Bailey , Georgia

From: Green , Donna Councillor
Sent: 22 June 2016 16:11
To: DevelopmentControl & DevelopmentManagement
Subject: FW: Planning Application 2016/0623 re 132 Park Grove Barnsley S70 1QG (FAO Rachel RODDIS-Case Officer)

Categories: Printed by Rachael

Please confirm objection sent to correct place

Best regards
Cllr Donna Green

Kingstone Ward / Chair Central Area Council

[redacted]

From: ANDRE SMYK
Sent: 21/06/2016 13:45
To: DevelopmentControl & DevelopmentManagement
Cc: BSCP; Green , Donna Councillor; cllrkevinwilliam@barnsley.gov.uk
Subject: Planning Application 2016/0623 re 132 Park Grove Barnsley S70 1QG (FAO Rachel RODDIS-Case Officer)

I am writing to formally object to the planning application above-proposed cellar conversion to form 2 bedroom self contained flat.My comments are as follows:

1.The application is effectively for change of use of the existing dwelling.The change of use arises by virtue of the proposed subdivision via creation of a basement flat.The physical works for which planning permission is also required are construction of a stair and light well to the front of the property.

2.Ground floor and above will be used as a 5 bed house in Multiple Occupation (HMO).Where such use is under 6 bedrooms permitted development rights apply meaning no planning permission is required for this element,albeit a separate licence regime exists.The basement flat will be 2 bed.

3.I believe there have been objections from other residents in the area to this proposal.

4.I believe the Highway authority have not objected as they consider that there will be no unacceptable impact such as harm from increase in on street parking ,highway safety,etc.I will comment on this later.

5.I understand you may be looking to approve this application under delegated powers on or after 23 June 2016.I know that local ward councillors have the power to call the application in for determination at the Planning Regulatory Board.I have previously spoken with Councillor Kevin Williams about this development and a similar one (by the same applicant) at nearby 118 Park Grove Barnsley (ref 2016/0416) which had similar proposals-and that application has been refused.I will be asking again that this application (ref 2016/0623) also be determined at the Planning Regulatory board this time.

6.Again,with this application there has been very limited distribution/neighbourhood notification by BMBC planning department of this application.In this case letters were only sent out to 5 properties nearby.This was the same with application 2016/0416 where only 6 properties nearby where notified.I feel this is inadequate distribution of planning notices to local people and not proper public consultation.Houses more or less opposite these proposed developments are not being notified by BMBC planning department.I do not feel this is proper public notification and consultation.This proposal needs to be properly debated by councillors.

7.There will be an erosion of the character of the area in Park grove which is in the main family housing ie.single family dwellings.The same applicant also made an application for the same changes to 118 Park Grove (refused) and there is already multiple occupation at 130 Park Grove and 52 Park Grove was granted HMO status last year.In the case of this application we will be looking at 3 no. HMO dwellings within a short space of Park Grove and the impact of that.

8.There will be an effect on residential amenity by virtue of an increase in noise and disturbance in the area.There may be an increase in crime also.The 5 bed HMO in this property and 2 bed basement flat being proposed could in theory generate 14 residents which would be significantly more than the occupants of a single family dwelling house.

9.There will be a resulting increase in on street car parking.In this application there is no provision for off street parking being made.Coupled with an HMO in the same dwelling it is possible that a theoretical 14 residents could own a car/have access to one/visitors with cars leading to further on street parking issues both in Park Grove and Charles Street.There is already a very real problem with parking on Park Grove and Charles Street (and all side roads nearby) and such proposed developments can only make things worse.

Park Grove is not on a bus route.It used to be on a Kingstone circular bus route many years ago but was taken off the route may years ago due to PSVs being unable to negotiate Park Grove owing to parked cars then!.The fact that Barnsley rail station is within walking distance is immaterial if the occupants of 132 Park Grove have cars and want to park them in that area on street!.Some years ago BMBC wanted to/proposed a residents parking scheme in Park Grove and surrounding areas but this was not implemented.At that time on street parking issues where nothing like they are now.Many residents are 2 car families,some have 3 or more vehicles and this has become a problem.Couple this with some who are bringing home works vans to park and the Doctors Surgery adjacent 122 Park Grove which has visitors and staff parking on Park Grove during the day and you get the picture.If it was not for people having to continental park on the footpaths traffic would not get through Park Grove-in particular fire appliances or refuse collection vehicles or the like.

It is so bad that particularly in the evenings cars are parked right on road junctions in Park Grove and all side roads in all sorts of manners just to get in somewhere to park.The result is traffic hazards galore.Traffic hazards turning in or out of road junctions and poor lines of sight for emerging from junctions.At one time this was policed but no longer is.

10.Although the HMO element does not require planning it is the cumulative impact of the proposed basement flat with HMO that results in a problem particularly when there are already 2 HMOs on the street (52 and 130) and a further one proposed at 118 Park Grove.

11.This proposal for 132 Park Grove will cause further problems with waste storage and collection.A large number of wheeled bins will have to be supplied and I can expect many issues with these being put out and taken back in from this development/HMO and others proposed in the same area.

12.Title Deeds may not have been checked which state that the buildings concerned may not be converted to multiple occupancy or used for a business use. HMOs are a business.

13.It has been stated by the developers' agent that designs of this type (creation of stair and light well beneath centre bay window to create basement flat) are commonplace in this area.I disagree with this statement.I have only seen one such property which is on Park Road.I think the conversion of these family homes in this manner alters the overall appearence of the building to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area.

14.In relation to the developers agents' own amended design and access statement relating to Housing Policy under Barnsley UDP and Supplementary Planning Document -relating to flats or houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) being allowed where certain criteria are satisfied the author has shot himself in the foot:

There WILL be unacceptable noise nuisance for existing neighbourhood residents in Park Grove from either developments at 132 Park Grove (2016/023) and 118 Park Grove (2016/0416).
There WILL NOT be satisfactory provision for off strett car parking AND the development is HIGHLY LIKELY to give rise to unacceptable congestion and safety issues in Park Grove and adjoining highways by reason of inadequate off street parking.

For ALL the reasons stated above I believe that planning application 2016/0623 be refused and the creation of HMO above be also blocked from occurring along with similar proposals for 118 Park Grove (2016/0416) and at least referred to the planning regulatory board and further and widespread consultation with affected residents in the Park Grove,Charles Street and Mount Street adjacent areas.

Yours sincerely

Mr.A.Smyk-119 Park Grove,Barnsley S70 1QE.