

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATION OFFICER REPORT

**APPLICATION:** 17/01281/FUL

**PROPOSAL:** Demolition of existing dwellings, former pavilion and store building and erection of 138x dwellinghouses including new highway access, car parking, open space and landscaping

**ADDRESS:** Sheffield Hallam University  
Norton Playing Fields  
Derbyshire Lane  
Sheffield  
S8 8LJ

## LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

The application relates to a parcel of land just under 4 hectares in size which is situated between Hemsworth Road, Warminster Road, Mount View Road and Derbyshire Lane. The site is private land and is not accessible for public use, with its last use as Sheffield Hallam University's Cricket Pitch in approximately 1998.

The site has remained secure with no public access since 1998, with the existing pedestrian access from Hemsworth Road, Derbyshire Lane and Warminster Road fenced off. The application site also includes No's 15 and 17 Hemsworth Road which are both vacant detached bungalows and a small single storey concrete building located adjacent to the pedestrian access off Hemsworth Road.

The surrounding area is characterised by housing on all boundaries of the site. Along Hemsworth Road and Derbyshire Lane the properties are predominately bungalows, with two-storey properties along Warminster Road and Warminster Place and two storey terraces along Mount View Road. There are 3 properties abutting the northern boundary of the site which are two storeys in height. Immediately adjacent to the south of the site is the former Old Diary along Hemsworth Road which is currently being redeveloped for 14 dwellings.

The site is located within an Open Space Area as designated in the adopted Sheffield Unitary Development Plan, with the surrounding area falling within a Housing Area.

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of two existing bungalows at No. 15 and No. 17 Hemsworth Road to create an access into the site and for the erection of 138 dwelling houses in a mixture of 1,2,3,4 and 5 bedroom properties.

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history relating to this site. However on the adjacent site at The Old Dairy (and sometimes referred to as Cowmouth Farm) permission has been granted for 14 dwellings in 2017 under application 16/02968/REM.

## SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

In total 35 representations have been received objecting to the proposed development.

Councillor Sue Auckland and Councillor Steve Ayris - we would like to register our objections on behalf of a significant number of local residents who completed a survey we carried out on the development. Of the 149 responses received, 110 people informed us they were against any housing development on the site and just 39 in favour.

Local Councillors have consistently opposed building on the site, with the local infrastructure unable to cope with the impact from the development. The land has been used for playing fields of high quality, locked in a residential area and the development would remove this valuable amenity. Local services are restricted, with only a small number of local shops and a few doctors surgeries, with Woodseats Shopping District 1.2 miles away, and not an easy walk.

The family dwellings proposed present a significant addition to this highly residential area, at a time when local schools are oversubscribed.

The measures within the Residential Travel Plan area are overly ambitious. Public transport serving the area has suffered in recent times, and remains vulnerable, with the car favoured. The No. 18 is now only hourly, No. 18a does not serve the area, and No. 20 is not conveniently accessible from the development. C3 is very infrequent and only goes to Tesco.

### Individual Neighbour Representations

#### Highways Representations

The surrounding area already suffers huge amounts of traffic, with nearby junctions including Hemsworth Road and Warminster Road frequently backed up. This proposal will see c.300 cars added to the equation with access to and from the site an accident waiting to happen.

The proposed access road is too close to the junction of Derbyshire Lane and Hemsworth Road and will be inadequate for the volume of traffic especially when events are taking place at Graves Park.

There is very limited parking at Graves Park and the surrounding roads including on the opposite side of Hemsworth Road, and grass verges are often parked on by visitors to the park causing significant traffic problems, and reducing the width of Hemsworth Road to single file, with poor visibility.

Having one access road is likely to cause major traffic congestion, both during construction phase and when the properties are occupied, especially so close to existing homes.

There are already new houses being built on Matthews Lane, and the Old Dairy, a new retail park at Norton, and redevelopment of the Sheffield University fields at Warminster Road attracting more car journeys, coaches blocking the road on Warminster Road when football matches are being played, an extra 138 houses would be a disaster for Norton and the surrounding area. This application should not be viewed in isolation but seen within the context of these developments that have already taken/taking place in the area.

The surrounding roads are already busy with traffic and can be challenging to cross. This proposal will impact on pedestrian safety in the area.

The proposed development will only compound the issues outlined in the Local Transport Plan and area a direct contradiction to the objectives to “enhance social inclusion and health, reduce emissions from vehicles and to make transport increasingly safe and secure, along with tackling accessibility, congestion, providing safer roads, better air quality and effective asset management”.

There should be a guarantee that the woeful public transport serving the area will see a significant improvement. This development is on one of the highest points in the city and its unlikely residents in the area will be using sustainable forms of transport to the extent of the standards set out both locally or nationally.

The traffic flow assessment has been conducted midweek at 15:30 – 18:30, and consideration should be given to the location of Graves Park and peak times at the weekends/bank holidays.

The traffic assessment does not take into consideration the development at Sheffield University playing fields on Warminster Road which is to be used to a greater extent on more days of the week.

