

CITY CENTRE SOUTH & EAST AREA COMMITTEE - 5 November 2012

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. **Application Number:** 12/02949/FUL

Address: 21 Twitchill Drive, S13 7EY

Additional Representation

Further comments have been received from the adjoining property (number 23) in respect of the impact of the proposals and to point out a number of inaccuracies that they believe are in the officer report. Their points can be summarised as follows:

- the reference to 32cm in their initial comments has been misinterpreted – what they actually meant was that their own conservatory is 32 cm from the boundary rather than on the boundary and they believe that the architect has mistakenly taken the boundary fence as the boundary line, which they state it is not.
- the monopitch nature of the single storey aspect of the proposals, with the roof starting just underneath the first floor windows, will create a dominant brick wall above the roof of their conservatory. It would be better if this roof was hipped or pitched away from the boundary, with the lowest part of the roof running along the boundary as this would remove the expanse of brick wall from this point and provide at least some relief to the conservatory.
- given that the neighbour is concerned that the boundary line has not been correctly denoted, they believe that the single storey extension between the existing kitchen extension and the boundary of the property is wider than it should be at 2.2 metres. They estimate that the space available is only 1.84 metres.
- the neighbour believes that guideline 5 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on House Extensions has been breached in that the 2 storey element of the extension projects further out from the rear of the house than the neighbour's nearest window to the extension. They estimate that their nearest window is 2.415 metres but the extension projects 3.5 metres at its furthest extent. This suggests to them that the upper floor extension should project a maximum of 2.415 metres.
- the neighbour reiterates that the proposed plans as they stand would affect their quality of life & enjoyment of their property due to unreasonable overshadowing and overdominance, contrary to Guideline 5 of the SPG.

Officer Response

The issues in relation to the alleged inaccuracies in the boundary position and the potential for the plans to be inaccurate as a result are noted. Unfortunately the planning service does not have access to individual deed plans of properties so cannot verify whether or not this is the case here. In order to highlight this concern it is possible to add an informative to any subsequent decision notice to alert the applicant to this issue and to advise them that they must be sure that any building works take place within the confines of their own boundary. If it is proved correct

that the boundary is wrongly plotted, this may ultimately mean that a revised planning application could be required to be submitted. The neighbour has been advised of the limited role that planning can play in a boundary dispute matter.

In respect of the design of the roof of the single storey element of the proposal, the applicant has now revised this aspect of the proposal to a hipped roof to reduce the impact of this element of the proposal on the neighbour (such that the roof now slopes up away from the neighbour).

In respect of guideline 5, it is correct to say that the length of the two storey extension at its fullest point does project further than the distance between the neighbour's window and the side of the extension. This is why the upper floor has been designed with a splay to meet the 45 degree angle, also stipulated in the guideline. Although this is not an ideal solution and it does create an awkward design, it is a solution that has been accepted on other schemes in the past, whilst accepting that it is not completely in compliance with the guideline. This is why the officer recommendation is very much on balance in this case as it is acknowledged that there will be an impact on the neighbouring semi.

Amended Description

"Single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension to dwellinghouse (as amended by plans received 1 November 2012)"

Amended Condition 2

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

Plans showing side elevation facing 19 Twitchill Drive received 26 September 2012;
Plans showing rear elevation, plan view and side elevation facing 21 Twitchill Drive received 1 November 2012.

Unless otherwise authorised in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to define the permission.

2. Application Number: 12/01017/FUL

Address: Meadowhall Way, Meadowhall Drive, Vulcan Road and Weedon Street

Correction/Clarification.

The third sentence of the penultimate paragraph on page 60 should read as follows.

"This has been a clear and consistent development plan policy since 2008".

3. Application Number: 12/02793/FUL

Address: 102 Harcourt Road, S10 1DJ

Additional Representations:

Following the publication of the planning report a further 6 written representation have been received. The comments made can be summarised as follows:

-Harcourt Road has diverse range of occupants. Site previously owned by South Yorkshire Housing Association, being 2 flats occupied by a family unit or related individuals. Proposal would upset this balance and set a precedent.

-Amendments to scheme do not address previous concerns, but add to them. Proposal will increase density of street, leading to extra overcrowding, noise, parking etc. Needs of area would be better served by retention of existing 2 flats.

-Proposal would conflict with Policy CS41(D).

-Living Conditions would not be satisfactory for residents or neighbour, being in conflict with Unitary Development Plan Policy H5 (part b). A large kitchen/lounge is unsuitable. Congregating together or social events will involve larger numbers. Party walls are only single brick width, meaning noise travels between houses. Leading to detrimental impacts on neighbours.

-Entrance and communal area to HMO is adjacent to/above studio flat, which will lead to unsatisfactory noise impacts to proposed basement accommodation.

-Studio Flat appears to not meet several standards set out in The Housing Act of 2004. These are as follows:

-Flat measures 20.8m², which falls below RIBA research which says the average 1 bedroom flat size in England is 46m², and below their recommendation of 50m² for 2 person occupancy of a 1 bedroomed flat. Lack of space could lead to social isolation, contributing to vulnerable mental health.

-Entrance appears vulnerable to break in.

-Inadequate natural lighting, no natural light to bedroom or bathroom area. View is to a driveway / bin area. Concerns regarding fumes from car/s and hygiene / pests.

-Conversion of basement will look out of character on the street.

Officer Comment

A number of the additional points are similar to those previously raised, and have therefore already been commented upon within the main agenda report.

The quality of the Studio Flat living space is considered to be reasonable, and to not be of sufficiently poor quality to independently support an argument for refusal. A flat layout would not have to satisfy Housing Act standards to be acceptable in Planning terms.

This page is intentionally left blank