

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

### Respondent details

**Comment ID number:** PDSP.387.001

**What is your Name:** SpringwellNik

**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 proposal for the development of site SES03 for industrial or traveller site development must not be permitted. It is great to see the local retail parks thriving, but this is placing an extreme load on the single-lane roads and roundabouts in the locality that cannot cope with the additional demand that any development on the SES03 site would cause. The site would require very significant investment also to develop drainage and highway infrastructure for the proposed uses, and better sites are available which would be more cost-effective to develop.

In terms of a traveller site, I recognise that the council has a legal obligation to provide support and facilities for families in the travelling community, but South East Sheffield already hosts 1 such facility at Holbrook, one mile away. It should not be for



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

### Respondent details

**Comment ID number:** PDSP.387.002

**What is your Name:** SpringwellNik

**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:** 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:**

Please note that I have already made a representation early in the process on this matter, but now return to this better informed and with additional new information to make a new representation.

The Council have a duty to provide sites for the various classes of traveller within the city, and to provide land for development to allow for growth and new jobs. That does not mean the council should permit any development 'because they can' or to fulfill needs regardless of the effects development would have on local communities.

I object to ANY development on the SES03 site in the strongest terms possible, and I will outline here some of the many reasons why this development is unsuitable and should not go ahead:

### 1. Traffic congestion on the B6053 Eckington Way adjacent to the site

This road is significantly congested around the clock, and the situation is worsening all the time with recent developments that have been permitted in the area, e.g. Asda on Waterthorpe Greenway, the small retail park including Aldi, Tim Hortons etc. on Drake House Crescent, Ergo Park on the same road with a Tesla garage, UPS distribution centre and others, Papas Fish & Chips Restaurant on Waterthorpe Greenway, and the astonishing decision to allow a drivethrough Burger King on a residential street, Sevenairs Rd, within a car park that was already used to full capacity from morning to night at the site of the Scarsdale Hundred public house - which has been making its owner very happy, with up to 1200 customers a day since it opened (The Star, 24/12/2022). These developments have brought welcome retail opportunities and jobs to the local area, but not without significant and ever increasing costs in terms of traffic. It is now extremely hard to travel from the Springwell Estate in the direction of Crystal Peaks, with many using the estate as a rat run routinely to avoid congestion.

The congestion is significantly worsened by the local road layout, which has not changed to any significant degree since at least 1999, with four roundabouts along the B6053 in quick succession, surrounded by a number of other large junctions. Any additional load on one junction has an immediate knock-on effect on all other junctions in the area, resulting in blocked roads at all hours. Even late at night this also causes significant noise pollution to residents on the Springwell estate.

### 2. Increased road accidents

The congestion in the area has led to a significant number of collisions on Eckington Way and the north roundabout over the past 5 years, with at least 5 serious collisions and 8 slight collisions recorded. The local footpaths are inadequate and pedestrians travelling to and from the retail parks funnelled towards these traffic hotspots and forced to cross at areas where traffic is often heavy.

### 3. Air quality

Here in particular it is clear that the plan is not sound. The planning officers have admitted at a public meeting that the modelling for the impact of this development is based on a 2015 air quality report, for which the data were collected between 2010 and 2014. Since this time, many developments have been permitted within a very short distance of the area, e.g. Asda on Waterthorpe Greenway, the small retail park including Aldi, Tim Hortons etc. on Drake House Crescent, Ergo Park on the same road with a Tesla garage, UPS distribution centre and others, Papas Fish & Chips Restaurant on Waterthorpe Greenway, a drivethrough Burger King on Sevenairs Rd, within a car park that was already used to full capacity from morning to night at the site of the Scarsdale Hundred public house. It is reasonable to assume that the increased road traffic will have led to an increase in exhaust fumes, including poisonous oxides of nitrogen and small particulate pollution (which may arise from erosion of e.g. clutches, tyres etc on vehicles). It must be noted therefore that in the 2015 report, one of three sites in the Beighton area were ALREADY in excess of the safe legal limit, with the other two close to it. The council cannot say the air is safe to breath in Beighton today, they cannot say it will be safe to breath tomorrow and with this local plan it certainly won't be safe to breathe in 2039 either. The council cannot assume that the emergence of electric vehicles will solve this problem, since these might be locally carbon neutral but they will still emit small particulate pollution as a minimum.

The SES03 site acts as an important buffer between the busy commerce and industrial districts and the village of Beighton. Lose this - especially for light industry

and a travelling showpeople site where diesel generators are guaranteed to be in use - and the air quality will only worsen further.

