

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SheffieldPlan](#)
Subject: FW: REPRESENTATION AND OBJECTION TO THE SITE REFERENCE SES03 DRAFT LOCALA PLAN AND SITES - LAND TO THE EAST OF ECKINGTON WAY, S20 1XE
Date: 30 January 2023 10:40:20
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

[REDACTED]
Policy, Performance and Communications
Sheffield City Council
Phone: [REDACTED]

I am currently hybrid working from home and the office. My working days are Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. I am on leave every Wednesday.
Website: www.sheffield.gov.uk/equality
Website: <https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/home/campaigns/equality-partnership>
Follow us on twitter: @SCCEqualityPart



From: Fiona Duncan [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2023 14:46
To: consultation <consultation@sheffield.gov.uk>
Subject: Fw: REPRESENTATION AND OBJECTION TO THE SITE REFERENCE SES03 DRAFT LOCALA PLAN AND SITES - LAND TO THE EAST OF ECKINGTON WAY, S20 1XE

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Fiona Duncan [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, 15 January 2023 at 14:44:19 GMT

Subject: REPRESENTATION AND OBJECTION TO THE SITE REFERENCE SES03 DRAFT LOCALA PLAN AND SITES - LAND TO THE EAST OF ECKINGTON WAY, S20 1XE

Site Reference: SES03 - Land to the east of Eckington Way, S20 1XE

We, Fiona and Adrian Hinson of [REDACTED] object to the proposed draft plans. [REDACTED] directly impacted by these planned proposals, we were appalled to find out 'by chance' about the plans that directly impact us under SES03.

Our councillors for this ward have attended meetings on behalf of this community, but have done nothing to make us [REDACTED] aware. I'm not sure how these councillors justify that they're acting in the best interests and on behalf of our community, especially when Bob McCann left before voting started at the meeting on the 14th December.

That aside, this is our official representation to the objection of these plans.

We have also signed the e-petition that has been set up by [REDACTED] which I believe now has over 1,000 signatures.

We object for the following reasons:

1. Development is being proposed on greenfield land, resulting in the loss of versatile agricultural land and the impact to wildlife which has already been affected with other industrial developments in this area
2. The proposed location is unacceptable due to the noise, and is already close to or in breach of air

pollution in the locality of urban housing in a residential area. Any building and development on arable land worsens this position.

3. Potential for hazardous installation due to the high pressure gas pipe that runs across the site

4. What is the proposed cost of this in terms of investment to develop the infrastructures that are needed to support - vs what is the gain and benefit to this community? [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] - specifically what is the benefit to me of these planned proposals? what's the cost / benefit analysis?

5. The traffic congestion on the B6053 Eckington Way / A57 is already at unacceptable levels, worsened with the development of the retail parks including the 'drive throughs' of Costa, Tim Hortons, McDonalds and KFC, plus the addition of Scarsdale Hundred, Papas and Burger King. The additions with these proposals worsen this without development, which then comes as cost and the additional disruption during any construction.

[REDACTED] There is also the issue of the unsightly impact of this proposal.

7. The adequacy of parking / loading / turning and road access required - and the cost to put measures in place that are adequate - when there are other areas outside of the South East ward that could be considered

8. The fact that the Sheffield South East ward already has a traveller site located at Holbrook - 1.1 miles from these new proposals. It's fully appreciated the council have a legal obligation to make provisions, and this was less of an issue in that not in a residential area. However, why another in this ward? the council must surely have an obligation to consider other sites - such as Long Acres, Redmires Land - where they are well away from houses and more appropriate.

In addition to the listed objections above, and something I know that the council will not even take this into consideration for objections, is the impact that all of this has on our mental health, with the stress and worry of it. Until you are personally impacted then you are not in our shoes and this is not important - but this is a very important issue.

[REDACTED], we were told there was no planning permission for any building or development. The [REDACTED] what sold this for us, and assurance that due to the gas pipe running across the land there would be no development. Now, this would be taken away by decisions being made out of our control. It's all very well people who sit and say they represent us and make decisions on our behalf when clearly it has no impact on them. There's no consideration or thought as to the real people this affects.

We also, have the privilege of paying Band E council tax, which is constantly on the increase, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
We will be requesting representation and along with other residents, expect to be kept updated of any deadline and meetings specific to this issue so that all our concerns are being fully heard and addressed.

Yours,

Fiona and Adrian Hinson

**COLLATED OBJECTIONS TO ECKINGTON WAY INDUSTRIAL AND TRAVELLERS SITE VIA OFFICE OF
CLIVE BETTS MP**

1) Residents: -

Mr Roger Brown

Mrs Carole Brown

Mr Carl J Brown [REDACTED]

Objections: - congestion. to near retail outlets. Other sites available.

[REDACTED]

- 2)** We would like to object to the proposals of Eckington Way Industrial and Travellers site. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and feel that the area is been choked with buildings and increasing traffic that becomes a daily problem with commuting and daily life.

We feel the area is already overloaded and cannot take any further developments.