The transport report states the site is within walking distance of Chesterfield Road (Woodseats), and whilst measurements of distance are given for cycling and walking, gradients have not been considered. All 3 ways of walking from Woodseats involve steep hills and it is unrealistic to think that any new resident will take these routes.

The travel plan is wrong, the No. 18 is once an hour, the 18a comes nowhere near the site, and the No. 20 runs every 15 minutes but no near the development on Hemsworth Road. The 721, 722, 723 are school buses not public transport and the C3 is a bus to and from Tesco's which runs very infrequently.

There is no pedestrian or cycle access shown at the northeast corner to Warminster Road, access already exists at this corner, and if it remains it would allow better access to public transport and the road network.

Mount View Road is already a thoroughfare between Derbyshire Lane and Warminster Road, with the top part of Mount View Road having a serious problem with parked cars.

Proposed parking for residents of the new development will be inadequate forcing yet more parking on verges and pavements, certainly for visitors to the site

#### Design and Scale Representations

The houses are large and not in the style of the local area, and are being built very close to some people's boundaries

There should be more bungalows within the proposal, which are in demand in the area.

The surrounding area comprises mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings, with this proposed development completely changing the demographic and character of the area.

The density and number of dwellings seems very high for the size of the site. The development does not comply with the Local Plan in size, scale, character and appearance, it does not respect local context and street pattern or the scale and proportion of surrounding buildings.

30% affordable housing is ok, but the scale is too much, with the local amenities not adequate to be in a position to deal with this development.

There will be pressure on the local primary school which is already full with no space for further extension and there are no doctor's surgeries in the area.

#### Amenity Representations

The density of housing results in severe issues with privacy for those on the boundaries of the field and a loss of a view

The noise and air pollution, and dust and dirt created during construction phases is likely to be extremely detrimental on the health of the owners of neighbouring properties, having to keep windows closed and not using rear gardens.

We (No. 38 Mount View Road) already experience the noise and vibration from excavations on the adjoining site (The old dairy site). This proposal will make it much worse.

We have altered our house (No. 286 Warminster Road) and put patio windows upstairs to overlook a field not 138 dwellings.

We will lose the quiet pleasant aspect to the rear of our property. (No. 6 Warminster Place).

The rear of Plot 51 and the rear of our property (No. 278 Warminster Road) will be approximately 18 metres apart. The roof line of Plot 51 will be approximately 1.4 metres higher than our roof line and we will completely lose the open aspect, light and privacy.

My house (No. 254 Warminster Road) will back onto an area designated for car parking, it is not clear whether there will a suitable fence/wall built to prevent headlights shining into my lounge.

The proposal will impact on the privacy on my (No. 21 Hemsworth Road) back garden and out of my back windows

The proposed new access is bang next door to our house (No. 19 Hemsworth Road) and gives us great concern about the amount of traffic that will run along site our lounge window. At present there is no traffic and the proposal will make a huge difference. A house is proposed 1 metre away from the bottom of our garden.

The two storey houses will impact tremendously on the privacy of the bungalows along Hemsworth Road.

The close proximity of new housing at a higher level will result in significant changes in light levels with no direct sunlight between November and February and rooms in the rear of our house will be overlooked (No. 34 Mount View Road), contrary to Policy H14(c) of the UDP.

The time scale of 3 years building is unacceptable and will impact on all surrounding properties.

Under the Human Rights Act the council have a responsibility in relation to this.

#### Drainage Representations

What will the effects be on neighbouring properties, their cellars and the drainage/sewerage system from the proposed drainage of the site? There are already problems with drainage and flooding particularly in the south-east corner of the field which affects the existing houses at the top end of the site.

The gardens of the properties on Warminster Road are lower than the ground levels on the proposed site, and the slope of the back gardens of Plots 50 and 51 and surrounding plots will cause No 278 and their neighbours gardens to flood during bad weather.

Our house (1 Gordon Avenue) is on the north side of the field and is below the level of the field, with all houses on this side having a cellar, and rainfall will cause ground water flooding.

If drainage is planned to run down the main sewers on Derbyshire Lane, then this will have a knock on effect in Woodseats, Heeley and Abbeydale Road. Hemsworth Road floods already with smells that are not pleasant, and there will be more usage from this proposal.

## Ecology Representations

Since the University abandoned the playing fields, the land has reverted to grassland and is full of wild flowers and grasses, supporting bird's insects and wild animals. The wildlife will be disturbed/lost by this development.

The site is an essential and pre-existing corridor for wildlife.

The ecology report makes no mention of badgers and foxes. Both are prevalent in the vicinity.

The ecology report contains an insufficient assessment of the prevalence of bats, and relies only on a visual inspection of possible roosting sites of the four bungalows. It is also not stated and unclear as to why the old club house and concrete storage building are considered unsuitable for roosting bats. Bird and bat boxes should be included on the plans to increase biodiversity and compensate for habitat loss.

There should be a requirement to check for breeding birds prior to any site clearance/demolition.

