

Draft Planning and Design Brief for Housing Sites (C, D, E), Moorthorpe Way, Owlthorpe

Appendix 1 - Public Consultation Comments

- Public consultation on the draft Brief was held from 17 February to 28 March 2014
- The lead Cabinet Member was briefed on 15 January 2014
- Local Ward Members were briefed on 5 February 2014 and invited to the drop-in sessions.

The recent public consultation on the Brief was undertaken in two main ways:

- (i) Two public drop in sessions held in Owlthorpe, 21 February and 7 March 2014;
- (ii) A mailshot was sent out to existing contacts via email; and
- (iii) Leaflets were delivered to around 1800 households in the local area.

The Brief was available on the Council's website and in the local library for people to read at home and send in comments.

There were 69 respondents to the consultation. Some made just one comment, others made numerous. The consultees ranged from individuals, households and organisations.

The comments received have been broadly grouped into the following categories alongside officer's responses and subsequent proposed changes to the Brief. Responses from consultees ranged from a single issue to numerous issues.

The public will have further opportunities to comment and influence the proposed development as part of the planning application process for the site.

Not all of the comments made were within the scope of the Planning and Design Brief; some were issues that have been passed to the Council's Property team (as landowner) to pursue.

Owlthorpe Planning and Design Brief		Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
Objection in principle	7	The site has been identified as being appropriate for new housing development in the development plan, so the principle of residential development is established and generally accepted. They were originally identified through the Mosborough Townships proposal from the late 60s and early 70s. The development of sites C, D and E was due to follow the completion of sites A and B (the Woodland Heights development) but was delayed until now.	No change to draft Brief.	
Support in principle subject to highways issues being addressed/link road being created; Building the link road in the early stages of development would reduce disruption. This is the only time that this link road will be considered. Unlikely that SCC would build this link after these developments are complete.	5	The link road is desirable but cannot be enforced through Planning. Furthermore, securing its delivery, especially as third party land is required, could take time. In Planning and Highways terms, development can commence without the link road.	No change to draft Brief.	
Highways, access, air quality and road safety				
Objection to the creation of the link road	10	The link road is desirable in terms of creating better permeability through the area and linking residents to the north with the new development and the medical centre. However, this needs to be balanced against issues such as the impact on the natural environment including ancient woodland.	No change to draft Brief.	
Support the creation of the link road; additionally roads needs to be improved/widened to cope with extra traffic In addition, Owlthorpe Local and Natural History Group believe that a Gateway Bridge Structure over the Ochre Dyke could be constructed with minimum damage to the woodland and accommodate the Owlthorpe Heritage & Nature Trail passing underneath it.	17	The link road would provide an alternative route into and out of the development sites and Woodland Heights. Any required improvements to existing roads will be identified through the Planning process, using tools such as the Transport Assessment. Should a link be provided, detailed design options would need to be explored and developed. Options could a ford or a bridge as suggested by the Owlthorpe Local and Natural History Group.	Add the need for development of design options for crossing the Dyke.	
Not necessarily in support of proposals, however, the link road should be built before/if plans are to go ahead	2	As above.	No change to draft Brief.	