Michael and Jane Tarron

[REDACTED]

- 3)** I am opposed to the above due to
1. Traffic congestion as road Are Already frequently gridlocked.
 2. Air pollution from yet more standing traffic.
 3. Waste of natural resources with Standing traffic burning petrol and diesel.
 4. Detrimental to health of vehicle drivers and riders together with residents due to air pollution.
 5. There are already many industrial units and a travellers site in the immediate locality.
- Mr. Leslie Fairest

[REDACTED]

- 4)** We object to the travellers & Industrial sites. We already have plenty of Industrial units
[REDACTED] We also as you and Sheffield Council know already have a traveller site. The traffic is already unmanageable every day with queuing to get in and out of the area.

There are plenty of brown sites not being used all over Sheffield... maybe looking at lower wincobank, pitsmoor. Maybe acquiring the old Authur Lees site or land where Stanley tools was on Pitsmoor Road. Barnsley Road Crabtree where the old nursing home was....

This area is too built up as it is. There will be no green space left for any of us. Carol Moffatt

[REDACTED]

5) Please can you put my objection forward for the above - Tammy Kelly

With reference to the above, I would like to lodge my objections to site S2S03 in the local plan. The site has been allocated for as an industrial site with a traveller/show people site at the Northern end.

My main concern with this, which is shared by all of the people in the local area, is the impact this will have on Eckington Way and the surrounding roads. There is already a significant amount of traffic throughout the day during the entire week.

Any further development in the immediate area is only going to make the traffic and congestion even worse for residents and customers/staff of the nearby Drakehouse Retail Park and Crystal Peaks Shopping Centre. We now also have a UPS depot which is behind the Aldi at Drakehouse Retail Park which has a large fleet of their courier vans in and out of the depot during rush hour. The congestion around this area is already really bad and unmanageable during Peaks times. Having another industrial site is only going to cause more congestion and pollution.

Before any further development is made in the area a plan needs to be put in place to deal with the existing traffic issues. I am aware that Council officers have already recognised these traffic flow problems and have indicated to me that this issue needs to be addressed. This needs to happen before this site is allocated for development.

There are already other business developments going ahead in this area such as a Burger King and industrial buildings behind Drakehouse Retail Park where there is already going to be an increase in traffic so this will add further to an already expected increase.

The site behind the residential area of Springwell Grove is a lot higher than the houses backing on to it. Any building/construction on that site would be imposing for residents which I do not feel is appropriate. There is also a risk, due to this elevation of the site there is a risk that residents are losing their right to privacy which is also a huge concern that needs to be looked at.

Finally, there are more suitable locations for both the industrial site and travellers site elsewhere in the city which would not be so close to a residential area. These should be looked at before placing the site above Springwell.

There is already an existing travellers site at Holbrook, Sheffield which is approximately 5 minutes drive away from this proposed site. I feel the location of that site at Holbrook is so much more suited with it being already established and being in an industrial estate. Why do we need another site so close. There is also a second travellers site in Sheffield at Lodge Moor which is based in a rural area not surrounding any residential areas. Why cant that site be used/expanded?

I am sure there are lots of other sites that are more suitable for this proposed site in and around South Yorkshire.

[REDACTED]

- 6) [REDACTED] and am extremely concerned about the traffic in and around Crystal Peaks and Drakehouse area if the proposed goes through. I do object. Jayne Clarry

[REDACTED]

- 7) Please note that I object to the above. We already have a traveller site in the locality.

Traffic is already heavy around Drakehouse and this will make matters even worse. Joan Hollowood

[REDACTED]

- 8) Traveller Site/Industrial Units / Eckington Way.

I would like to protest against Traveller site/Industrial Units here marked for Eckington Way. MORE VEHICLES more grid locks and more pollution. Causing more chaos. The highways cannot cope at the moment and more traffic is not acceptable for those who already live in this area. Mrs Pauline McGuire

[REDACTED]

- 9) I would like to raise my concerns with you regarding the above proposed plans.

[REDACTED] and the traffic problem around this area has got progressively worse as every spare piece of land has been developed. We will probably see another increase with the opening of Burger King. I also understand there is further development on the Weatherspoons car park. The area has been over developed and saturated without thought to the road network or indeed its residents. Parking in the area is also an issue as these developments cram on so many businesses there's not enough land left for customer parking. If the above plans go ahead it will become even more problematic. There will be more large vehicles and the road network and roundabouts in that area already struggling to cope.

The roads in this area are also a thoroughfare for commuters from surrounding areas into Sheffield, Rotherham and Chesterfield and it gets very busy and at times grid locked.

I am also concerned about air, noise and litter pollution and worry about health and safety issues. Will there be any air/noise pollution testing prior to any further development.