## Principle/Use Representations

Prior to the University sealing off the site, it was frequently used by Mundella School, Mount View Church for tournaments as well as informally by the local community. The pitches were of a similar high quality to the adjacent Sheffield University pitches on Warminster Road. The site is virtually flat and level which is a rarity in the area and the city. Building on the whole of the site would deny the local school and wider community any possibility of having the use of high quality sports fields.

The playing field used to be used consistently for a variety of sports until 1999. At that point it became apparent that SHU were being strategic in the field not being used. The local school wanted to use it, as did Birkdale School during the Foot and Mouth outbreak but were told the field could not be hired. At the same time SHU bought houses around the edge presumably with the intention of forming an access road to the site.

There are not enough cricket pitches in the area and Millhouses Cricket Club were very interested in the initial proposal of housing and cricket pitch. This has since been over ridden with a development for just housing.

There are plenty of brownfield sites within Sheffield to build houses on without building on a greenfield site that was only a few years ago considered to be part of a "green lung" into Sheffield City Centre.

The proposed 138 dwellings is a massive increase from the 40 proposed in the Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment etc. Nov 2015 Section (b) Sites Suitable for Housing but with Policy Constraints (iii) Sites Safeguarded as Open Space" and will have a huge detrimental effect on the whole area.

In Jan/Feb 2012 in a feasibility study on a document entitled "Additional Site Allocation Options" produced by Sheffield City Council stated "the field is an underused playing field and is not surplus to requirements, is a value to the area and has the potential to remedy local deficiencies in terms of cricket as well as providing a high quality facility". Why has this changed?

A mix of housing on the site and of open space is necessary to balance the needs of the community. The proposal is not compliant with both local and national policy.

We are not against the land being put back to good use, e.g. leisure, recreation, or natural ponds. This proposal is not a step in the right direction. Once it's gone, you can't get it back.

The land is held in trust for Hallam University, and it should continue to be used for educational purposes.

#### Other Representations

A wider and more lengthy consultation should take place.

There are inaccuracies in the plans not showing the true situation. 34 Mount View Road is substantially lower (2 metres) and close to the boundary (2 metres) than the vague indication on the plans.

The questionnaire that was circulated was flawed, regarding the current/recent usage of the site. (This questionnaire is believed to have been carried out by the developer).

Loss of view of field.

Light pollution will be an issue with any additional lighting unwelcome. There are "significant levels of contaminants" in existing tennis courts which the developer will have to address.

Access to the planning application and the website itself is not straightforward and may have put many people off who might wish to express views. There are a few older residents that will not understand all this and not understand how to use the website.

The proposal will devalue my property

The proposed development should be moved to Lightwood Training Ground, where the catchment area includes more primary schools and is far more flexible in terms of vehicular access.

No site notices have been posted along Warminster Road.

#### Sheffield Wildlife Trust Representation

We note from the ecological report that the ecological value of the site is not currently high and the site is not used, however the site is designated Open

Space and this would change is permission is granted for the 138 houses, with substantial areas of green space lost and trees removed.

Some new trees and shrubs are proposed on the site layout plan but this is lacking detail. A full landscape plan should be submitted and approved from an ecological point of view to ensure that the proposal will enhance biodiversity.

Green roofs should be proposed ideally on the dwellings or at least the substations etc.

#### Sport England Representation

The site has not been used for at least 5 years, and as such Sport England is not a statutory consultee. Notwithstanding this, Sport England has commented on the application.

Sport England objected to the application at first because it is not considered to accord with any of the exceptions to Sport England's Playing Fields Policy or with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.

Sport England have since withdrawn its objection to this application subject to a legal agreement that delivers the financial contribution of £265,000 and that this is ring-fenced for cricket use.

#### PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The main issues to be considered are whether the principle of the development is acceptable (including the loss of the open space), the effect on the character and appearance of the area, the effect on living conditions of future and existing occupiers, the impact on the surrounding highway network, and drainage/flooding issues.

#### Principle of Development

At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, promoting the delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes.

The application site is designated as Open Space Area in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP), with the surrounding area on all boundaries designated as Housing Area which includes the two bungalows proposed to be demolished to create the new access road. On the opposite side of Hemsworth Road is Graves Park, which is also designated as Open Space Area.

Core Strategy Policy CS47 "Safeguarding of Open Space" sets out the criteria to be applied to proposals that seek to build upon open space land. The first part of this policy at sections a-d lists where development will not be permitted on open space, and the second part e-g allows for development that would result in the loss of open space providing a number of criteria are met. Paragraph 74 of the NPPF also requires that existing open space, including

playing fields should not be built on unless a number of criteria are met. These are:

- An assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- The development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.

An assessment of quantitative provision in the local area shows even with the loss of this 4ha site, there would be sufficient provision of both informal and formal open space meeting the requirement of Policy CS47(a) whereby development should not be permitted where there would be a shortage. The minimum standards for open space provision are 2.7ha/1000 people for informal open space, and 1.3ha/1000 people for formal open space.

Following development, there would be 8.97ha/1000 of informal open space, and 1.47ha/1000 of formal open space in the local area.

