 36 to 44 residents, and the perceived threat of increased crime and ASB, some of which is based on experience and an albeit small increase in reported ASB confirmed by SYP, it is considered that the use of the site to accommodate a high number of homeless people on a permanent basis would, on balance, undermine the quality of life of residents that live close to and adjacent to the site to the detriment of the amenities of the locality and the area's established residential community.

Similarly, the Director of Housing with lead responsibility for the development of the Council's Housing Strategy and for its statutory homelessness services, said that the concentration of 44 studio apartments/bedsits for people who have been or are at risk of being homeless, including some with multiple and complex needs, could have a significant impact on the living conditions of the occupiers and local community.

As such, it is considered that the development would be contrary to UDP Policy H14 part k and government guidance contained in paragraphs 91 and 127 of the NPPF.

Suitability of the hotel as a homeless residence in this location

As stated above, UDP Policy H6 permits good quality short-term accommodation for homeless people in accessible locations, while policy H8 permits supportive accommodation in suitable locations where it is within easy reach of a shopping centre and public transport and is suitable for people with disabilities.

Paragraph 61 of the NPPF states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

Paragraph 92 of the NPPF states that, to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health and social well-being for all sections of the community and ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, community facilities and services.

The Director of Housing, responsible for the development of the Council's Housing Strategy and statutory homelessness services, has stated that the area of the site is not suitable for the proposed development as will not provide the level of support and services needed for the intended residents.

As part of COVID 19 emergency measures, Sheffield City Council placed a maximum of 36 homeless people in the hotel. These were short-term placements with daily on-site support from specialist Council housing staff and partner agencies. Each person had an agreed support plan and was rehoused as soon as possible into suitable supported or general needs housing. There was a 24 hour on-site officer and security presence, arrangements with local policing teams to respond to any community safety concerns, and non-residents were not permitted in the building.

Midland Living CIC subsequently set out the level of support that would be offered to future residents of the building, but the proposed design of the building does not include areas that could facilitate multi-agency support work or intensive housing management and support, such as shared spaces or offices. And, other than a small gym, the plans do not include any communal facilities. As a result, future residents may not be provided with adequate support because specialist facilities are not available in the local area. Furthermore, local doctor surgeries and pharmacies may not be equipped to support a concentration of people with complex needs. Residents would also be unable to easily access existing support networks, which are largely located in or close to the city centre.

There are also concerns about the accommodation proposed. The Director of Housing reports that studio apartments/bedsits are generally unpopular in general needs housing and are not recognised as meeting a particular housing need in most parts of the city, with the possible exception of areas of very high need and/or areas with high numbers of young single people, which does not apply to Chapeltown. There is a need for additional apartments in this location, but SCC Strategic Housing would be looking for a mix of properties with one and two-bedrooms, with good space standards, built to accessible design standards and ideally with a small number of wheelchair adaptable properties.

Most of the proposed properties fall below the minimum Nationally Described Space Standards for a one bedroom one person unit of 37m² and below the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide minimum standard for a 1 person studio of 33m².

It should also be noted that the Council has no agreements in place with the developer to make referrals to their services or to commission support services from them, and that the Council only make referrals directly to supported housing

schemes that it has agreements with and in accordance with Sheffield City Council's Housing Strategy 2013-2023.

It is acknowledged that some management and support is proposed by the applicant alongside the 44 social housing dwellings. However, it is considered that the development would not provide the level of support and services needed by the intended residents, either within the facility or in the locality, as a result of its isolated location (and in relation to existing support networks).

It is therefore considered that the proposed development does not support the delivery of local strategies to improve health and social well-being for all sections of the community, nor is it part of an integrated approach to considering the location of housing and services as required by paragraph 92 of the NPPF.

The development is therefore contrary to UDP Policies H6 and H8 and paragraphs 92 part b and 127 part of the NPPF

Loss of a Community Facility

Development Plan policy in respect of community facilities is contained within UDP Policies CF1—CF2. Policy CF2 sets out that development which would result in the loss of community facilities will be permitted if:

- a) The loss is unavoidable and equivalent facilities would be provided in the same area; or
- b) The facilities are no longer required; or
- c) Where a change of use of a building is involved, equivalent accommodation would be readily available elsewhere.

Although the UDP's definition of community facilities (pp169-170) is limited to uses in Use Class D1 usually provided by the public sector, the NPPF recognises the social benefits of a range of facilities in promoting healthy and safe communities.