There are lots of empty industrial units around and priority should be given to putting these to use before building any more. Sometime ago land was allocated for industrial use on Eckington Way/Holbrook Avenue which is away from residential housing. Nothing has been built there so why allocate more land. I believe the size and height of industrial buildings would over shadow the area. In my opinion the lay of the land is totally unsuitable. Kathryn Kelly

[REDACTED]

10) My main objections to the proposed planning and developments are;

Traffic - the road infrastructure around the proposed development is insufficient to handle the current volume of traffic especially between 7.30am - 9.30am and 3pm - 6pm on weekdays. Weekends see excessive volumes of traffic on both Saturday and Sunday causing significant delays in getting past or access to both Crystal peaks and Drakehouse retail developments. These traffic issues affect not only properties close by but also the surrounding areas.

The level of pollution during these periods, due to slow moving and standing vehicles is actually visible and can be detected by taste. My personal experience is that it can take 15mins - 30mins to travel half a mile during these busy periods.

Sheffield is introducing a clean air zone on the inner ring road to protect air quality but, has made no consideration of air quality further out of the city and in this case it would see vehicles trying to get to the south west of the city and avoid the clean air charges using these routes and making this area even worse.

In addition, putting a travellers site close to this busy infrastructure and poor air quality appears a lack of consideration to their welfare.

Therefore before any such developments are even considered, these issue need to be rectified.

Parking/Access- Currently, during the working day access to the Springwell estate and hospital is down to that of a single track road making it difficult for anything but cars to use this access because of parking. This is mainly due to the lack of or restricted parking available in the area to meet the current requirements. In the near future, this will only become worse due to the introduction of a Burger King drive through tailing back on to the roundabout or Springwell housing estate at busy times. This scenario can be witnessed at busy times at the Mac Donald's drive through in the Drakehouse retail park entrance.

The introduction of more larger vehicles to service the proposed industrial estate, travellers work place and accommodation will only exacerbate the issues of access for travellers, businesses and residents alike.

Traveller site location - Whilst I appreciate the need for the traveller community to have accommodation it seems disproportionate to have two sites in this local vicinity taking the above issues into account when other areas are available within Sheffield.

In short, a plan for this development appears not to consider the businesses, travellers or residents in the immediate area and those in the surrounding areas who need to use this infrastructure on a daily basis. Simon Voyse

[REDACTED]

11) See attached PDF. Steve English

[REDACTED]

12) [REDACTED], and over the years the traffic congestion has increased to such a level that there is 'Gridlock' around the Eckington Way area most of the time, especially during rush hour, at weekends for through traffic, Crystal Peaks and the Retail Park.

Last year Wetherspoons opened, creating an astonishing amount of additional traffic all day from Eckington Way onto Severnairs Road, this will increase further when the Burger King opens shortly (along with the addition rubbish that is dropped) on the same site, with a further development planned!

We also have Papa's that has opened up on the roundabout, most people travel there in a car!

[REDACTED], and have noticed that United Parcel Service (UPS) have recently moved into the new large unit behind Aldi. They have fleet of large brown vans that are in an out, recently while out at the top of the field, there were FIVE of these vans, all following each other onto the Aldi roundabout (8:10 am), further impact on congestion and pollution! There are also forklift trucks going in and out of the building, each time sounding their horns!

The road infrastructure in this area cannot cope as it is, along with the pollution caused with vehicles stood queuing with engines running!

It would be interesting if a pollution monitoring station could be set up, as it has been in other areas if the city, I think the results would not be good!

Sheffield City Council are creating a clean air zone in the city, but are not interested about this area, disgraceful!

The proposed Industrial/Travellers site would create further congestion with the Industrial site at rush hour especially, as they go to and from the premises for work!

Depending on the type of companies taking up the Industrial units, thee would also be potential noise pollution, especially if they are a metal fabricator for example, then what if they work night's!

This area would be adjacent to houses on Springwell and is not the correct place for a Traveller's site.

On the estate there are [REDACTED], they would not be safe to play out in their own gardens.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

There is a gas main running under the site, and electricity pylons over the site, has consideration to any potential issues or maintenance been considered for these, I can only assume it hasn't!

On another point, times are difficult at the moment with energy costs and high interest rates, I would estimate house prices on the estate would reduce by more than £50,000 with a Traveller camp over the fence, that's if anyone would want to buy one! - Paul & Patricia Fox

[REDACTED]

- 13) [REDACTED] and am opposed to the proposed development on the above land and am pleased to see that you too are opposed to it.

The ongoing development of the Crystal Peaks area over the last few years has dramatically increased the volume of traffic in the area and further development would put the road network under even more pressure which I am sure will then lead to a deterioration in air quality in the area.

Noting that Sheffield City Council are introducing air quality controls in other parts of the city, it seems that this development could well work against that around Beighton. I understand that nearby, where the Moss Way Police Station is and the Asda supermarket, that the air quality is already outside the ideal level.

In addition, depending on what type of industrial units are proposed, the site is totally inappropriate for heavy industrial use or businesses which may operate 24 hours per day noting such close proximity to residential properties. I understand also that the travellers site is for showpeople which will include their truck/trailers for moving their equipment around the country. Presumably they will also need to repair & maintain those vehicles on site which again I do not consider appropriate so close to residential properties.