Part (b) of CS47 sets out that development will not be permitted where it would result in the loss of open space that is of high quality or of heritage, landscape or ecological value. This site is considered to be of high quality for outdoor sports provision, and whilst it has not been maintained for a significant number of years, this is down to a management issue and does not take away the high quality nature including the flat topography. In addition, paragraph 73 of the NPPF notes that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and wellbeing of communities.

The site has not been used since approximately 1998, and has been fenced off from public access. Given the site's inaccessibility for so long, it cannot be argued that people in the local area would be denied easy or safe access to the open space. Furthermore, Graves Park is directly opposite the site entrance providing a vast area of publicly available open space, and therefore there is no conflict with CS47 (c). The loss of the open space would also not impact on the City's Green Network as it is a separate piece of land from other green spaces which is surrounded on all sides by residential development, complying with CS47(d).

The site has been dis-used for nearly 20 years, however it does have the potential to be brought back into use as a high quality cricket pitch, particularly given it is a large flat site which there is a lack of due to the city's topography. The Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan 2013 recommended that in this part of the City there is a requirement for additional pitches and improved facilities with local clubs restricted at their current venues in terms of expansion, and that this site could be developed as dedicated provision within a short term timescale of 1-2 years.

Paragraph 74 of the NPPF states that planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the need for open space, sports and recreational facilities and opportunities for new provision. The recently completed Sheffield City Council Cricket Strategy (2015) has identified a need

for 3 more cricket grounds (29 wickets) in the city to meet current and future need.

As such in order to comply with CS47(e), and paragraph 74 of the NPPF, development should only be permitted whereby an equivalent or better quality replacement open space would be provided in the local area. A pragmatic approach to the policy objections is to agree an equivalent financial contribution to be used to provide or improve cricket pitch provision elsewhere in the city.

There is no set criterion within policy CS47 or the NPPF for calculating a financial contribution and as such Sport England's Facilities Costs guidance (2016) Document has been used. This gives a figure of £265,000 for a Cricket Pitch, with 8 pitch squares and 2 winter sport pitches (area of 20,649m<sup>2</sup>).

The applicant has confirmed that they are agreeable to the provision of a financial contribution of £265,000 to be used to provide or improve cricket pitch provision elsewhere in the city and this is to be secured through a Legal Agreement.

Therefore subject to a Legal Agreement, there is no policy objection to the loss of the open space, meeting the requirements of LR5 of the UDP, Core Strategy Policy CS47, and paragraph 74 of the NPPF.

#### Housing Land Supply and Density

The NPPF paragraph 47 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify a 5-year deliverable supply. Paragraph 49 also states that, planning applications for new housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with relevant policies for the supply of housing not being considered up-to-date if there is not a demonstrable 5-year housing land supply.

The proposal would make a significant contribution towards housing supply as set out in CS22 "Scale for the Requirement for New Housing" of the Core Strategy. Although latest monitoring shows Sheffield has a 5-year supply of housing sites against the Core Strategy target, the target pre-dates the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and should now be considered out of date. The latest Government household growth projections suggest that housing need in the city is higher than was previously planned for in the Core Strategy. As such, the city has a shortfall in the 5-year supply if need is assessed using the latest growth projections.

Policy CS23 "Locations for New Housing" of the Core Strategy seeks to focus at least 90% of new dwellings in the main urban area, and this site is considered sustainably located with the urban area of Sheffield.

The site is designated as Open Space Area, and is considered to be greenfield land. Policy CS24 of the Core Strategy seeks to "Maximise the Use of Previously Developed Land for New Housing". In this instance the development of new homes on this greenfield site will not contribute achieving the objects of CS24, however the Policy does set out circumstances in which housing on greenfield sites will be developed in the period between 2004/05 and 2025/26. CS24 (d) does allow for sustainably located larger sites within or

adjoining the urban areas and if annual monitoring shows that there is less than a 5 year supply of deliverable sites. Taking into account the lack of a 5 year supply, part (d) of the policy is relevant and the proposal is acceptable in principle.

The site area is approximately 4 hectares which gives a density of the proposal of approximately 35 units per hectare. Core Strategy Policy CS26 “Efficient Use of Housing Land and Accessibility” suggests a density range between 30-50 dwellings per hectare for this type of location whereby it is not near to the City Centre or a District Centre so the proposal is in line with this policy guidance.

The proposal is for a mixture of 1,2,3,4 and 5 bedroom dwellings. Core Strategy Policy CS41 “Creating Mixed Communities” requires that mixed communities should be promoted by encouraging development of housing to meet a range of housing needs, and whereby no more than half the new homes in larger developments should consist of a single house type ensuring that large family households are included. This application proposes 1 x 1 bed, 4 x 2 bed, 50 x 3 bed, 39 x 4 bed and 3 x 5 bed units, along with 25 x 2 bed and 16 x 3 bed affordable units which represents a good range, with no single house type over 50% of the ratio. This also follows the advice of paragraph 50 of the NPPF which states that Local Authorities should plan to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

It is considered that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy CS22, CS23, CS26 and CS41 of the Core Strategy.

#### Affordable Housing

Policy CS40 “Affordable Housing” of the Core Strategy requires all new housing developments over 15 dwellings to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing where this is practicable and financially viable. The Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document require in this part of the city a target contribution of 30% affordable housing based on a gross internal floor space.