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Queries regarding whether the link road will be built; i.e. Page 14 - 5.2.3 "... This road (Moorthorpe Way) was created to access the whole of the new Owlthorpe Development...". Why does this consultation draft seek to change this? – Please advise.</p>	2	<p>The consultation draft states that the completion of the link road is desirable but not essential for enabling development. This is the Planning position; the final decision will be taken by the Council as land owner.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Concerns regarding volumes of traffic, congestion, delays and access problems; Currently too many traffic lights in the area; Additional concern that extra vehicles using the roads will result in accidents occurring; The project is far too big for road logistics; The existing right turn from Donetsk Way to Moorthorpe Gate is dangerous, there is no right turn lane or right turners traffic light; Concerns regarding accessibility of roads in winter; Concerns regarding stationary traffic causing pollution</p>	23	<p>There are known areas of traffic congestion at peak times on and around the sites. These will be dealt with in more detail through the planning application process, using tools such as the Transport Assessments. Solutions and mitigation against further problems will be explored in detail and could include altering the signals at the junction of Donetsk Way/ Moorthorpe Gate. Highways' advice is that issues are not insurmountable.</p>	Acknowledge the existing areas of congestion and identify the need for a Transport Assessment.
<p>Request that traffic surveys are undertaken</p>	1	<p>A Transport Assessment will be required in support of any planning application and should include survey data.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Concerns regarding speed of traffic in area currently. Traffic calming measures suggested on Moorthorpe Way for example; speed bumps or a speed camera where accessed from Moss Way, and double yellow lines to one side of Moorthorpe Way to ensure traffic flow; Improved pedestrian crossings required joining Donetsk Way and at Moss Way; Propose the introduction of a lower speed limit</p>	5	<p>The development should be designed and promoted as a 20 mph zone. This would be extended to include surrounding roads linking into the development. It is unlikely that traditional traffic calming would be implemented along Moorthorpe Way. Alternative means of speed reduction will be promoted (such as the use of street trees and pinch points).</p>	Add further information to the brief about 20mph zone and traffic calming measures.
<p>Concerns regarding parking issues; i.e. Parked vehicles reduce visibility on Moorthorpe Way. After new houses are built, parked car negotiation issues will increase. The reduced visibility for drivers could result in accidents, especially with the proposed tree lined pavement that children will hide behind and run out from. Suggest two off-street parking bays per dwelling to minimise on-street parking issues.</p>	5	<p>The Brief states that: An adequate amount of on-site parking must be provided for however, although the following maximum number of spaces not exceeded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bedroom 1 space • 2 - 3 bedrooms 2 spaces • 4 - 5 bedrooms 2 - 3 spaces • + 1 space per 4 dwellings for visitors 	No change to draft Brief.

Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Throughout the planning brief the main road through the site is referred to as Moorthorpe Way instead of Moorthorpe Gate. Note that there are two roads called Moorthorpe Way at Owithorpe, originally intended to meet up in the middle. Suggested that these 2 roads are now renamed (i.e. Moorthorpe Way East and Moorthorpe Way West).</p> <p>Suggested that a bus service/bus stop be included in the proposals for the area as the Supertram stop is quite a distance away and the bus route is necessary to provide a service to the Medical Centre, for example.</p> <p>Additional queries; Page 1 – 2.1 States “...offering everyone a range of facilities and services...” Will this include a bus service along Moorthorpe Way? – Please advise.</p> <p>Page 14 - 5.2.4 “...The site’s topography results in a substantial uphill walk (from the tram) to the top part of the site and the medical centre; especially difficult for people with mobility problems...” This could be solved by the two sections of Moorthorpe Way being linked and a bus service through Owithorpe?</p> <p>Additional concerns that if the link road is not connected up to Moorthorpe Way then a new bus service would definitely not be provided. The completion of the link road is key. For example, TM Travel route 55 should be redirected from Broadlands Avenue to the Moorthorpe Way link and in so doing provide a service to the Owithorpe Medical Centre, the three new residential developments to each side of Moorthorpe Way and the existing development at Woodland Heights.</p> <p>Page 14 - 5.2.1 “...There is, however, scope to improve access to the site and surrounding area by</p>	<p>1</p> <p>The main road through the site is called Moorthorpe Way; only the short entrance way is Moorthorpe Gate. The signage on the ground is misleading.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>The Local Authority is working with the Passenger Transport Executive (PTE) to establish the likelihood of a bus service being created or diverted along Moorthorpe Way should the link road be completed. Diversion of an existing route is a possibility. Without the link road, a bus service is unlikely.</p>	<p>Include the update regarding PTE discussions in the Brief.</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
bus." Would this require the two sections of Moorhorpe Way to be linked? – Please advise			
Page 35 - D1 "...should be designed to promote public transport..." Moorhorpe Way..." This could be achieved by the two sections of Moorhorpe Way being linked and a bus service through Owthorpe?	6	The Council liaises with SYPTE who in turn consult with bus and tram operators about any proposed new developments. Discussions about this issue are ongoing.	No change to draft Brief but note that discussions with SYPTE are ongoing.
Supertram must be improved to serve the area. i.e. Concerns regarding the development causing overcrowding on Supertram as it is already busy at peak times; More trams required at peak times.	3	Several options for the use of the site adjacent to the tram stop have emerged.	Include this option in the brief.
A car park/park and ride next to the Supertram stop would be welcome in order to avoid on-street parking narrowing the streets.	4	A park and ride facility is not currently proposed but could be considered alongside other options for the site. An advantage of allowing parking along Moorhorpe Way is that it slows traffic.	No change to draft Brief.
Oppose a park and ride scheme due to traffic creation, it would look unsightly, is not required, would impact on green space and would be located on Gas Mains.	5	Large developments such as this usually have planning conditions attached to them which deal with such issues.	No change to draft Brief.
Concerns regarding and traffic during/caused by construction of the site. i.e. access to Medical Centre; general nuisance and condition of the roads during construction; Tyre washing needs to be strictly enforced; Site traffic should be prevented from using Moorhorpe Way due to noise and dirt from traffic as well as danger from heavy fast traffic; Query how the works will affect the roads in the local vicinity? Will they be repaired when the works are completed?	10	The impact of the new Asda will be factored in to Transport Assessments.	Identify the new Asda proposal in the brief.
Concerns about traffic levels in the area when the new Asda store opens.	1	Comment noted.	No change to draft Brief.
The Highways Agency state that it is not considered that the site would have a significant impact on the M1.	6	The established routes are to be retained.	Amend the keys on the plans. Correct route of bridleway.
Concerns regarding the impact on the new woodland footpaths/cycle routes; The walking/cycling route should not be moved going through site E as it is very well used by the local community; Would be			

Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>beneficial to upgrade footpath to Crystal Peaks and Rother Valley Park into a cycle route;</p> <p>Query whether a heritage trail can include recognition of Moorthorpe Colliery?</p> <p>The cycle route should be maintained along the link road to Moorthorpe Way;</p> <p>Page 7 – The map refers to "...Walking /Cycling Routes..." This is in fact a Bridle Way.</p> <p>Page 37 - The reference to the "Heritage route" are in fact the bridle way. The Owlthorpe Heritage and Nature Trail should be added to this map.</p> <p>The proposed new bridle way link from the Owlthorpe Heritage and Nature Trail to the existing bridle way should be shown on this map.</p> <p>Development design, size and density</p>	<p>This cannot be included as a specific requirement in the Brief but could feed in to any improvements to the heritage trail.</p> <p>We cannot make changes at present to the development plan.</p> <p>This comment refers to the development plan which cannot be changed at present.</p> <p>Key to be amended.</p>	
<p>Pleased with the low density proposal</p> <p>Concerns that the proposals amount to overdevelopment of the site; Needs to be the smallest number of dwellings possible (no flats) – 200 max</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The draft Brief puts forward a case for development that is lower than the density range required for the site, due to the site's semi-rural location. However, development still needs to make efficient use of the land. There is no scope in Planning terms to ban the development of apartments although they would not be permitted to make up more than 50% of the units on site (and commercial advice is that there would be a very limited market for apartments).</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p> <p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Welcome the idea of a boulevard feel on Moorthorpe Rise.</p> <p>Query why the Moor Valley site is marked as housing development as this has just been changed to cattle fields?</p>	<p>The Moor Valley site was allocated for housing development in the UDP. However, it was not required to be brought forward for development and was subsequent designated as Countryside Area: Non Green Belt. This site, together with numerous other non-allocated sites (including in the Green Belt), may however</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p> <p>No change to draft Brief.</p>

Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Imperative that a consolidated community that works as one is created. We have to make sure that conflicting or widely opposing housing/families are not placed together to create a melting pot.</p> <p>Understand that the housing types/sizes will be under the control of the developer. However, the draft proposal document proposes specific (if conflicting) DPHs for the area. The suggested layout on page 37 shows high-density (smaller) dwellings facing Moorthorpe Way. This is in conflict to the detached houses facing the road further up the road (Moorthorpe Rise). If two conflicting community demographics are positioned side-by-side, there will be problems. We need to ensure that the new housing and families moving to the area, fit in with make-up of the area.</p> <p>New developments should enhance or complement the existing community.</p> <p>The planning of Owlthorpe was extremely poor with development in four peripheral areas with no sense of community. The connection of Moorthorpe Way is the key to this feeling of community.</p>	<p>need to be considered again for proposed development as part of the Local Plan Review, given the current shortfall in Sheffield's housing land supply.</p> <p>The site is outside the scope of the Brief and its current use is noted.</p> <p>The exact housing mix will be determined by the developer and may include a mix of different sized homes for sale on the open market. Affordable housing is normally spread through the site.</p> <p>The urban design framework positions higher density development along the main route through the site. These units are not necessarily smaller; they could be higher for example.</p> <p>New development in the area should reduce the isolation of the Woodland Heights development.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief. (although the section on affordable housing will be expanded to include the definition of affordable housing and changes from the IPG)</p>
<p>Concern at how little green space within the estates is factored into the design. i.e. trees and shrubs should be included within the development sites to provide a softening of the hard lines of the development.</p>	<p>A landscape strategy will form part of a Planning application.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
Page 35 - L1 "...a new character..." What does this mean? Why do we want to change the character of Owlthorpe? The residents have an expectation that the buildings within the development should be in keeping with the current developed areas of Owlthorpe and not fundamentally change the character of Owlthorpe.	1	There is no intention to change the character of Owlthorpe. Any new development of this scale will inevitably have its own, new character but the key is to ensure that it must complement and where possible enhance the existing character of the area. A key premise of the Brief is to ensure that new development respects, protects and enhances the natural environment whilst promoting high quality buildings.	No change to draft Brief.
Concerns that the link road may cut us off from the historic woodland.	1	The impact on the ancient woodland is a consideration in relation to the provision of a link road.	No change to draft Brief.
Clarification needed on the 80% "green roof" statement?	1	This guideline is within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document "Climate Change and Design", although in practice green roofs can only generally be implemented on flat roofs e.g. garages, and this, together with the perceived liability for maintenance of them, has meant that the 80% figure is flexibly applied as a guideline only.	No change to draft Brief.
Page 1 – 2.1 Is there a specification for the "...high quality buildings and spaces..."? – Please advise	1	There is nothing specific for this site but development proposals will be assessed against the Building For Life standard that seeks high quality development and public realm etc.	No change to draft Brief.
Queries regarding infrastructure; will road layouts have adequate signage?; along bridle paths/woodland paths, will there be signs, lights, dog waste bins and access for wheelchairs, prams and guide dog and handlers?; Street lighting on all public footpaths should be included; Query whether play areas will have fencing gates and suitable materials?	2	This level of detail will be worked up as part of a planning application.	No change to draft Brief.
Play needs to be provided early or it will not happen.	1	The Brief states the desire to provide play early on.	No change to draft Brief.
Page 3 - 3.2.4 States "...Moorthorpe Way is over designed for its current function..." That is because its current function is not its intended function which was to carry a public bus service – Please explain.	1	Modern highway design standards would suggest that the design of the existing roads is a little excessive but the change in standards is only fairly modest, and there remains the potential to link it through.	No change to draft Brief.
The "possible future extension of Site C" is only shown on 1 plan, which does not allow fair comment. It should be shown on all plans if the intention is to allow building on this site	1	The "possible extension" that is shown includes part of the UDP allocated housing area but is an area of grassland, is a suggestion only. The Council's property team (as landowner) will take a view on whether or not to pursue development on the land.	No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
Design should take account of the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide.	1	Agree	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Type of housing, affordable housing</p> <p>Queries regarding the tenure of the houses to be built, i.e. what percentage will be for private sale and what percentage will be affordable housing and where will these be located? Will any houses be rented through Housing Associations?; Query how property developers will be prevented from buying up all the houses?</p> <p>Query whether the social housing aspect of this development will take the form of funds from the developer to buy social housing at a location that is not necessarily within Owthorpe, rather than provision of actual physical buildings in the new development for the purpose of social housing? Please confirm whether this is the case or explain the actual strategy in more details.</p>	9	Affordable housing will be provided in line with the Council's Interim Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing (updated 2014).	Update the Brief in line with proposed changes to the affordable housing IPG. Include a definition of Affordable Housing.
Query regarding the number of houses (and flats) to be built and the number of bedrooms they will have?; Query regarding dates of possible build and completion?	4	The developer will determine the mix of properties. The timescales for promoting the site and development are outside the scope of the brief – they will be determined by Property team (landowner) and developer (once appointed). It is anticipated that the vast majority of new housing will be private for sale. There will be an element of affordable housing in line with planning policy.	No change to draft Brief.
Private housing would be preferable; Concerns regarding the percentage of affordable housing and the type of residents this may attract (drug dealing already an issue); Concerns about the type of housing being built and the devaluation of current properties.	6	The exact mix of house types on site will be determined by the developer. The council requires that 25% of new homes are built to Mobility Homes standards.	No change to draft Brief.