Nearby there is also a community hospital for young people where I believe they provide help & support to those suffering from anxiety, eating disorders etc and again I believe this development is not ideal because of the close proximity.

And finally, I noted that any planning would have to ensure that hedgerows etc are protected and measures put in place to protect wildlife and with the best will in the world I fail to see how that won't be detrimentally affected by the development. Julie Skelton

[REDACTED]

14) We wish to object to the proposed industrial and traveller's site at Beighton.

It is overdevelopment. [REDACTED]

There is already a traveller's site at Halfway and to install a second one about two miles away from this site is overkill for this district. The area in question is a very nice leisurely area and to install these proposals would be to the detriment of the neighbourhood not to mention the deterioration of property prices.

This suburb and surrounding area is suffering from heavy traffic congestion (together with exhaust fumes), a total failure on behalf of the local traffic planning i.e. road systems, retail developments and general overcrowding of what is or rather was an attractive residential space. Any further developments will result in a further downgrading.

We need to retain these green spaces that remain for the benefit of us all. John and Sandra Carr

15) My objections to the proposed travellers and industrial site are as follows:

1. This will create more traffic on roads that are already gridlocked at the best of times.

2. Having done some research on the cultural practice of show people it's clear that the plots of land required for them is larger than other travellers as they require additional space in order to store and maintain large equipment. Their equipment including rides, kiosks and stalls and thus will have a detrimental effect of proposed development on the character of the local area. Also by the very nature of their business thus could be construed as an industrial activity which is detrimental to the area.

3. The proposed site is very close to a housing estate. Research on the cultural practice of show people highlights that they move their equipment at all hours of day and night. This will create noise pollution to local residents.

For these, and many other reasons I believe that this land is not suitable for a travellers and industrial site. Claudine West

16) See attached word document. Tim Walker

17) Please find detailed below my objections to the above section of the Draft Local Plan from Sheffield City Council.

Objections

1. The plan hasn't considered the already abysmal traffic situation in the surrounding area. Continuous development of commercial and industrial use, along with residential developments sees the roads within a mile circumference of the area of this proposed development at gridlock twice a day on working days and pretty much all day on Saturday. Further development as suggested in SES03 will only compound this matter.
2. The plan doesn't consider the addition to local pollution. Already in this area pollution levels are above those that SCC deem safe on a regular basis.
3. The plan doesn't consider the fact that there are high voltage overhead cables traversing the site with associated easements. These themselves could render the plan unfit for the suggested use
4. The plan doesn't consider that there is an underground high pressure gas mains pipe that traverses the site with associated easements. This could also render the plan unfit for the suggested use.
5. The plan doesn't consider the elevated nature of this site and that it is adjacent to residential dwellings. Any development for industrial or traveller use will be a blight on the outlook of these dwellings.
6. The plan doesn't consider the loss of green and open land used by many in the area for wellbeing and recreational use on a regular basis. As industrial, commercial and residential development has continued at pace in this part of Sheffield, the loss of green and open land has been just about catastrophic.
7. The plan doesn't consider the loss to local and migrating wildlife, the further damage to hedgerows and the overall general impact on wildlife in the area.

I trust the above can be utilised in a positive manner to see the Sheffield Local Plan being altered with the removal of this thoughtless and needless part of the overall plan.

[REDACTED]

18) I would like to take this opportunity to object to the above proposed development.

My initial concern is the negative effect this development would have on the environment and wildlife in this area. Traffic in this area is already at a very high level and this development would add to the problem.

In my opinion the proposed area should remain a corridor for wildlife and an area for local residents to use for recreational purposes.

A further concern is whether the infrastructure locally could cope with these further developments, Medical Practices, Schools etc.

Sorry I could not attend meeting as it is fully booked. Colin Huntington

[REDACTED]

19) I would like to take this opportunity to object to the above proposed developments.

My main concern is the negative effect on the environment, this development will further destroy nearby wildlife.

Traffic in this area is already at a very high level and this would only add to the problem. In my opinion the proposed area should remain a corridor for wildlife and an area for local residents to use as they do at the moment for recreational purposes.

Another concern is whether the infrastructure locally could sustain further developments, Medical Practices, Schools etc.

Sorry I could not attend meeting as it was booked. Susan Huntington

[REDACTED]

20) With reference to the above, I would like to lodge my objections to site S2S03 in the local plan.

The site has been allocated for an industrial site with a traveller/show people site at the Northern end.

We have recently found out that this plan was decided last July without any consultation of the residents of Beighton and surrounding areas, which is totally out of order. This will have a huge impact on wildlife, traffic congestion, pollution and increased noise levels. One of many concerns with this, is the impact it will have on Eckington Way and the surrounding roads, my thoughts and concerns are shared with local residents.

Any further development in this area is only going to make the traffic and congestion even worse for residents and customers of Drakehouse Retail Park and Crystal Peaks Shopping Centre. Before any further development is made in the area a plan needs to be put in place to deal with the existing traffic issues.