The development proposes 46 affordable dwellings to be provided on site, spread evenly in different locations, comprising of 1 x 1 bed property, 27 x 2 bed properties, and 18 x 3 bed properties which are located in several small clusters sporadically around the site. The demand for affordable units in the area is for 2 and 3 bedroom units, and this mix is considered appropriate. This gives 41,749 square feet of affordable provision out of an overall gross internal floor area of 140,022 square feet which amounts to 29.8% in total.

This falls very marginally short of the 30% target contribution, however providing an additional unit would take the figure over the 30% target, and it is so close that it is considered the target has been met, and the level of provision is welcomed.

The provision, retention, and operation of the affordable housing on the site will be controlled through the submission of a legal agreement which is currently being prepared.

## Design

Policy BE5 of the UDP “Building Design and Siting” states that good design and the use of high quality materials will be expected in all new buildings.

Policy CS74 “Design Principles” of the Core Strategy expects high quality development which respects, takes advantage of and enhances the distinctive features of the city, its districts and neighbourhoods. Development should contribute to place-making that contributes to a healthy, safe and sustainable environment that promotes the city’s transformation. Development should help to transform the character of physical environments that have become run down and contribute towards creating attractive, sustainable and successful neighbourhoods.

This is reinforced through paragraphs 56-65 of the NPPF. Paragraph 56 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 65 requires that planning permission should not be refused ‘for buildings that promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape if those concerns have been mitigated by good design’, and at paragraph 60 that planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes.

At present the site is landlocked so that there is no vehicular access from the surrounding highway network. A new access is proposed to open up the existing site to vehicular traffic from Hemsworth Road by demolishing two existing bungalows No. 15 and No. 17 Hemsworth Road. These bungalows have little architectural merit and their loss will not impact negatively on the character of this part of the street scene. This allows sufficient space to create the only vehicle access to the site, which will be heavily landscaped with a solid brick wall running along the boundaries with neighbouring dwellings at No.13 and No.19 Hemsworth Road.

The proposed layout is based on a main circular route running around the edge of the site, with 4 smaller streets running from this to a feature central square. This provides a logical and legible street pattern, creating a clear hierarchy of routes. There is a strong and positive frontage onto all streets, open space areas and the central area. There are a number of smaller mews courts proposed on the site where parking is grouped together to the rear in two of these, but these remain well overlooked.

The sense of place and character of the neighbourhood has been improved through amended plans to ensure these axial views are terminated by a building, with the relocation of Plots 9, 17 and 47. The number of unbroken rows of frontage car parking areas have been reduced to Plots 11-15, 81-86, 54-61, 106-109, and 116-118, with additional landscaped areas enhancing the street scene. The removal and relocation of the car parking to the central square ensures that this will not be car dominated.

The layout is based on 3 character areas. Character area 1 surrounds the main central square area, with character area 2 and 3 being sporadically

spaced around the site in cluster groups. The approach to the character areas is unlikely to read as a truly distinctive piece of townscape, coupled together with a mixture of 20 different house types, however, the scale of the proposed dwellings, and their relationship to one another is considered appropriate for this location.

Furthermore, this development is very much an enclave buried within a large suburban block, and will to a large degree establish its own character, having no residential frontage onto the surrounding street scenes. There are a number of features that contribute to the establishment of good quality street scenes and a positive addition to the local neighbourhood. Conditions should be added to any approval for full details of all materials to ensure a high quality is achieved.

Boundary treatments are critical in helping to define streets, establishing a clear hierarchy and creating a sense of place. Amended plans show an updated boundary treatment plan which demonstrates a logical and cohesive approach to the development. Masonry walls, rather than timber fencing now flank the vehicular entrance and a stronger sense of arrival has been established.

The highways are to be a mixture of tarmac as you enter the site, with contrasting material and colour of block pavers further into the site.

Policy BE12 "Public Art" of the UDP requires that public art should be provided as part of the development and integrated into the landscaping and treatment of the public spaces. This can be the subject of a condition.

Therefore the proposal accords with policies BE5 and BE12 of the UDP, CS74 of the Core Strategy, and the NPPF.

### Sustainability

The core principle of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which is mirrored in Core Strategy Policies CS63, CS64 and CS65. Core Strategy Policy CS63 "Responses to Climate Change" seeks to reduce the city's impact on climate change. Policy CS64 "Climate Change, Resources and Sustainable Design of Developments" requires that development should achieve a high standard of energy efficiency, make the best use of solar energy, passive heating and cooling, natural light and ventilation and minimise the impact on existing renewable energy installations.

Policy CS65 "Renewable Energy and Carbon Reduction" of the Core Strategy requires that all significant development will be required to provide a minimum of 10% of their predicted energy needs from decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy.

A fabric first approach to construction is proposed with a number of dwellings also fitted within photovoltaic panels to the roof providing solar energy. The proposed dwellings will all have energy efficient condensing boilers, with

water saving features on toilets and showers. High levels of insulation and maximum levels of passive solar gain are proposed.

