

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.233.001

What is your Name: gillwhit5121

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

N/A

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

N/A

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Annex A: Site Allocations

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

SES03

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: No

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

There are many reasons why this Plan is unsound, which mainly are covered by the following headings - Infrastructure, air pollution, loss of natural habitat & effect on wildlife, potential catastrophic dangers for services (gas, electricity, water & sewage) & life.

The proposed development has been used for arable farming for many years. However due to the proximity of a major gas bore pipe the farmer has only been allowed to plough the land to a maximum depth of 18 inches. The infrastructure in this area already has already been stretched due to the growing retail sites of Crystal Peak & Drakehouse retail parks, which most recently include the new industrial units for Tesla, Amazon & UPS distribution. When combined with noticeably

increased traffic to Weatherspoons Scarsdale 100, Papas Fish & Chip restaurant & before the ever growing area reaches maximum capacity with further development about to start on completion of the newly built Burger King. Eckington Way is a single carriageway in each direction with the only proposed site entrance being off an-already congested road, leading to both existing retail parks. In addition to air pollution the site will be unable to offer safety to the travellers, their children & animals. This will also increase pressure & resources which are already working on a stretched capacity. Funding for schools, health services are also at full capacity.

Surely Sheffield City Council have learned to their cost lessons from the water ingress into gas pipe/supply at Hillsborough/Malin Bridge only a few months ago? It seems a catastrophe waiting to happen to increase gas, electricity, water supplies to this area, where I believe access is required at all times & all areas by The National Grid, gas & water services. Surely the fact that there are major electricity pylons traversing the proposed area must be a major concern for safety of the existing population & proposed new?

The land of the proposed site is on a gradient which would need extensive reconstruction to make it remotely suitable. Surely given the costs involved would outweigh any advantages where there are other sites which have greater advantages already in place. Disturbing the exiting land would have major implications & mean a loss of natural habitat of the hedgerows & inhabitants. There is a bridle way which runs in between the proposed site and the next field, which is well used by the local community & visitors wishing to enjoy the wildlife. Only recently we have seen returning heron to this area after being absent for many years. My understanding is that there are several Travellers/Showpeople sites already available in the locality which have not found favour with their Guild - be that for whatever reason. Has the Council spoken to the Guild for their views/preferences I wonder as this could end up being another unused site? Furthermore I understand there were many other sites originally suggested which have been discounted at an early stage. How have the Council reached their decision to exclude these sites at such an early stage & yet seem to have given favour to this particular one? There is already an established Travellers site within a mile of the proposal. On what basis does the Council believe this will be advantageous to have a second site so close putting even more pressure on stretched resourcing & funding.

I also fear any emergency services vehicles would be unable to reach their intended destination in a timely manner which at best would cause major traffic disruption with little or no alternative routes given Eckington Way is a single carriage roadway & is unable to cope with current traffic levels at most times of the day already, Whilst not uncommon to the Sheffield area the well established housing development (Springwell Estate) majority are mainly still Leasehold properties. Therefore any alterations to properties require the approval and agreement of the Leaseholder - generally at a cost to the Leasee. How does the Council intend to police this element to ensure the Travellers/Showpeople respect their agreements? Additionally if they fall foul of the requirements who will ensure their alterations are dealt within a fair & universal manner? - ie the situation recently highlighted in Shiregreen Cemetry, where a shrine has been built around (& beyond) a travellers grave, where the Council have not been asked for their permission & the said shrine has been deemed as unlawful. Who ensures the Council's rulings are carried out?

Given these proposals (should they be agreed & carried) would mean the close proximity to an established residential area would be a first on ground breaking with tradition what arrangements does the Council have in place to protect any errors of their judgement & how this would impact these residents?

In essence I feel the area of South East Sheffield has already seen more of its fair share of development with little or no increase in budget or funding to support any further developments. There are I'm sure other areas of Sheffield who have more capacity to fund & resource any further developments, & are more in keeping with the Travellers/Showpeople needs & requirements which would prove a more efficient & cost effective use of the taxpayers money.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Not completed by respondent

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A