Finally, on this point - it should also be noted that the 2015 report pollution figures for Moss Way/Donetsk Way were similar or higher than those reported for Parkway / Broad Street, in the city centre, which will by the time of reading fall within the city's Clean Air Zone. Why is Beighton's air OK to be dirty?

#### 4. Oversubscription of local amenities

I can fully appreciate that the travelling communities want and have a right to be close to local amenities, but those within Beighton are already significantly oversubscribed. A Sheffield Star report from 1st April 2022 listed the Beighton and Sothall GP practice as the 8th most heavily subscribed in the city, while Westfield Academy has also been oversubscribed for some years and was listed by the Star as the tenth most oversubscribed school in the city in 2022. The addition of new housing locally elsewhere in the local plan will worsen these positions, and the need for additional services grow even more urgent. Who will pay for new schools and GP surgeries in this climate, where will the staff come from?

#### 5. Effects on local wildlife and green space

The council's own processes have identified that the SES03 site is of the same quality as the adjacent larger field, which is green belt. Clearly, in all reality, this SES03 should also be made green belt land. Regardless, the site is a feeding ground for buzzards and we have bats that also patrol the area. There are many small birds on the site as well. It is easy to write off arable land as having low biodiversity - but it's not clear what surveys have been made to this effect. To the eyes of locals, this field is important for nature and wildlife and it must not be lost. The site appraisals I am aware of certainly agree that the site has ecological value. We should be looking at how we can improve this value and the biodiversity on the site.

#### 6. Topography

Anyone who visits the site will see challenges for development immediately. There is a significant slope to the site, which is also crossed by a mains gas pipe and high voltage pylons. It is impossible to see how the site can be meaningfully developed with all of this in mind, without huge enabling works that would also pose questions about run-off and an increased risk of localised flooding. It just doesn't make sense. Develop without addressing the lie of the land would mean the local houses being completely in shadow to the industrial development. It's already noisy from the Drake House Crescent businesses - more this close to the houses on the Springwell Estate would be completely overbearing. This looks like a site has been chosen from looking at maps and models but without real-world understanding of a site - again questioning the soundness of the plan.

#### 7. Noise pollution

It is already noisy on Springwell Grove - my Apple Watch tells me in excess of 40dB on average, even late into the evening as cars race along the A57 and B6053. More needs to be done to manage this now, urgently. How will these developments not add further to the pain? The levels now are already an issue for the Dept. of Environmental Food and Rural Affairs in my eyes. These developments, with industrial units and travelling showpeople working on maintaining their equipment will not be silent.

#### 8. Unsuitability of B6053 / Drakehouse Way roundabout

The Travelling Showpeople may not be coming and going night and day, but they will have big wagons and long trailers - this roundabout is relatively small and not suited

to this type of traffic at all in my eyes, especially given it is already extremely busy. Slow moving lorries trying to navigate their way out of new development will be an absolute disaster and significantly worsen congestion.

#### 9. Ability to stick to the plans

Looking at the satellite view on Google Maps, it is clear that the existing travelling showpeople site at Stocksbridge is, as the council says, heavily overused. It looks like there are about 80 caravans on a site intended for a fraction of that. How can the council guarantee that the same problem won't arise at this site where quite a small number of pitches are suggested? This makes it hard to agree that the impacts on traffic congestion, air and noise pollution won't be significantly worse than modelling might suggest.

#### 10. Lack of consultation

It is clear that the council has engaged with the travelling showpeople about the site long before the public consultation. Asking if they'd be interested in buying a site seems to have been given a lot of weight, when their answer at this stage would always be yes. We don't know that they would follow through on this interest, and this might all be a waste of time and effort. Regardless, the local community should have been engaged with sooner as well. Even at the recent public meeting we were told what would happen, with at least schematics for the site in planners' minds but not shared or shown. Getting ALL sides on board is critical when proposing sensitive developments and the council's handling of this has been poor. This calls into question how sound the proposals are in general.

How can we trust the council on all this? We were told the local area committee meeting on the development was recorded, and that the recording would be made available, and that has not happened. Transparency is important.

#### 11. Good arable land

At the local meeting and in communications it has looked as if the council think the site is poor quality arable land. Local residents can recall crops having been grown on the field for AT LEAST the last 62 years. This includes crops for food as well as oilseed rape. The land is clearly of productive value.

#### 12. Lack of support

None of the local South East Sheffield councillors or residents are in favour of the plan, at least not openly. There's no support for a bad plan, don't waste our money or your time in development a losing idea further. Go back to the drawing board and find a more appropriate site for these developments.

**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:**

No development should be permitted on the SES03 site, and I would argue that it should be reclassified as Green Belt.

**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:**