I have been informed that Council officers have recognised these traffic flow problems and have indicated that this issue needs to be addressed. This needs to be done before this site is allocated for development.

There are other business developments going ahead in this area such as a Burger King and industrial buildings close to Drakehouse Retail Park where there is already going to be an increase in traffic so this proposal will add further to an already expected increase.

The proposed site backs onto the residential area of Springwell Grove and is a lot higher than the houses backing on to it. Any construction on that site would be imposing for residents which I do not feel is right. There is also a risk, due to this elevation of the site that residents are losing their right to privacy which is also a huge concern that needs to be looked at.

There is also a huge concern to wildlife on this site if any construction is to go ahead.

I am sure there are suitable locations for both the industrial site and travellers site elsewhere in the county or South Yorkshire which would not be so close to a residential area. These should be looked at.

I am aware there is an existing travellers site at Holbrook, Sheffield which is about 5 minutes drive from this site. The location of the site at Holbrook is more suited, it is an established site that has been there for many years and is part of an industrial estate. Why do we need another site this close in a much more built up residential area.

Another concern is house prices, this would plummet leaving many local residents losing tens of thousands.

Please put my objection forward. Should you require any further information please contact me. Kevin Kelly

[REDACTED]

- 21)** Please take this email as my objection to the above, due to the increase of traffic congestion it would cause in an area of high traffic congestion already.

I was unable to attend the recent LAC meeting but would be interested in receiving any minutes/outputs of the meeting, to understand which other sites have been considered and why Eckington Way was picked? Helen Griffiths

[REDACTED]

- 22)** My objections to the industrial and traveller site are as follows: -

1. It is already acknowledged that there are traffic problems in the area that need to be addressed. This proposed development will exacerbate and compound those problems. Highway safety comes to mind.

2. In addition, there is also (a) a drive thru Burger King currently under construction and (b) an application that has been granted for a further drive thru, a fast-food take-away and a nursery.

All this consequentially leading to an increase in traffic as mentioned at point 1, adding to an already over stretched roadway network.

3. Further development, plus the increase in traffic brings increased pollution and poor air quality. It is acknowledged by the Council that pollution contributes to early deaths.

4. Due to the current climate situation should we not be protecting our green spaces not building on them.

Jacqueline Lowe

[REDACTED]

- 23)** My objection is based on my concerns of the potential increased congestion resulting from this proposal, the highways infrastructure in this part of Sheffield is already hugely overstretched and beyond the point at which any further increase in the traffic would become intolerable for residents in this area. Linda Andrews

[REDACTED]

24) Please see below my objections to the above proposed development: -

1. The road of Eckington Way is already congested with excess traffic during the weekends & at peak times during the week.

Traffic starts queueing at night peak times at the Parkway exit for Mosborough Parkway which is over 3 miles from Eckington Way.

Drivers are using other routes which are including side roads to try & reduce the time taken to travel to Mosborough townships.

All of these actions being taken by drivers are defeating the desired positive effectiveness of having Eckington Way as a main traffic route.

The current road system around Drakehouse Retail Park including Eckington Way is at saturation point & cannot service an increase in traffic use.

We are now having to deal with the new industrial units erected on Drakehouse which are occupied by UPS, Argos & Tesla.

2. The pollution levels generated by the excessive traffic using Eckington Way & its surrounding roads is already beyond acceptable levels & increasing the traffic will only increase this further.

UPS & Argos have large delivery vehicles now using Eckington Way 24/7 & what will be 365 days a year adding to the traffic congestion & excessive pollution levels. On hot sunny days the pollution gases generated from the traffic can be tasted in the air & the sky is a milky colour due to the carbon gases discharged by the traffic.

3. To allow the construction of an industrial estate & travellers site next to a settled private residential area does not take into consideration [REDACTED] air & noise pollution [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4. The existing greenfield has a wide array of wildlife which exists & contributes to the eco-balance of local environment.

Hedgehogs, foxes & nesting birds all use the field in question to exist & thrive but by developing the field you will be placing their survival/existence in jeopardy.

We have constantly been told to nurture our eco system to save for future generations & all the council is wanting to do here is build an industrial estate in tandem with a not wanted travellers' site. How can these actions be regarded as saving our environment for the next generations. Simon Hurt
[REDACTED]

25) Site Reference: SES03 - Land to the east of Eckington Way, S20 1XE

We, Fiona and Adrian Hinson of [REDACTED] object to the proposed draft plans.

[REDACTED], we were appalled to find out 'by chance' about the plans that directly impact us under SES03.

Our councillors for this ward have attended meetings on behalf of this community but have done nothing to make us [REDACTED]s aware. I'm not sure how these councillors justify that they're acting in the best interests and on behalf of our community, especially when Bob McCann left before voting started at the meeting on the 14th December.

That aside, this is our official representation to the objection of these plans.

We have also signed the e-petition that has been set up by [REDACTED], which I believe now has over 1,000 signatures.

