

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

### Respondent details

**Comment ID number:** PDSP.404.001

**What is your Name:** Tome

**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:**

I am a [REDACTED] and I have been distressed by the recent news of the proposed industrial and traveller site being allocated between Eckington Way and Springwell Grove. I very much oppose this proposal on the following grounds. Increase in traffic - The area already struggles with the amount of traffic coming through the location, the combination of residents, local retail site users along with people using the B roads as connection roads to other areas of the city makes these roads often congested. Peak times and weekends are particularly difficult. The recent introduction of the Wetherspoons pub and the soon to be drive thru Burger King will only compound this issue further, I would suggest that adding the potential for industrial vehicles and equipment into

the equation will make the traffic flow much worse. This form of traffic would be above and beyond what a typical family would be expected to make which in a residential area should be a considered factor. I have read a publication from The Department of Communities and Local Governments (published Aug 15) - Planning for Travellers Sites, Policy B 13 (f) states 'avoiding placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services' should be considered when allocating a site. I would suggest the proposed site is going against this policy and I have yet to hear any proposal for how this would be resolved. Air Quality due to the increase in traffic and the slowing down of other traffic The additional pollution caused by the increase in traffic flow also needs to be addressed. There will be more traffic in the area moving at reduced speeds or idling in traffic jams and one of the most significant green spaces in the area will have been totally removed. Can you please confirm how you plan to ensure the pollution figures stated within the National Air Quality Objectives and Air Quality Standards Regulations will be complied with? I have noted that in 2015 Moss Way / Donetsk Way (any measurements closer to the site don't appear to have been published, not that I can find anyway) had Nitrogen Dioxide levels above the safe levels. The readings were 48  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  whereas the aim should be 40  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  and this is before the addition of the new Asda Superstore. Adding additional traffic and removing green space will only exasperate this issue. Lack of Infrastructure on the site The lack of infrastructure on the site, is for me a clear sign the site is not the best place for the proposed location. A minimum of drainage, sewage and water supplies will need to be put in place, whilst working around and avoiding the high pressure gas pipe you yourself have identified on the site. The cost for this will be significant and having seen how much Sheffield Council are already over the allocated budget for this year I have to question where the funds for this work will come from and at the expense of what? The council have already considered other locations for the site, There are certainly other sites within the city boundary which already have some of this infrastructure if not all in place, cost wise these must make more sense. Loss of privacy and noise for local residents. A significant portion of this land is higher than the residential estate, using this land for the purposes outlined runs the real risk of people losing some if not all their privacy in their back gardens. I am also deeply concerned about the noise levels associated with an industrial site of this nature, I am presuming the site will be required to have access 24 hours a day, how can you ensure the noise levels will be in the legal limit and not have an impact on the sleep of local residents? Whilst I do not disagree that there is a need for traveller provision within the city, I don't feel next to a settled community is the place, particularly not in S20. The area already hosts one of the two travellers sites in the city and the burden this places on the community is considerable. To add to this further is unfair and unjust. Secondly, both existing sites are not in residential areas, they fit the requirements of being close to amenities but they are away from housing areas as this proposed site would be, They have set the precedent and to an extent have shown to work well, to deviate from this layout is an error in my opinion. I understand that the over reaching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life for travellers but this is on the caveat that it respects the interest of the settled community in the area, Something that at this moment in time has clearly not been considered. My understanding is an Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be completed on the proposed site, I feel it is a reasonable and common sense approach for this to be carried out before any further allocation to the site is