Paragraph 92 part a) of the NPPF states that to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments, with community facilities including local shops, meeting places, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

While a hotel would not be classed as a community facility for the purposes of UDP Policy CF2, it is acknowledged from the high number of representations received that prior to its closure, the hotel's restaurant, bar and function rooms in particular were well frequented by local residents and provided an important community facility catering for social events such as weddings and birthday parties as well as being a general meeting place.

While the hotel is a valued asset that provides social benefits to local community, it is considered that only limited weight can be afforded to the loss of this facility. The NPPF does not include hotel bars or restaurants within the list of community facilities

set out at part a) of paragraph 92, indeed many hotel bars and restaurants are not open to the general public. Moreover, there are a range of similar facilities available in the Chapelton and High Green shopping areas, as well as a nearby public house located to the south of the application site at the junction of Lane End and School Road.

No nomination has been made by the local community to turn the hotel into an Asset of Community Value (ACV) and the facilities provided by the hotel remain ancillary elements to the primary use of the building as a hotel.

It is considered, therefore, that it would be difficult to sustain a refusal on the grounds that the change of use of the hotel would lead to the loss of a valued community asset.

Highway Matters

UDP Policy H14 sets out at part (d) that in Housing Areas, new development will be permitted provided that it would provide safe access to the highway network and be provided with appropriate off-street parking and not endanger pedestrians.

NPPF paragraph 109 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The hotel currently benefits from a large car park at the southern end of the application site. The car park has a wide access and visibility for vehicles entering and leaving the site, and for pedestrians passing the site, is good.

It is considered that the existing car park would meet the likely parking demands of the development, which given the proposed tenure is likely to be low.

The proposals raise no highway safety concerns and the requirements of policy H14 d) are met.

Design Issues and Effect on the Character and Appearance of the Surrounding Area

UDP Policy BE5 (c) states that good design and use of good quality materials will be expected in all new and refurbished buildings and extensions. It goes on to state that all extensions should respect the scale, form, detail and materials of the original building.

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. At Part (c) it includes the townscape character of neighbourhoods with their associated scale, layout and built form, building styles and materials.

These policies are considered to be consistent with government policy contained in the NPPF, which states at paragraph 127 that planning policies and decisions should

ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, and at paragraph 170 that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The proposed change of use of the building does not involve any external alterations to the building. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

It is therefore considered that UDP Policy BE5 and Core Strategy CS74 are met.

Residential Amenity Matters and Effect on the Living Conditions of Neighbouring Properties and Future residents of the studio flats.

UDP Policy H14 'Conditions on Development in Housing Areas' permits new development or change of use proposals provided that: (c) the site would not be over-developed or deprive residents of light, privacy or security, or cause serious loss of existing garden space which would harm the character of the neighbourhood; and (k) that the development would not lead to air pollution, noise, smell, excessive traffic levels or other nuisance, or risk to health and safety for people living nearby.

UDP Policy H15 relates to the design of new housing developments and states at part a) that the development should provide easy access to homes and circulation around the site for people with disabilities or with prams and at part b) have adequate private gardens or communal open space to ensure that basic standards of daylight, privacy, security and outlook are met for all residents.

These policies are broadly in line with NPPF paragraph 127 f) which states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Effect on the Living Conditions of the Occupants of Neighbouring Properties

It is acknowledged that there are/will be a number of residential properties (both existing and proposed) that are situated very close to the site, some of which are currently being overlooked by windows of the hotel.

The supporting plans show that the proposal would utilise the building's existing windows, with no additional windows planned, and, on the face of it, the proposed change of use would not lead to any additional overlooking issues. However, it is acknowledged that, unlike hotel rooms in which guests are unlikely to spend a lot of time, the occupants of self-contained flats will spend more time in their rooms and rely more heavily on their windows for outlook. Consequently, given the high number of windows along the building's side elevations that face neighbouring properties, it is considered that the proposed change of use would increase the instances of and opportunities for overlooking.

This weighs against the proposed change of use. However, it is considered that the

likely increase in the instances of and opportunities for overlooking would not be so significant that it would prevent use of the hotel for residential use. The number of habitable windows in close proximity to neighbouring properties is relatively low (as some serve hallways or are set a good way back from the boundary). It is considered, therefore, that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties would not be so seriously diminished to justify a refusal on grounds of unacceptable loss of privacy.

In terms of noise, future residents of the proposed flats would be provided with acceptable living conditions. Furthermore, the impact of the proposed use on nearby residential properties in respect of noise breakout should be less than from the hotel use, given that the hotel includes conference facilities, an entertainment suite, a bar and a restaurant, all of which are likely to generate noise over and above the use of the building for residential use.