We object for the following reasons:

1. Development is being proposed on greenfield land, resulting in the loss of versatile agricultural land and the impact to wildlife which has already been affected with other industrial developments in this area
2. The proposed location is unacceptable due to the noise and is already close to or in breach of air pollution in the locality of urban housing in a residential area. Any building and development on arable land worsens this position.
3. Potential for hazardous installation due to the high-pressure gas pipe that runs across the site
4. What is the proposed cost of this in terms of investment to develop the infrastructures that are needed to support - vs what is the gain and benefit to this community? [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] specifically what is the benefit to me of these planned proposals? what's the cost / benefit analysis?
5. The traffic congestion on the B6053 Eckington Way / A57 is already at unacceptable levels, worsened with the development of the retail parks including the 'drive throughs' of Costa, Tim Hortons, McDonalds and KFC, plus the addition of Scarsdale Hundred, Papas and Burger King. The additions with these proposals worsen this without development, which then comes as cost and the additional disruption during any construction.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] There is also the issue of the unsightly impact of this proposal.

7. The adequacy of parking / loading / turning and road access required - and the cost to put measures in place that are adequate - when there are other areas outside of the South East ward that could be considered

8. The fact that the Sheffield South East ward already has a traveller site located at Holbrook - 1.1 miles from these new proposals. It's fully appreciated the council have a legal obligation to make provisions, and this was less of an issue in that not in a residential area. However, why another in this ward? the council must surely have an obligation to consider other sites - such as Long Acres, Redmires Land - where they are well away from houses and more appropriate.

9. [REDACTED] are being used as thoroughfares which is not acceptable. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] the way cars are speeding through here

10. The parking on sevenairs road is horrendous, where cars can't pass through, and with the addition of the Burger King drive through is only going to worsen - you'll not be able to tell if parked car or queueing traffic, and if anything like the McDonald's drive through and problems they had with Tim Hortons will be a nightmare! This is made worse that it runs direct to roads and roundabout .. at least the other two limited queues to the retail park only

11. The pollution and noise again is a serious issue. They mentioned light industrial but can't control what this is going to be or what would be in them. I would question why we need to plan for more industrial units when we have so many empty. But, the issues of Abbey Glenn as I raised at the meeting where they allowed another industry into a unit and changed usage, and now having to deal with complaints as enforcement after the event. We cannot be in this position and shouldn't be expected to be.

Travelling Showpeople come with large equipment, which needs maintenance, will run off diesel generators. They need space to move and manoeuvre. All of which is completely inappropriate for this area in the proximity of a reduce risk estate.

In addition to the listed objections above, and something I know that the council will not even take this into consideration for objections, is the impact that all of this has on our mental health, with the stress and worry of it. Until you are personally impacted then you are not in our shoes, and this is not important - but this is a very important issue.

[REDACTED], we were told there was no planning permission for any building or development. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] what sold this for us, and assurance that due to the gas pipe running across the land there would be no development.

Now, this would be taken away by decisions being made out of our control. It's all very well people who sit and say they represent us and make decisions on our behalf when clearly it has no impact on them. There's no consideration or thought as to the real people this affects.

We also, have the privilege of paying Band E council tax, which is constantly on the increase,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We will be requesting representation and along with other residents, expect to be kept updated of any deadline and meetings specific to this issue so that all our concerns are being fully heard and addressed. Fiona and Adrian Hinson

[REDACTED]

26) Please find below my objections to the proposed traveller/showman site to the east of Eckington Way backing on to Springwell Grove, Beighton.

- This will exacerbate already high pollution levels in the area.
- High voltage overhead cables across the site could mean the plan is unfit for this site.
- There is already a massive traffic problem in the surrounding area. Which has recently been added to by building the Weatherspoons pub, Burger King and other planned developments. Sevenairs Road past Becton Childrens Centre is down to almost one lane. The traffic island by Wetherspoons is almost gridlocked twice a day and all day at weekends.
- There will be gas mains/water/sewerage pipes under the proposed land which will create many problems and massive expense.
- The proposed land is elevated and next to residential properties which will most definitely ruin the views from these properties.
- The loss of green open space used recreationally by locals in the area on a daily basis. This is already getting out of hand in this area.
- Consideration to wildlife/hedgerows.

I trust the above can be considered and the plan overturned as i consider the use of this land for this purpose inappropriate. Sarah Charlesworth

[REDACTED]

27) See attached word document. Amanda Lewin

[REDACTED]

28) I would like to register my objection to the plan for the following reasons: -

It would result in the loss of a green field site adjacent to an established residential area. It would worsen the already heavy traffic on an inadequate road layout in the area causing an increase in air pollution and noise. The road layout around the area (the B6053, Sevenairs Rd, Drakehouse Way and Waterthorpe Greenway) is much the same as it was in 1999 but since then the following have been built: -

