

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.204.001

What is your Name: Clare Barnes

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:

ES03

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: 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 understand that Sheffield City Council have a legal obligation to provide facilities for members of the travelling community. The proposed site can be seen in the draft local plan (Draft Local Plan | Have Your Say Sheffield (engagementhq.com) - Annex A, page 177) and is labelled as SES03. I understand that plans include provision for 12 families and storage of 18 fairground equipment however how can Sheffield council ensure the site does not expand over the years along with the number of rides they own,

I like many many others in Beighton, have concerns about the amount of traffic and subsequent air pollution in the local area as the council continue to grant permission

for more development of the area. Beighton is supposed to be a suburb however has begun to expand at a rapid speed over recent years without community engagement. The new Burger king was not discussed with residents for their opinion. I already have issues where I cannot leave the Springwell Estate at peaks time traffic and weekends and actually drive a mile to do my shopping as I am unable to park and spend longer queuing to get into Drakehouse than I actually do shopping.

There is already a problem with high levels of traffic congestion and this will incur further traffic demands and associated air pollution. I make reference in particular to the B6053 Eckington Way that would be adjacent to site SES03 which already has high levels of congestion and will form the entrance to the site.

The south east of Sheffield has relatively few air quality monitoring stations, but the one nearby at Moorthorpe Way (Moorthorpe Way, Sheffield, United Kingdom, Sheffield, United Kingdom Air Pollution: Real-time Air Quality Index (AQI) (aqicn.org)) already shows a small but significant number of days per year where the air quality degrades to 'unhealthy' or 'hazardous', while there are regular complaints on local community forums about road and industrial noise. The development of the SES03 site will only serve to significantly worsen these health and safety issues, especially given the extreme proximity of the site to a well established residential area.

I would like to formally request for air quality to be monitored prior to the end of the consultation period alongside a traffic count for a month which will indicate the sheer volume of traffic which passes along this road. With Sheffield now imposing clean air zones the same should apply to areas like ours where there are significantly high numbers of industrial units. We have at least four very large industrial sites which have

empty units. So why would you look to create additional areas in the south east, the development needs sharing across the city. The existing sites have huge amounts of litter which I do not want to see when I open my curtains. What plans would you have in place to stop this happening on the proposed site. Also the gradient of the ground will make it impossible to hide or disguise the infrastructure from the houses on Springwell Grove.

Myself and my neighbours have been in discussions with our local MP, Clive Betts, who seems similarly surprised and opposed to the plans. He has pointed out that development will also require significant costly work to improve draining and infrastructure on the site, and he shares our concern about the local traffic situation and that adding new load to the area is not tenable.

Local impacts

I understand that as a city we have a responsibility to better support the local travelling community, as the city currently only has two sites for travellers - one at Lodge Moor, and one at Long Acre View, Halfway. The Halfway site lies just over a mile away from the proposed Beighton site at SES03. The other traveller sites are not located close to established residential homes. It is my view that the north of the city should share the responsibility and that multiple traveller sites, particularly not when other suitable sites that would be easier and less expensive to develop must exist without the need to use good quality arable land. The addition of a second traveller site in the area would place additional burdens on overstretched local facilities - I'm aware that Westfield school is already significantly oversubscribed and the local doctors surgery for example. These sites should be shared fairly across the city. I also have concerns that good quality arable land is being used for development impacting upon the local ecological environment and wildlife pathways.

The field houses bats which can be easily seen at night in the Spring/ Summer months and the field joins to the Shirebrook valley nature reserve. I feel in one way Beighton is the forefront of saving green spaces and have benefited from investment in these areas and therefore cannot understand why you would then look to destroy the natural habitat for so many animals.

We should consider what the travelling community want in all of this as well - government reports suggest they prefer a rural setting on the edge of major towns and cities. The proposed SES03 site does not meet these criteria well.