The proposal is in a sustainable location within the main urban area with an overall package of measures proposed by the applicant that will result in an energy efficient building which will provide 10% of a developments predicted energy needs. The details of which can be controlled through a condition.

Therefore the proposal is considered to comply with Policies CS63, CS64 and CS65 of the Core Strategy.

### Living Conditions

Policy H15 “Design of New Housing Developments” of the UDP requires that new housing will be expected to provide adequate private gardens and to ensure that basic standards of daylight, privacy, security and outlook are met for all residents, provide uniform boundary treatments around rear gardens next to roads, footpaths and other open spaces.

UDP Policy LR5”Development in Open Space Areas” states that development will not be permitted where it would result in over-development or harm the character of an area, or would be incompatible with surrounding land uses.

Within the core planning principles at paragraph 17 of the NPPF, planning should seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

### Existing residents

The closest neighbouring properties are those which bound the site on all four sides, along Hemsworth Road and Warminster Place to the south, Warminster Road to the east, Derbyshire Lane to the west, and Mount View Road and Gordon Avenue to the north.

The guidelines found in the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (SPG) are not strictly applicable in this instance owing to them relating to house extensions. However they do suggest a number of detailed guidelines relating to overbearing and overshadowing, privacy and overlooking, and appropriate garden sizes. These guidelines include that two storey dwellings which face directly towards each other should be a minimum of 21 metres and that rear garden lengths should be at least 10 metres to ensure that privacy is retained. Two storey buildings should not be placed closer than 12 metres from a ground floor main habitable window to prevent adverse overshadowing and overbearing.

The bungalows along Derbyshire Lane are between 22-33 metres away from the rear elevations of plots 7-21, with Plot 23 having its side elevation with no habitable windows 22 metres away from rear of No. 297/299 Derbyshire Lane, which meets the recommended guidelines.

The proposal maintains a distance of over 25 metres to the bungalows along Hemsworth Road, with the exception of plots 2 and 73 which have side

elevations with no habitable windows which are positioned in excess of the 12 metres required to prevent adverse overshadowing.

Houses along Mount View Road have long rear gardens, far exceeding minimum distances and as such the proposed development will not impact on the amenities of occupiers of these properties. There are 3 buildings which do sit close to this northern boundary of the site, No 34 Mount View Road, and No's 1 and 2 Gordon Avenue. Plots 26 and 27 have been amended to address concerns from the resident at No. 1 to now provide an open vista through (above the proposed garages), and also maintaining a distance of 22 metres between facing windows. No. 34 Mount View Road is set on a lower level than plots 28-29, with amended plans moving these properties away from No 34, maintaining a distance of 25 metres between two storey rear elevations meeting the requirements for overlooking and overbearing.

No. 2 Gordon Avenue has its side elevation facing the application site, with plot 24 having no habitable windows in the side and being positioned as to not extend significantly past the front and rear elevations of No. 2 Gordon Avenue.

Properties along Warminster Road are positioned over 21 metres away from plots 39-56 with 10 metre rear boundaries proposed for each of these plots. The corner of the building at Plot 57 is positioned approximately 18 metres away from the rear of No's 286 and 288 Warminster Road but is splayed at an angle with a rear garden length of between 8 and 12 metres to the boundary. The rear window is centrally located at first floor level and owing to the splayed positioning of plot 57, this distance follows the guidelines which allow this distance to reduce where properties are at an angle. Plot 58 is also close to the boundary with a minimum distance of 6 metres between the corner of the building and rear boundary. The property is splayed at 45 degrees with the boundary and is positioned more than the recommended guideline away from No.6 and No. 8 Warminster Place to prevent adverse overbearing or overshadowing. Windows in the rear of plot 58 will not face directly towards the windows in the rear of No's 6 and 8 owing to the angle, and as such will not create adverse levels of overlooking.

The Old Dairy has consent for the erection of 14 dwellings on the site. Plots 63-67 are positioned 10 metres away from the rear boundary. On the Old Dairy site it is proposed to have two houses close to the site boundary of this application with blank side elevations facing towards the rear of Plots 63-67. Therefore no adverse impact will be created to future occupiers of The Old Dairy site.

With the site being vacant for nearly 20 years and its previous use as a cricket pitch, a development proposing housing will inevitably impact on occupiers of all neighbouring properties. However, the development is based around a layout which ensures that adequate separation distances are proposed between existing and proposed properties that prevents an adverse level of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing being created.

Issues relating to the length of time for construction, and the disturbance and nuisance created are an inevitable consequence of any development, and can

be controlled through separate Environmental Health Legislation. Once complete, a new residential development located adjacent to an existing residential development is a compatible use with one another, and this is not a reason to refuse planning permission.