- Asda Superstore
- Aldi etc extension to Drakehouse Retail Park
- Ergo Park (Tesla and Argos/Sainsbury's)
- Drake Business Park
- Boots etc extension to Drakehouse Retail Park
- Halfords Auto Centre
- Papa's Restaurant and Takeaway
- Crystal Peaks East Mall extension
- Flats on Sevenairs Rd
- Scarsdale Hundred pub
- Completion of Springwell Grove to join on to Sevenairs Rd
- Soon to open Burger King Restaurant

All have contributed to increased traffic and therefore noise and air pollution in the area and in my opinion if the draft plan is adopted without significant improvements to the roads the already unacceptable traffic levels will only increase. Neil Jackson

[REDACTED]

29) I wish to object to the proposed traveller site in Beighton. Its proposed location is wholly inappropriate in terms of impact on traffic and proximity to congested roundabouts, businesses and housing. Access to the highways has not been properly evaluated. How on earth large caravans and trailers will access the site without causing damage to the environment, road surfaces and increasing pollution to the local area is beyond me. In addition, the pressure on local services will be significant. GP surgeries in the area are under significant strain and this influx of people will put pressure on a variety of local public services.

There is already a traveller site within 2 miles of the proposed new site. It's on an industrial estate, on the edge of the city and seems more appropriate. Why should the centre Beighton be home to 2 sites when they could be spread across the city?

The proposed site is in predominantly greenfield land.

This proposal neither meets the needs of the travellers nor the local community. Alyson Fender

[REDACTED]

- 30)** This area already has major traffic issues around Crystal Peaks, Drakehouse Retail Park, specifically the B6053 Eckington Way and the A57 main South East Sheffield arterial route which the council are already aware of and are currently conducting a review to see what can be done. There are substantial delays / stationary traffic multiple times of everyday already and this is because there has been no amendments or improvements to the road network in this area for over 25 years. The following developments have happened during that time adding vastly increased traffic:
- a. Asda
 - b. Aldi
 - c. Total Parks Sheffield – 11-acre site
 - d. Expansion of Drakehouse Retail Park (Tim Hortons, Home Bargains, Costa, Starbucks)
 - e. Tesla
 - f. Papa's Fish and Chips (formally the Aagrah Indian)
 - g. Various housing developments in the area
 - h. Burger King – yet to open
 - i. Further approved but unknown development on the land next to Wetherspoons – a nursery and Taco Bell have been in the running

Adding Industrial units and a Travellers site at this site will add further to this already desperate traffic situation will make things worse when the road network can't cope today with the traffic. The only possible access to this site is via the island that is the main access to the Drakehouse Retail Park which will make a significant impact on the traffic. It is unknown what type of businesses could take tenancy in the industrial units but any additional traffic would have major impact to an already overloaded traffic network.

I find it unbelievable that all this passed development has been allowed to happen with no thought given to the cumulative impact this is having on traffic in the area. This proposal having been strongly objected too at the Local Area Council meeting by the local residents and all local councillors at that meeting stating that they also object to the plan this point should not be ignored. The planners advised at the LAC meeting on Thursday 9th February 2023 that the traffic assessment says there would be no significant impact to traffic. I put it to you that if an assessment has taken place, it has not been done on the roads around the SES03 site on anything like current data (carried out during the covid lockdown period). I do suspect that this was purely a modelling exercise of the expected additional traffic and does not take in to account the already dire traffic situation.

I strongly propose that no further development is allowed in this area until the traffic planning report is completed, been fully reviewed and the recommend improvements fully implemented. Failure of the planners / council to cancel any development on the SES03 land before any more money is wasted by the City Council would be irresponsible and bring in to question the ability of the people involved to perform their job and they should all be held to account for their failings. If they are "following the process" then process is not fit for purpose and should be review immediately.

2. There will be a detrimental impact to the already poor air quality in the area cause by the bad traffic situation detailed in point 1 deteriorating it further. The amount of standing traffic is adversely affecting the air quality in the area and even more traffic means even more stationary vehicles and more pollutants in to the air. There was an air quality study

taken on 2014 (published in 2015) where I understand the levels were borderline unsafe back then. With all the additional traffic added to the road network since then I'm confident any new air quality study will now show the current levels are harmful. That is without the opening of the new Burger King currently under construction or other developments in the area that already have planning but yet to be built.

I strongly propose that no further development is allowed in this area until an air quality report has been completed and its result are available to be considered. It would be irresponsible of any further development to take place without having this information.