Conduct of local councillors

I am extremely disappointed with local councillors for Beighton who have told me they were unaware of the report or the proposed developments, which have been in discussion for a while. They are more interested in pointing the blame game at labour instead of supporting the local residents. The local plan was last discussed as an agenda item at the Sheffield South East Local Area Committee, which covers Beighton in addition to Birley, Woodhouse and Mosborough, in their meeting on the 11th January 2023. At least two of the Beighton councillors (Woolhouse and McCann) were in attendance. None of the residents to the plan, or notify us of the dates of consultation meetings on local planning development meetings. This raises concerns over the legality and soundness of the local plan and the works being carried out by councillors. They are paid well to look after the interests of the community and this is clearly not the case. Bob McCann is more interested in arguing with The Sheffield star than speaking to the community and replying to emails..

Transparency in local government is expected. Putting things on websites is good, but it's not truly transparent if people aren't made aware or given the opportunity to discuss their views. I found out on Facebook by chance.

This raises wider concerns about developments in Beighton, which seem to be springing up everywhere with similarly little transparency or genuine consultation - such as the new drive-through Burger King which uses and is located within a few meters of the roundabout entry to the Springwell estate or the new Tesla Centre on Drake House Crescent. All adding to the noise, pollution and traffic concerns we already have as a community.

While I cannot speak on behalf of the local community, I do form part of the panel on the Springwell Estate who have shared an ePetition on the Sheffield City Council website (Sheffield City Council - ePetition - Opposition to proposed travellers site) started on Thursday by Michael Chilton from the local Labour party has at the time of writing already garnered over 2000 signatures from local residents since its launch. The petition has also been shared with local businesses, who also say they will sign. I would like to see a detailed review of the additional proposed site and why each one was not chosen and would like to ask if anyone has considered reopening the travellers site at Tinsley which was closed by Bob McCann in 2010 due to lack of use. This land was previously chosen for this purpose and will already have basic utilities and is close to the motorway and save precious government funding

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:

Need to consider other compliant and appropriate site as discussed above.
Confirmation that the bats can be rehomed and a plan for management of the traffic on such a small congested road.

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:

████████████████████ I want to be involved in the process and understand clearly why this site was chosen rather than the other 10 and how you can guarantee the traffic , noise, pollution and preservation of the land will not impact ██████████

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.204.002

What is your Name: Clare Barnes

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:

I understand that Sheffield City Council has a legal obligation to provide facilities for members of the travelling community. The proposed site can be seen in the draft local plan (Draft Local Plan | Have Your Say Sheffield (engagementhq.com) - Annex A, page 177) and is labelled SES03. I understand that plans include provision for twelve families and storage of 18 pieces of fairground equipment however how can Sheffield council ensure the site does not expand over the years along with the number of rides they own,

I like many others in Beighton, have concerns about the amount of traffic and subsequent air pollution in the local area as the council continue to grant permission for more development of the area. Beighton is supposed to be a suburb however

has begun to expand at a rapid speed over recent years without community engagement. The new Burger King was not discussed with residents for their opinion. I already have issues where I cannot leave the Springwell Estate at peak time traffic and weekends and actually drive a mile to do my shopping as I am unable to park and spend longer queuing to get into Drakehouse than I actually do shopping.

There is already a problem with high levels of traffic congestion and this will incur further traffic demands and associated air pollution. I make reference in particular to the B6053 Eckington Way that would be adjacent to site SES03 which already has high levels of congestion.

The south east of Sheffield has relatively few air quality monitoring stations, but the one nearby at Moorthorpe Way (Moorthorpe Way, Sheffield, United Kingdom, Sheffield, United Kingdom Air Pollution: Real-time Air Quality Index (AQI) (aqicn.org)) already shows a small but significant number of days per year where the air quality degrades to 'unhealthy' or 'hazardous', while there are regular complaints on local community forums about road and industrial noise. The development of the SES03 site will only serve to significantly worsen these health and safety issues, especially given the extreme proximity of the site to a well-established residential area.