Queries regarding the numbers of dwellings for older people and disabled people; Dwellings/accommodation for older people suggested to balance the community, providing they are not several stories high; Query whether	6		No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
retirement housing will be included?; Query how many dwellings are bungalows for disabled families?; Ensure that the design and fitting out of new homes is suitable for the disabled.			
Welcome new houses and families into our community. Woodland Heights is a modern leafy suburb for affluent local families. A mix of housing is required. It is important to have aspirational provision as well as social housing for the less fortunate, to keep these people within the Mosborough Townships. New development should enhance and compliment the Woodland Heights area. Plots C, D and E should provide similar housing to attract like-minded families to create a single Owithorpe community	2	The exact housing mix will be determined by the developer. There will be an element of affordable housing, in line with policy.	No change to draft Brief.
Residential amenity			
The proposals would spoil the view from residential properties.	2	It is acknowledged that the new development will change the view of the sites. Loss of a view is not a planning consideration but careful thought will be given to how the development fits into the location.	No change to draft Brief.
Concerns regarding impact of the building works. i.e. regarding dust emissions. Will residents be compensated?	2	Large developments such as this usually have Planning conditions attached to them which deal with such issues. Financial compensation for inconvenience caused is not a requirement.	No change to draft Brief.
Concerns regarding the impact on residents on the Stoneacre and Leebrook estates where the impact of new housing will be most felt.	1	Impacts of new development on existing are assessed and taken into account when considering and determining planning applications.	No change to draft Brief.
Doctors facilities			
Query whether Doctors and dentists can cope with extra demand? What impact will the increased numbers have on appointments and the standard of care at the medical centre?; The medical centre capacity needs to be increased, currently difficult to get appointment and long waits to see a doctor of choice.	5	A lot will depend upon who registers where, how many are new patients, exactly when the development goes ahead, etc. Discussions with the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group are ongoing.	No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>The surgery should form the focal point of the new development. Play should be located with it.</p>	1	<p>This is one option for the location of play facilities.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Schools Suggested that a primary school be included in the proposals - the nearest primary school is Rainbow Forge and this is quite a walk away. If a primary school was included children living on the south side of Donetsk Way could attend thus saving parents driving children to school and causing traffic problems on Beighton Road; Query how many children of school age are expected on this development? Can the local schools accommodate the increase? Concerns that schools are already full and there is no 6th form at Birley School; Query whether there will be any new schools or whether existing schools will be expected to pick up the increase in pupil population alone?</p>	5	<p>Education use an average yield calculation of 3 pupils per year group per 100 houses. The Owthorpe development is likely to be in the region of 250-300 new homes. Further assessment will be carried out as part of the planning application process but at present there is no suggestion that an increase in pupil numbers cannot be accommodated.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Sewerage, drainage and utilities Concerns regarding the high number of houses to be linked to existing sewerage and utility services and whether this will affect existing houses; Query whether the sewerage and water network is sufficiently sized or whether it has to be upgraded? This will again have an impact on traffic congestion due to road works.</p>	2	<p>Yorkshire Water has been consulted over the Brief. Their advice is that the sites are greenfield and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) should be the preferred option for disposal of surface water, followed by discharge to watercourse. Any proposed discharge to public sewer, even at a heavily attenuated rate, must be the subject of consultation with Yorkshire Water (as well as Sheffield Council). The sewage treatment capacity at Woodhouse Mill has been increased to accommodate development at Owthorpe and elsewhere.</p>	<p>Include this information in the Brief.</p>
<p>Concerns about communications infrastructure and requests for better broadband /Wi-Fi internet connections, sockets etc. (i.e. to enable home working).</p>	5	<p>This is not a Planning issue.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Page 5 - Is there a map showing the "...60m easement..." for high voltage power lines? – Please advise</p>	1	<p>This is shown in Fig. 19 of the Brief. Current government advice is that new residential development should not be located within 60m of high voltage power lines.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Regarding drainage, the Environment Agency are satisfied with the information provided in section 5.8 and Appendix 5; any surface water scheme should also be designed to store the calculated flows for a 1 in 100 year return period with an allowance of 30% for climate change without causing flooding to property or adjacent land; the site layout for any future development should be designed to shed surface water flows away from properties; surface water run-off should be controlled as near as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface management (SUDS) - the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS provided that options are feasible, can be adopted, properly maintained and would not lead to other environmental problems.</p>	1	Comment noted.	No change to draft Brief.
Ecology			
<p>Concerns about the threat to wildlife; i.e. Badgers seen in site E (exact location unknown). Adders seen in site D.</p>	8	An ecological assessment will be required as part of a Planning application. This should include mitigation measures.	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Support the retention of woodland in the proposals; Support the extensive areas of Green Infrastructure proposed;</p>	3	Comments noted.	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Support that the projects delivered in the area over the past 5 years, such as the hedgerows and cattle stockades, have been left intact.</p>			
<p>Concerns about the threat to ancient woodland which would be taken over by developments and the precedent that this would set, and the threat to natural flora and fauna; The land should be set aside as a nature area/woodland. Owthorpe Local and Natural History Group have recorded seven ancient woodland indicators in these areas.</p>	11	<p>An Ecological Assessment will be required in order to establish the impact of proposals once they are developed. Mitigation measures will also be identified.</p> <p>Recent environmental projects in Owthorpe have focussed on land outside the development boundaries (which have been established for a number of years).</p>	Identify the opportunity to improve or provide further habitats in the Brief.

Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Concerns regarding the impact of the development on Owlthorpe Community Forum and Owlthorpe Local & Natural History Group's environmental projects.</p> <p>The Brief could ensure better ecological outcomes, and more sustainable development, by explicitly requiring the creation of multi-functional GI including new priority habitats alongside more formal areas of open space, as required by paras 17 and 114 of the NPPF and its Annex.</p> <p>The site borders deciduous woodland priority habitat to the north (Ochre Dike Ancient Woodland) and south (Westfield Plantation) and a local wildlife site to the west. As required by NPPF para 117, the Brief should explicitly require integration of new and existing priority habitats (grassland or deciduous woodland) to strengthen the biodiversity network, essential for wildlife to adapt to the effects of climate change and human activity.</p> <p>Alongside the creation of multi-functional GI on the edges of Owlthorpe, swales and SUDs provide opportunities to create smaller biodiversity networks within the developable area. This should be recognised within the Brief.</p> <p>Query regarding what protecting arrangements are in place for the wildlife and any wild flowers? Assuming an assessment of this sort has already been made to cover this?</p> <p>The impact on the ecology of the sites is being downplayed.</p> <p>Query regarding whether the woodland buffer zones are big enough?</p>	<p>The woodland buffers are standard distances needed to avoid harm to the trees.</p> <p>A landscape strategy will be developed as part of a planning application. The extent of any off site works has not been agreed and is too detailed for the scope of the Brief.</p>	

