

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.403.001

What is your Name: Tom Rusby

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:

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green

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

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Not completed by respondent

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:

I have provided the below representations to Sheffield Councils Regulation 19 consultation, in order to explain areas of the Local Plan we feel are not 'Sound' and also promote the inclusion of a site we feel has tremendous potential in Grenoside, Sheffield.

One of the most significant changes that has been made by Sheffield Council between the Regulation 18 and the Regulation 19 stages of the Local Plan preparation, is the significant reduction in housing targets and site allocations for the district over the plan period. The Council initially targeted 40,000 homes over the 15 years, which was rejected by Central Government, who required a target of 53,500

homes to be delivered inline with demand and population increase. The Council is now targeting 35,700, which is a decision driven by political gain rather than doing what is required to help tackle the housing crisis. We therefore passionately believe this makes the plan 'unsound' for examination and therefore ask the Council or NPPF to rethink their proposals immediately.

We agree Sheffield City centre should be significantly developed to meet the growing housing needs and employment requirements for the City. However, in addition to the above, we believe the Plan doesn't deliver enough homes in the fringes of Sheffield and more should be done in these areas. This is to ensure housing demand from a variety of backgrounds, demographics, ages and cultures can get good quality housing, as not everyone will want to live in the City centre.

An example sub-area of the City which should be targeting significantly more housing targets is Chapeltown/ High Green. We agree with the statement on Page 88 of the Plan, Policy SA9 which states 'Chapeltown/ High Green is a popular place to live' and that it is 'well connected with access to the M1 Motorway to the East and there is a railway station at Chapeltown providing easy access to the City Centre of Sheffield'. Given the above, why does the Plan only look to deliver 25 new homes by 2039? The area was also noted in the various SHELAA and HELAA assessments to be a key employment contributor & business growth area in the City, which would add to the demand for new housing. Again, we believe this makes the plan 'unsound' for examination and ask the Council to increase the targets and site allocation numbers for the various sub-areas of the City. If the appropriate number of brownfield sites cannot be provided, then less sensitive green belt sites should be brought forward by realigning the green belt boundary in these areas.

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:

New Site Allocation (Title number SYK 57760)

We believe a site in Grenoside, Sheffield (S35 8QJ) has tremendous potential for a residential or senior living development.

The 6-acre site is located in green belt, but is not considered a sensitive green belt site, with built property on three sides and large housing developments to the North. It has capacity for up to 80 dwellings (35 units per hectare), with generous amenity and public open space provided. We also propose to enhance the Whitley Lane road, to make it safer for road and pedestrian users.

Central Sheffield is situated approximately 6 miles to the south of the Property. This is a direct route by car or bus on Penistone road. Direct train services to Sheffield from Chapeltown Train Station. It is well located for connectivity to the wider area, M1 junction 35/36 is 3 miles away.

The site contains no listed properties or TPO's.

The development of this land has the potential to deliver significant benefits to the town of Grenoside, as well as significantly contributing to Sheffield's and Grenoside's housing requirements, particularly within the early stages of the emerging Local Plan. The site is well located for new residential development as it is in a sustainable location within close proximity to Penistone road and Chapeltown railway station.

There are also opportunities to improve pedestrian/cycle and road links around the site and to improve local bus routes. These potential improvements will be of benefit

to existing residents of Grensode, for example, by increasing the safety of cyclists, pedestrians and cars around this area, as well as to new residents of the development.

If the appropriate number of brownfield sites cannot be provided, then less sensitive green belt sites should be brought forward by realigning the green belt boundary in these areas.

Conclusion

- Fully in one ownership & title (Nr SYK 57760)
- Desirable & attractive location on the edge of Sheffield
- Good transport links, with 2 bus stops next to the site, 15 mins drive to/from Sheffield City Centre and 5 mins to/from the M1 by car.
- Bordered by 2 highways with direct connection to the site, therefore no right of access issues and minimising infrastructure works.
- It is not an 'oasis' within the green belt. It is surrounded by built property on three sides and close to a large housing development to the North.
- It is not an 'amenity' as it is neither overlooked nor has any public access by way of foot or bridle paths.
- The land is not 'worked' for agricultural purposes.
- It would provide additional residential stock close to the areas of Chapeltown & Ecclesfield, identified by the Council as one of the main business growth areas of the city.
- Off-road pedestrian/ cycle/ road improvements
- Range of amenities and open public spaces

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

Yes, I 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:

Happy to attend in person sessions if required.