

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.234.001

What is your Name: ██████████

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: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

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:

The development of this plan will have an adverse affect on the local community for many reasons:-

* Noise/disturbance - the industrial units will be far too close to existing properties and would increase the noise levels resulting from use of the buildings. It would result in a loss of natural light and lack of privacy. Many of these home have solar panels (provided with Council grants) so it could affect these as the land is much higher than the existing housing.

* Out of hours access - The Travelling Showpeople may need access late at night after closing down a fair etc. This would be a nuisance in terms of noise levels for the local housing.

* Traffic - the road is already severely congested and as such could not cope with the additional pressure that would come with this proposal. This includes smell of exhaust fumes, inadequate access and turning onto the site and general highway safety. It is the main road to the Mosborough Township which has junior and secondary schools in the locality. Additional traffic will add to the issues we already see.

* Over-development - this is an area that has already been subjected to mass development within half a mile of this - Aldi, Argos, Tesla to name a few. The land is greenfield and used by the community for walking and agriculture.

* Proximity to other industry - there is a council waste site nearby which already has a negative impact on air quality. This would add to this existing problem.

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:

* Traffic - There is already a need to deal with the congestion on Eckington Road. A full survey of this needs to be undertaken before considering adding any future developments nearby. The plan only shows one access point (from this road). This is not sufficient or safe. Any additional access to this site would be in the middle of the housing estate so makes the overall plan unviable.

* Industrial Units - there are several empty units within a 2 mile radius. A review needs to be undertaken to check the suitability of these before building more.

* Travelling Showpeople - The supporting documents clearly show that the community has not had much input into these plans. This needs to be completed before approving a location for them.

* Location - Several sites were considered for this. A review needs to be taken to reconsider the outcome and find a more suitable location.

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

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SheffieldPlan](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Site SES03
Date: 24 January 2023 09:38:00
Attachments: [Objection to site SES03 GB.docx](#)

Hi Scott

We met last week at the Lifestyle Centre and you gave me your email address so that I could send me comments regarding the planned site in Beighton.

I have completed the online representation form but felt that a lot more needs to be said.

I have attached my detailed response to the matter and would appreciate if you could share it as discussed. I have copied in the generic email address from the website too.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

Objection to site SES03

Firstly, I am not qualified to say whether or not I think the plan is legal or complies with the duty to operate, but I have several comments I would like to be included when this proposal progresses. I also have concerns regarding the publicity of comments. This is a very sensitive subject and I would not want my name linked to any potential issues from the site but would like to ensure my views are registered please.

- Here are my overall comments for this proposal
 - Are there any more details regarding the type and size of Industrial Units planned? There is a huge emphasis on the Travelling People part of the plan but this is only 1.5 of the 5.35 hectares. We need to know the type of industry planned on this area.
 - Why has the impact of the Local Geological Site not been undertaken as part of these proposals and when will this be done?
 - The high pressure gas pipe is a known issue. What measures are in place to ensure that, should development go ahead, the infrastructure remains intact and accessible at all times?
 - Why choose a site that is greenfield/agricultural land? Has a Previously Developed Land site been considered as an alternative and why were they discounted?
 - This is close to an existing council household waste site and will therefore have an impact on the already poor air quality and too close to existing housing.
 - There are already several unused industrial units within this area so these should be used first if there is a need to increase employment in the area. Has a review of unused units been done in the same locality?
 - The report states under “suitability for employment” as “N” saying it is not recommended for employment purposes. Please explain.

- Traffic Issues
 - This road is already severely congested, and this has worsened in the past 2 years since the addition of Aldi, Wetherspoons and other retail and industrial units. Before anything else is considered in this area, the existing infrastructure should be reviewed as it is already not fit for purpose.
 - This is one of the main roads to the local high school as well as several infant/junior schools and at peak times the roads cannot cope with the volume.
 - Increased traffic also includes increased exhaust fumes.
 - Whilst the full detail of the plan is not available, it is likely that the type of vehicle needing to access this facility will include long wheel base and larger vehicles. Access from Eckington Road would simply not be big enough.
 - Without seeing full details of the plan, it is hard to see where any other access may be required for fire purposes etc. Where will any additional roads be?

- The Community
 - The impact on the community is massive. Several gardens back onto this land which is higher than the current houses. This will affect privacy, lack of natural light and increase noise levels.
 - Many of these houses have solar panels (funded by council grants). With the additional buildings at a higher level near these houses, will it have an impact on the effectiveness of the panels?

24 January 2023

- It will affect the amount of daylight to these properties too for reasons mentioned above.
 - There is insufficient information to comment on the affect from the industrial units specifically, but there will be disturbance to the residents when the Travelling Showpeople return from fairs etc which often close late at night.
 - Pressure on amenities – We already have over subscribed schools/ doctors/dentists etc. What provision is in place to deal with additional people in this area?
- Travelling Showpeople
 - I have read the travellers needs assessment and would like to ask about growth. If they currently haven't got enough room (8 yards), how is 1.5 hectares going to give them the expansion they need in the next 5-10 years?
 - P34 describes community tension between different groups of Travellers. With 2 sites so close from different groups, this will increase the possibility of such tensions.
 - P50 – this says that there is an oversupply in Doncaster and a potential site in Bolsover. Why is it “unclear if Showpeople from Sheffield would be interested in living on these sites”?
 - P50 – The Sheffield Showpeople have not been engaged when asked to respond as they were frustrated because they had not been able to acquire land. All these plans are based on the hope that they will take part in consultations.
 - Surely these key questions need to be raised as a matter of urgency before any more time is wasted on progressing a site that will be rejected by the people who are looking to use it. Also, all the findings are based on information taken in 2015. This needs to be reviewed before progressing.
 - My final question is about the overall proposal
 - If one part is rejected – either the industrial units or Showpeople site, will the other part still go forward for planning?
 - Does the travellers site need to be located next to an industrial site and if so, why is an existing one not being used?
 - Your “Visions and Aims” states that you are looking for thriving neighbourhoods and open space. It has also identified that by 2038, this area will have the highest shortfall of specialist older people's housing. How can using space for more industrial areas tackle this problem?