3. The impact of industrial unit and a Traveller's site will have a major noise pollution to the residential area near, especially the houses it will back directly on to. This is not acceptable to any of the residents.
4. The land elevated so it rises above the local houses, specifically those on Springwell Grove that directly back on to the site, and the development will completely overlook these houses completely invading their privacy. The elevation of the land will also mean that any building will directly block sunlight out from the properties.
5. The site is used for arable farming, we are in a world where we need to be producing local produce in the UK, protecting the climate, rather than shipping it in from all over the world and the council wanting to destroy that and build industrial units on it. What will happen to all the rain water that currently soaks in through the arable land and what impact will that have to the houses directly below? With the increase in extreme weather, I have great concerns about the effect of this on the nearby houses and what the cost is to keep them safe.
6. This site has an underground mains gas pipe running through it and also sites an electricity pylon with overhead cables. What is the cost and is it even viable to attempt to utilise this site in any meaningful way?
7. The proposed Gypsy and Traveller site is not following national policy or giving them consideration by the site being located next to busy main road and the noise from the industrial units proposed on the same site. There are also industrial and retail units located immediately on the other side of the busy main road creating noise that is against the guidance for locating Traveller sites.
8. I support the provision of a site for Travellers and we have a responsibility to provide this but surely the Traveller sites should be spread across all the council parishes and not just in the South East area of Sheffield. There is a larger Travellers site situated just over 1 mile away from this proposed site at Long Acre, Holbrook. This is not fair to the region and not fair to the Travellers.

This is going to be another example of Sheffield City Council wasting yet more money if they don't see common sense and remove SES03 from this plan now! When the council has no money and hiking up Council Tax by approximately 5%, why are they pushing this site which anyone can see is not a viable option? Or is there another factor, that we are currently unaware of, driving this proposal?

I further propose that the SES03 area is redesignated as Green Belt and there is no further attempt to build on this land for the foreseeable future. Steve Brough

[REDACTED]

31) I am writing to object to the proposed traveller site at Eckington Way, Beighton based on the following:

1. This will increase levels of pollution already in the area.
2. There are high voltage overhead cables across around the site which could mean safety implications. Also, services such as gas, water, sewage etc would need to be provided for the site, this would cause major disruption to an already extremely busy and congested area.
3. There is already a massive traffic problem in the surrounding area due to the retail park and Aldi supermarket, this has also been made much worse recently by the building of the Scarsdale One Hundred Weatherspoons pub, Burger King and Papas fish and chip restaurant. I understand there are also other planned developments due shortly, including a Taco Bell and a children's nursery on Sevenairs Road. The traffic is extremely high on that island, especially over the weekend, with many accidents waiting to happen.
4. The proposed land is elevated and next to residential properties which will most definitely ruin the views from these properties and affect the environment.
5. The loss of green open space used recreationally by locals in the surrounding area on a daily basis.

I trust the above can be considered and the plan overturned as I consider the use of this land for this purpose inappropriate. Alison Woodall

[REDACTED]

32) We would please like to object to the proposed Draft Local Plan Site, Case Ref ZA24512, Travellers Site and Industrial Estate

We would like to object for the following reasons:

The area is already highly congested with cars and lorries. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] due to the current levels of traffic.

[REDACTED] and have seen the traffic constantly increasing due to the level of development of the surrounding area that has already taken place. (ASDA, Wetherspoons, Drakehouse Retail Park, extension of Crystal Peaks, Burger King etc).

The increased level of traffic pollution due to all of the above must be already having an impact on the health and well-being of the families and children who all live nearby. To add more to this already now highly built up area can have no positive impact as far as we are concerned.

We also now have the issues of traffic cutting through the Springwell estate (which are all family sized houses) due to them trying to avoid the high level of congestion near Crystal Peaks and Drakehouse areas. It is only a matter of time before a child gets knocked down. We are also obviously concerned that there is already a traveller site approximately 2 miles away. Why does this area need another one so close?

To build such a development so close to a residential estate can only have a negative effect on the residents and their families for all the reasons above. Ruth and Garry Shillito

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SheffieldPlan](#)
Subject: FW: (Case Ref: ZA24288) Correspondence from Office of Clive Betts MP
Date: 24 February 2023 11:39:51
Attachments: [Objections to site SES03.docx](#)
[Objections to site SES03 Tim Walker](#) [REDACTED]
[Objection to Site ref SES03 Steven English](#) [REDACTED]
[Objections to site SES03 Amanda Lewin](#) [REDACTED]

Hi – please see attached in case not received already.

Mike.

Michael Johnson
Head of Planning
Sheffield City Council
[REDACTED]

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Web: www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or
www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingcontrol

Location: Planning Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street, SHEFFIELD S1 2SH
Building Control Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street

Apply for planning permission online at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

Your email address, and any other personal information you may have shared with us, will only be processed in accordance with the Council's commitment to comply with the UK GDPR. If you would like further information, please refer to Sheffield City Council's [Privacy Notice](#)

From: Clive Betts MP [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 February 2023 09:38
To: Michael Johnson (DEL-Planning) [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: (Case Ref: ZA24288) Correspondence from Office of Clive Betts MP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Morning Michael,

Can you forward this on to the Planning inbox? We do't seem to have the correct email address as planning@sheffield.gov.uk just bounced back.

Best,

Michael Chilton
Constituency Assistant to Clive Betts MP

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 February 2023 22:31
To: planning@sheffield.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: (Case Ref: ZA24288) Correspondence from Office of Clive Betts MP
Good evening,

Please find attached a compilation of the objections we have collated for site SES03 in the Draft Local Plan.

These objections represent the views of the individual residents. Our office has just collated them for submission.

Best,

Office of Clive Betts MP