### Future Occupiers

The future occupiers of the application dwellings, are all afforded a good quality outlook from habitable windows, which are not overshadowed by adjoining neighbours with at least 12 metres between main facing windows and two storey blank gable elevations. There is one exception to this which is plot 130 which has main habitable windows in the rear facing a two storey garage block which is positioned only 7 metres away. The garage is located north of the plot 130, and will not overshadow occupiers of the plot, but could have an overbearing impact. However, whilst this is a shortfall against the guidance, it is only one shortfall across a development of 138 dwellings and this is not considered sufficient to render the whole development unacceptable

There is a distance of at least 21 metres between two storey main facing windows at the rear, with this distance being relaxed where windows are positioned overlooking the public highway, whereby you would not expect the same level of privacy.

Proposed new gardens vary in size, but in most circumstances have at least 50 square metres of private garden space with 10 metres to the rear boundaries.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the amenities of existing occupiers, or on occupiers of the proposed new properties to a degree which would warrant refusal of the application. Accordingly, the proposal complies with UDP Policy H15 and LR5, and the core principles of the NPPF at paragraph 17.

### Highways

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF seeks to focus development in sustainable locations and make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, focussing significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. Paragraph 32 requires that safe and suitable access to a site is achieved for all people, and that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of developments are severe.

Policy CS53" Management of Demand for Travel" of the Core Strategy states that good quality public transport and pedestrian routes will be promoted, the best use of existing road capacity will be made and maximum car parking standards will be applied to manage the provision of private parking spaces.

Vehicular access to the site is gained from a new access to be taken from Hemsworth Road through the demolition of No's 15 and 17 Hemsworth Road. This allows for a 6 metre access road into the site with segregated pedestrian route on either side. A further pedestrian route is also proposed in the

northwest corner, leading onto Derbyshire Lane between the Mount Pleasant Inn and 295 Derbyshire Lane.

The findings of the Traffic Assessment show that the existing highway network is operating within maximum theoretical capacity with moderate levels of queuing. Potential traffic generation has been calculated using the TRICS database, and shows that the development is likely to generate a total of 147 and 135 person trips in the morning and evening peak periods respectively. In order to determine the number of vehicular trips reference has been made to the 2011 census which indicates a modal split of 73.7% of residents travelling by vehicle this equates to 109 vehicles in the AM peak and 99 vehicles in the PM peak.

Highway capacity assessments were undertaken at the following junction:

- Hemsworth Rd / Warminster Rd
- Hemsworth Rd/ Norton Lane / Blackstock Rd
- Norton Avenue / Bochum Parkway / Lightwood Lane
- Derbyshire Lane / Norton Lees Lane.

The assessments indicate that all the junctions will operate within their theoretical capacity for the assessment year of 2022 for the base situation (i.e. no development). With the development proposals there is some reduction in capacity, however not to a degree which would require mitigation or justify refusal of the application. It is therefore concluded that the development proposals would not have a material impact on the capacity of the surrounding highway network.

In accordance with the document Manual for Streets, on a 30mph road the requirement is for sight lines of 2.4 metres x 43 metres. This proposal is located adequate distance away from the junction/corner of Derbyshire Lane and Hemsworth Road, and provides visibility splays close to 2.4 metres x 70 metres.

With regard to other sites nearby, the University site along Warminster Road was not a consented scheme at the time this application was submitted and has only very recently been granted. It is unreasonable to ask for an updated Transport Assessment, especially whereby peak traffic movements generated by the University scheme do not coincide with the peak hours for this type of housing development. The scheme at Matthews Lane is an existing factor with traffic generated already travelling through the area.

Once within the site, the highway layout has been designed so there is a primary route around the perimeter of the site, with four smaller roads meeting in a central area. There are a number of different surfaces, build outs and ramps to help slow traffic when traveling through the site. The footpath has been amended to include the area in front of plots 3-19, and the car parking spaces originally proposed to the central area have been removed and relocated.

In some areas (plots 81-86) manoeuvring in to and out of parking spaces is particularly tight owing to the narrow highway width, and parking spaces have

been removed and replaced with low level landscaping to allow for more width when turning.

Car parking provision is based on 1 space for the two bedroom units, and 2 to 3 spaces for the 3, 4 and 5 bed units. This level of parking provision is considered acceptable in this location, and parking spaces meet the recommended 5 metres x 2.5 metres with garage having internal dimension of 6 metres x 3 metres.

The site is located within a sustainable location. There are a number of bus stops within walking distance of the site, albeit there has been a reduction recently in the frequency of the services, and there are limited amenities in close proximity of the site including a small food store.

To conclude, the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network is not so severe as to justify the refusal of this application, and the surrounding highway network can cope with the extra vehicular movements generated. The proposal complies with Policy CS53 of the Core Strategy and Paragraphs 17 and 32 of the NPPF.

#### Air Quality

The application itself has not been accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment as it does not meet the criteria for such a statement to be required owing to it not being within 200 metres of an area exceeding Air Quality Limitation Values.

It is also noted that, there are many options for dispersal from the site before meeting the closest air quality hot spots which are on the main traffic corridor along Woodseats which are in excess over 500 metres from the site. It would be considered highly unlikely that air quality around the application site would be in breach of any of the relevant air quality objectives.

#### Landscaping

Policy BE6 "Landscape Design" of the UDP requires that good quality landscape design will be expected in new developments.