Living Conditions of Future Residents

The building would be adapted to provide 44 self-contained studio flats, which vary in size between 20.8 and 39.4 square metres, and all are provided with en-suite toilet/shower and kitchen facilities. Apart from the ground floor, which would contain the development's larger flats, the adaptation of the hotel would primarily utilise the hotels existing bedrooms.

It is considered that the flats are small and, as previously described, many are below the minimum Nationally Described Space Standards for a one bedroom one person unit and below the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide minimum standard for a 1 person studio. However, with no locally set minimum standards (in Sheffield), the proposed accommodation is considered to be acceptable and unlikely to result in significant harm to the amenities of future occupants. Particularly as the accommodation is designed to be short term rather than a permanent home.

The residents would also benefit from a ground floor gym and have access to the site's gardens.

As such, it is considered that future residents would have a reasonable level of amenity in accommodation that would meet their everyday needs. It is therefore considered that the development complies with UDP Policy H15 part b), which expects basic standards of daylight, privacy, security and outlook to be met.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to provide infrastructure to support new development. Mostly CIL replaces some previous payments negotiated individually as planning obligations, such as contributions towards the enhancement and provision of open space (UDP Policy H16) and towards education provision (Core Strategy Policy CS43).

In this instance the proposal is liable for CIL charges. The applicant has completed the relevant form and has confirmed that the development is CIL liable and not exempt for the reasons set out under Section 4 (Exemption or Relief) on the CIL

form.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

This application relates to the Staindrop Lodge Hotel in Chapeltown. The hotel closed in March 2020 in response to the Covid-19 pandemic and was leased by Sheffield City Council to accommodate homeless people under emergency coronavirus legislation brought in by the government. The Council ceased this arrangement at the end of June 2021.

The applicant is seeking full planning permission to change the use of the hotel to 44 self-contained flats for homeless people. The applicant has stated that the use of the hotel would continue in a similar manner to how the Council has been using it since the beginning of the pandemic.

The Staindrop Hotel is located in a Housing Area, where housing is the preferred use of land. In principle, the proposed change of use is acceptable and the site is in a sustainable location.

While there would be some harmful impacts on neighbouring residents as a result of increased overlooking, this is not considered to be on a scale that would warrant a refusal. Living conditions for occupants of the proposed accommodation would also be satisfactory and there would be appropriate off-street car parking and no adverse impacts on highway safety.

While the hotel is clearly a valued asset that provides social benefits to local community, it is not an Asset of Community Value (ACV) and the communal facilities are ancillary elements to the primary use of the building as a hotel. Moreover, a range of similar facilities are available in Chapeltown and High Green and in a nearby public house.

The development would comply with UDP Policy H5 (a and c) and Policy H6 (a and b). It is also considered that the development would not conflict with Core Strategy Policies CS23, CS24, and CS41.

However, there are significant concerns regarding the suitability of the proposed use in this residential suburb of Chapeltown. While South Yorkshire Police have confirmed that only a small increase Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) can be directly attributed to the recent use of the site as a shelter for homeless people during the pandemic, it is clear that many local people have experienced ASB and that the perceived threat of increased crime and ASB would, on balance, undermine the quality of life of residents that live close to and adjacent to the site to the detriment of the amenities of the locality.

Furthermore, the proposed internal reconfiguration of the building does not include areas to facilitate multi-agency support work, none of the studios would provide suitable facilities for people with disabilities, and there has been no assessment of the impact of the development on local services. It is considered that the development would not provide the level of support and services needed by the intended residents, either within the facility or in the locality, as a result of its

isolated location (and in relation to existing support networks) and so the development, in this location, is not acceptable.

For the reasons set out in the report and having regard all other matters, the proposal is considered to be contrary to UDP Policies H6 (c) and H8, H14 and government guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraphs 91 (parts a and b), 92 part b) and 127 part f). It is therefore recommended that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development, which lies in a residential suburb of Chapeltown, would result in instances of anti-social behaviour and a fear of crime that would undermine the quality of life of residents that live close to and adjacent to the site to the detriment of the amenities of the locality. As such, the development would be contrary to UDP Policy H14 part k) and government policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 91 b), 92 b) and 127 f).
2. The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development, by reason of its layout and location within a residential suburb of Chapeltown, would not provide the level of support and services needed by residents with complex needs, either within the facility or in the locality, as a result of its isolated location (and in relation to existing support networks). As such, the development would be contrary to UDP Policy H8 and government policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 92 b) and 127 f).
3. The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposed development does not provide suitable facilities for people with disabilities making the flats inaccessible for people with impaired mobility. As such, it is considered that the development would be contrary to UDP Policies H6 c), H8 b) and H15 a) and government policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 127 f).