

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.401.001

What is your Name: thollands

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:

To whom it may concern.

Please see below my strong objection for the proposed travellers site and industrial site, at the side of Eckington Way, Sheffield.

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 the plan includes provisions for 12 families, and storage of fairground equipment, and will include a large number of caravans and trucks on the site. In

addition to this, there are proposals for an industrial site to be placed on the same piece of land.

I strongly object to these plans for the following reasons.

Traffic, pollution, and road infrastructure.

I have serious concerns about the amount of traffic and subsequent air pollution in the local area as the council continue to grant permission for more development within the local area. Within the space of just over a year, and in very close proximity of this proposed site,

- Wetherspoons has opened for trade
- Burger King is in the process of being built (soon to be opened next to Wetherspoons)
- Papas Fish & Chips restaurant has opened for trade
- Tesla car dealership has opened for trade

The proposed plans mean that local roads that already have a problem with high levels of traffic congestion, will incur further traffic demands and associated air pollution. I refer in particular to the B6053 Eckington Way that would be adjacent to site SES03 which has extremely high levels of congestion, multiple times a day, across the entire week. This is made worse by the nearby Crystal Peaks shopping centre and Drakehouse Retail Park, along with the mental health hospital for vulnerable children.

[REDACTED] Before any plan is even considered, I believe Sheffield City Council need to address this issue, putting a proper plan in place.

To further support my argument for pollution, I assume the industrial site would mean heavy goods vehicles having regular access to the site. I assume machinery and other equipment within the site will also be used. This would no doubt create an increase in pollution in a condensed area, immediately next to residential properties.

[REDACTED] Sheffield City Council would also be putting the health of the travellers, employees, and visitors to the industrial site at risk, as they would no doubt be breathing in fumes from nearby stagnant traffic and nearby lorries and machinery for long periods of time.

[REDACTED]

To support my argument, having read the Sheffield City Council Gypsy & Traveller accommodation assessment 2015/16 – 2020/21 Final report, and I have the following to note under Section 10.3 (consultation findings). This details the lifestyle of travelling show people, clearly stating that in the winter months, they would remain on site where they would, store, maintain and repair their equipment. This coupled with the noise of an industrial site is not fair and must not go ahead.

Proximity to existing traveller's site.

There is already one travellers site located in Sheffield South East (Holbrook). I do not believe another site placed in the constituency would be proportionate or fair. As already detailed above, I understand that Sheffield City Council have a legal obligation to provide facilities for members of the travelling community, but I believe there are other areas within Sheffield that would be better suited. Google maps shows the distance between the Holbrook travellers site to the proposed site is 1.6 miles. Sheffield has current area covering 47.29 miles².

Suitability of proposed location and financial costs.

In relation to the proposed travellers site, it is not on the city boundaries, unlike the two current sites at Holbrook and Redmires. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I note that the travellers site in Redmires is set away from residential properties, surrounded by open land, but close enough to local amenities. The traveller site at Holbrook is close to an industrial estate but set away from residential properties, also surrounded by open land, but again, still close enough to local amenities. Again, this poses the question, surely there are other areas within Sheffield that are more suitable?

An electricity pylon and cables run directly above the proposed site. Sheffield City Council would have duty of care to ensure this would not impact the health of travellers placed on site along with any employees and visitors to the industrial site. A quick google around the impacts on health, being in close proximity to electricity pylons can be found here; <https://substation-health-risks.co.uk/what-are-the-health-risks-of-living-near-pylons/>

Having read the Sheffield City Council Gypsy & Traveller accommodation assessment 2015/16 – 2020/21 Final report, I have the following to note. Under Section 5.4.3 :New site in Sheffield, I note that some travellers indicated that any new site should be located away from a main road for safety concerns. As already outlined above, this is immediately next to a congested arterial route.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

In summary, I believe the cost to go ahead with this site would be extortionate to the taxpayer. The land is sloped and elevated, often flooding occurs at the bottom corner. I assume any excavation or building would be extremely costly. As we are in a cost-of-living crisis, with many families in the community and nationally, choosing to either eat food or heat their homes, it is now more important than ever that Sheffield City Council is accountable for every penny spent, and I strongly believe there are other places in Sheffield which would be better suited and cost far less. I also believe there is a great fairness issue with the proposed plans. These have only recently come to the attention [REDACTED] despite information to suggest that local councillors who are supposed to represent the local community,

having knowledge of the proposed sites as early as July last year. This has not given the community a fair amount of time to view the plans and make an informed decision should they wish to object. I believe Sheffield City Council should be inclusive and treat members of the public with respect. They should be transparent and honest throughout all decision making. On this occasion, I feel they have not done this and let me down, [REDACTED]

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:

As outlined above, I believe the plan must consider more appropriate sites within Sheffield.

A proper plan needs putting in place to deal around the surrounding road network to manage the current traffic and congestion which is evident on a daily basis.

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:

[REDACTED]