Policy GE15 "Trees and Woodlands" within the UDP requires that trees and woodland will be encouraged and protected. This will be carried out by requiring developers to retain mature trees, copses and hedgerows wherever possible and replace any trees which are lost.

The site has not been used/ managed since 1998 and as such consists of a large open field. There are a number of trees which are located along the boundaries which mainly appear to be outside of the site boundary within the curtilages of the adjoining residential properties. 5 trees are to be removed, along with a group of self-set trees in the northeast corner of the site.

Landscape plans show that there will be trees and soft boundaries incorporated within the scheme along the road frontages, with several small pockets of soft landscaped open space, the finer details of which can be

controlled through a relevant condition if the application is recommended for approval.

The proposal therefore meets the requirements of Policy BE6 and GE15 of the UDP.

### Ecology

Policy GE11 "Nature Conservation and Development" of the UDP requires that the design, siting and landscaping of development should respect and promote nature conservation and include measures to reduce any potentially harmful effects of development on natural features of value.

An ecological survey has been produced and classifies the site as having low nature conservation value being primarily rank grasses and some scrub (mainly bramble). The site does not support protected species other than nesting birds. Under the Wildlife and Country Act 1981, it is an offence to remove damage or destroy the nest of any bird while the nest is in use or being built. A condition should be attached to any planning approval to this affect.

The majority of the site is to be built on, for housing, gardens, and highways with some small pockets of landscaping. The loss of the open space will inevitably result in the loss of the existing habitat and biodiversity, however this is not a reason to refuse permission. Furthermore there is the potential to design into the landscape scheme biodiversity, and this can be controlled through a condition.

### Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy CS67 "Flood Risk Management" of the Core Strategy requires all developments significantly limit surface water run-off, requiring the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) or sustainable drainage techniques where feasible and practicable.

There are two open watercourses in the vicinity which may accept surface water runoff, Graves Park Brook which is located within Graves Park, and a drain which outfalls to Meers Brook which is located within the Sheffield University site at Norton Playing Fields.

The application site does not fall within the catchment of the Graves Park Brook, and the Sheffield University site is separated from the application by third party land.

Following site investigation, infiltration is not a viable option on the site owing to the presence of strong impermeable clay and bedrock at a shallow depth which has been confirmed from testing.

The eastern part of the site will not drain by gravity to the public sewer and pumping is required for foul water via a pumping station to be located adjacent to plots 57-58. Full details of the discharge of surface water from the application site are to be conditioned. Accordingly the proposal meets the requirements of Policy CS67.

## Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

CIL applies to the creation of all new floor space, and places a levy on new developments. The money raised will be put towards essential infrastructure needed across the city as a result of new development which could provide transport movements, school places, open space etc. The site is located within 'Zone 4' so would be subject to a charge of £50/square metres.

## Education

The creation of new homes will in most cases result in an increase in the number of school age pupils in the area, and therefore create a need for additional school places. Since the implementation of the CIL, contributions towards providing additional school accommodation, either through an extension or the commissioning of a new school will normally be funded through CIL.

## Responses to representations

The majority of issues raised through representations are discussed in the above report. Those which are not are addressed in the section below.

The level of consultation carried out meets the criteria set within the Statement of Community Involvement, and included the posting of 7 site notices on the adjacent streets.

A topographical survey accompanies the application showing the spot levels of the eaves and ridges of neighbouring properties (including 34 Mount View Road) along with land levels of the existing site. These do show that there is a level difference between the houses located immediately to the north of the site and the application site, and from a site visit, it is apparent that there is a single storey extension on the rear of 34 Mount View Road. These factors have been taken into consideration in the assessment.

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of 2 existing bungalows on Hemsforth Road to create a vehicular access into the former cricket ground allowing the development of the site for 138 new dwellings.

The site has not been used as a cricket pitch since 1998, and the applicant has confirmed that they are agreeable to the provision of a financial contribution of £265,000 to be used to provide or improve cricket pitch provision elsewhere in the city meeting the requirements of Open Space Area policies.

The site is located within a sustainable location and significant weight should be attributed to the provision of 138 new dwellings where a 5 year supply cannot be demonstrated.

The design and layout of the proposed development is considered acceptable, and it is not considered to impact severely on the surrounding highway network.

With regard to the living conditions, the proposal is designed to that it will not have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of existing residents and provides a good level of amenity afforded to future occupiers of the site.

The proposal represents an appropriate density, with a good mix of housing types, and a total of 46 affordable units provided on site equating to 29.8% of the floor space, within 0.2% of the Council's target level of provision.

The proposal is considered to comply with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant Core Strategy and adopted Unitary Development Policies as discussed in the sections above.

It is recommended that members grant planning permission subject to the conditions and the signing of a legal agreement to secure and retain on-site affordable housing, and a financial contribution to secure the provision of cricket facilities elsewhere within the city.

#### HEADS OF TERMS for legal agreement

1. The owner shall pay the sum of £265,000 to the Council before development is commenced which shall be used to provide a replacement cricket facility within the city.
2. The owner shall enter into arrangements to secure the provision, operation and retention of affordable housing on the site in the form of the 46 units identified on the approved site layout drawing.