I would like to formally request for air quality to be monitored prior to the end of the consultation period alongside a traffic count for a month which will indicate the sheer volume of traffic which passes along this road. With Sheffield now imposing clean air zones, the same should apply to areas like ours where there are significantly high numbers of industrial units. We have at least four very large industrial sites which have

empty units. So why would you look to create additional areas in the south east, the development needs sharing across the city. I understand that as a city we have a responsibility to better support the local travelling community, as the city currently only has two sites for travellers - one at Lodge Moor, and one at Long Acre View, Halfway. The Halfway site lies just over a mile away from the proposed Beighton site at SES03. The other traveller sites are not located close to established residential homes. It is my view that the north of the city should share the responsibility and that multiple traveller sites, particularly not when other suitable sites that would be easier and less expensive to develop must exist without the need to use good quality arable land. The addition of a second traveller site in the area would place additional burdens on overstretched local facilities - I'm aware that Westfield school is already significantly oversubscribed, for example. These sites should be shared fairly across the city. I also have concerns that good quality arable land is being used for development impacting upon the local ecological environment and wildlife pathways. The field houses bats which can be easily seen at night in the Spring/ Summer months and the field joined to the Shirebrook valley nature reserve. I feel in one-way Beighton is the forefront of saving green spaces and have benefited from investment in these areas and therefore cannot understand why you would then look to destroy the natural habitat for so many animals.

We should consider what the travelling community should consider what the travelling community want in all of this as well - government reports suggest they prefer a rural setting on the edge of major towns and cities. The proposed SES03 site does not meet these criteria well.

Conduct of local councillors

I am extremely disappointed with local councillors for Beighton who have told me they were unaware of the report or the proposed developments, which have been in

discussion for a while, until the same time as the local residents. The local plan was last discussed as
m extremely disappointed with local councillors for Beighton who have told me they were unaware of the report or the proposed developments, which have been in discussion for a while, until the same time as the local residents. The local plan was last discussed as an agenda item at the Sheffield South East Local Area Committee, which covers Beighton in addition to Birley, Woodhouse and Mosborough, in their meeting on the 11th January 2023. At least two of the Beighton councillors (Woolhouse and McCann) were in attendance. None of the residents to the plan, or notify us of the dates of consultation meetings on local planning development meetings. This raises concerns over the legality and soundness of the local plan and the works being carried out by councillors. They are paid to look after the community and this is clearly not the case. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Transparency in local government is expected. Putting things on websites is good, but it's not truly transparent if people aren't made aware or given the opportunity to discuss their views. I found out on Facebook by chance.

This raises wider concerns about developments in Beighton, which seem to be springing up everywhere with similarly little transparency or genuine consultation - such as the new drive-through Burger King which uses and is located within a few meters of the roundabout.

- such as the new drive-through Burger King which uses and is located within a few meters of the roundabout entry to the Springwell estate or the new Tesla Centre on Drake House Crescent. All adding to the noise, pollution and traffic concerns we already have as a community.

While I cannot speak on behalf of the local community, I do form part of the panel on the Springwell Estate who have shared an ePetition on the Sheffield City Council website (Sheffield City Council - ePetition - Opposition to proposed travellers site) started on Thursday by Michael Chilton from the local Labour party has at the time of writing already garnered over 2000 signatures from local residents since its launch. The petition has also been shared with local businesses, who also say they will sign. I would like to see a detailed review of the additional proposed site and why each one was not chosen and would like to ask if anyone has considered reopening the traveller's site at Tinsley which was closed by Bob McCann in 2010 due to lack of use. This land was previously chosen for this purpose and will already have basic utilities and is close to the motorway

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:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The increased noise, pollution and congestion are a concern . [REDACTED]

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:

Am I key stake holder the decisions made directly affect my [REDACTED] , health and community , an area which i don't want to leave.