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Concerns generally about pollution. i.e. the proposed development site falls into the Sheffield Air Quality Management Area. How can another 300+ houses, each with a car, adding more emissions to this be justified?</p>	2	<p>Owlthorpe does not have significant air quality issues compared with other parts of the city. However, an Air Quality Impact Assessment with an associated Traffic Impact Assessment will be required when a planning application is submitted.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Additional comments for clarification; Page 9 - 4.3.3 States "...UDP Proposals Map (Fig.6)..." and "...Site F Moor Valley..." and "...now designated as Countryside Area..." Also 4.3.5 States "...the UDP Proposals Map in this case carries limited weight..." Is this area at risk of development? – Please advise why has it not been re-designated as Phase 2 of the Owlthorpe Grassland Grazing Project?</p> <p>Query why site "F" remains as countryside and not one or more of the other three sites to ease the burden of traffic?</p> <p>Additionally, the ground survey work is underway. I have had sight of a map showing where pits are to be dug. From this map it is obvious that you have no intention of connecting up the road. The footprint has been extended into Phase 1 of the Owlthorpe Grassland Grazing Project with a hole planned to be dug in the field where we have had 15 Highland Cattle grazing this year. This area must not be included in the footprint of the site.</p> <p>We constructed this field taking into account the development plans at that time which included the road connection with the area for housing development terminating at the inside radius of the new section of road.</p> <p>Page 11 - 4.2.2 "...by the planting..." should refer to all of the land covered by the Owlthorpe Forest Setting.</p>	2	<p>The Moor Valley site was allocated for housing development in the UDP. However, it was not required to be brought forward for development and was subsequent designated as Countryside Area: Non Green Belt. This site, together with numerous other non-allocated sites (including in the Green Belt), may however need to be considered again for proposed development as part of the Local Plan Review, given the current shortfall in Sheffield's housing land supply. The grazing project is not something that would appear on a development plan but clearly if any land is subject to an environmental project then this would need to be taken into account when assessing that land's suitability for development.</p> <p>The development boundary of site C does not extend as far south as that shown in the UDP. The "possible extension" that is shown includes part of the UDP allocated housing area but is an area of grassland, is a suggestion only and may well be deemed not to be appropriate for development.</p> <p>See comments above regarding link road.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Page 7 - The map does not show Green Corridors, the Owlthorpe Heritage and Nature Trail or the Owlthorpe Forest Setting. – Please Explain.</p>		<p>The map on page 7 is from the development plan and cannot currently be altered. Furthermore, it only shows statutory designations.</p>	
<p>Open space</p>			
<p>This is a lovely and unspoilt valley and once it is developed it will never be able to be turned back; Query why the development is necessary here given there are other Sheffield (brownfield) sites that could be developed before this greenfield site; Empty homes should be brought back into use as a priority over the development of greenfield land; The land you want to build on, and indeed the land which has already been built on, was designated green belt</p> <p>Object out of appreciation for this open, accessible bit of countryside in the midst of development, it is managed by the community and is of educational use; Concerns regarding restrictions to walking/dog walking on open fields and woodland</p>	9	<p>The city, along with many other local authority areas around the country, does not have sufficient housing land to meet future household growth forecasts. Even with the allocation of long-standing sites such as at Owlthorpe for housing, the Council still needs to find additional housing sites in order to meet housing needs. The city's housing needs cannot be met just by building on brownfield sites and by reducing the number of empty homes. The Owlthorpe sites were allocated in the UDP in 1998 and went through various stages of consultation as part of the Sheffield Development Framework (SDF) and Local Plan process, attracting very little objection to their development, and are suitable, available and deliverable for new housing development in accordance with national planning policy.</p>	
<p>The land behind Donetsk Way tram stop should be developed as a community green space, e.g. a communal garden. A number of trees have already been planted there.</p>	1	<p>The tree planting has been noted and the site has been suggested as a possible location for play.</p>	<p>Include as an option for use of the site in 5.12 of the Brief.</p>
<p>Page 17 - 5.4.1 "...UDP Policy H16..." Will the local community have a say in how this contribution is spent? – Please advise.</p>	1	<p>Contributions must be related to the development and how they are spent is determined by a process involving the relevant Council Officers (Development Management, Environmental Planning and Parks), the Local Area Partnerships and local ward councillors. The local community can influence the process by lobbying local ward councillors (and by commenting at public consultations such as this).</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Recreation facilities and local infrastructure</p>			
<p>Support a new children's play area, or modernisation of the current park located on the Edenthorpe Estate</p>	1	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Support new children's play facilities generally.</p>	8	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>Remove the preferred location for children's play – more flexible</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Play area should be modelled on Oxclose Park.</p> <p>Support location of play facility (next to the medical centre).</p> <p>A second play area should be included near the bottom of the hill, more accessible to residents on the other side of Donetsk Way.</p> <p>Query how can you ensure that the playground remains in good repair?</p> <p>The playground should have an extensive range of equipment for a large number of children of varying ages.</p> <p>Parking bays for the play area should be provided.</p>		<p>Proposals will be developed and influenced by what there is a need for in the area.</p> <p>The location is flexible.</p> <p>It is unlikely that more than one play area will be provided. The location could be such that new facilities are easily accessed by residents to the north of Donetsk Way.</p> <p>It is likely that the developer will be required to manage and maintain the play facility.</p> <p>Comment noted. Proposals will be developed and influenced by what there is a need for in the area.</p> <p>The need for parking will depend on the location of the play area.</p>	<p>approach. Add that Proposals will be developed and influenced by what there is a need for in the area.</p>
<p>Oppose new children's play facilities generally.</p>	3	<p>There is a lack of play facilities in the area which has a high amount of family housing.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Oppose proposed location of play facility (next to the medical centre and near houses).</p> <p>Additionally, Page 17 - 5.4.2 "...children's play..." "...the medical centre..." This would not be a good location if the Moorthorpe Way link was not completed. The dead ends that currently exist because the road has not been completed are a magnet for fly tipping, drinking, drug dealing and sexual activity. This is evidenced by our observations and the detritus collected on our litter picks.</p>	9	<p>Several possible locations for play facilities have come out of the consultation. Land by the medical centre is an option.</p>	<p>Remove the preferred location for children's play – more flexible approach</p>
<p>Support new children's play facilities in a different location on the site.</p>	5	<p>Several locations for play facilities have come out of the consultation.</p>	<p>Remove the preferred location for children's play – more flexible approach</p>

Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Children's play area should be sited with clear view of housing with no big trees to provide cover for the drug dealers.</p> <p>Other recreational facilities suggested; i.e. low maintenance sports facilities would help local teenagers. i.e. a skate park suggested.</p> <p>The proposals cover part of the football pitch. Local children have had great use of the only pitch at no cost for many years. Developers do not seem to consider what is already there, or how much use it gets. Local residents have maintained the upkeep of the pitch for many years. I cannot see anything on the design that replaces it? This is an area with lots of children left with nothing to do.</p> <p>Suggested that a surfaced football pitch be included in the proposals.</p>	<p>Proposals for the play area will be developed along with the housing proposals.</p> <p>It is assumed that this comment refers to the kick pitch located outside the development boundary. It is the intention that it is retained.</p>	<p>Add that Proposals will be developed and influenced by what there is a need for in the area.</p>
1	The layout of site C should provide overlooking of the kick pitch which should make it feel safer to use.	No change to draft Brief.
2	The sites are allocated for housing.	No change to draft Brief.
3	The sites are allocated for housing. Should such a proposal come forward, this would be considered on its merits.	
5	The sites are allocated for housing. Should such a proposal come forward, this would be considered on its merits.	
2	The sites are allocated for housing.	
2	The sites are allocated for housing.	
1	The sites are allocated for housing.	
2	Should a proposal for a pub come forward as part of a small commercial development, issues such as traffic would be considered as part of a planning application.	No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
Suggestions for commercial development including a family pub or restaurant	2	Sites C, D and E covered by the Brief are to be promoted as residential sites. However, there is scope for a pub to be included as part of a future phase of commercial development as discussed in 5.12 of the brief.	No change to draft Brief.
Request a for a cashpoint ATM.	1	This cannot be required through the Brief but could form part of a commercial proposal at a later date.	No change to draft Brief.
Site of allotments with north facing slope not ideal	1	Allotments are one idea and the suggested location is flexible.	No change to draft Brief.
Question whether a commercial development will be viable.	1	Commercial development will not happen if it is not viable. The Brief covers the possibility that at some point there may be a local demand.	No change to draft Brief.
Retail / Commercial Development			
A shop (newsagent/convenience store) would be welcomed generally.	4	Commercial sites are not being promoted currently, but a market may emerge in the medium to long term.	No change to draft Brief.
Shops generally not required given the new Asda and Crystal Peaks 500m away.	4	If commercially unviable, they are unlikely to be delivered.	No change to draft Brief.
Support a convenience store by the tram stop; Concerns about a shop being located on the estate next to the medical centre.	4	The medical centre would not be the most accessible location for people to the north of Donetsk Way. Land closer to the tram stop would be more accessible.	No change to draft Brief.
Concerns regarding commercial premises by the tram stop due to traffic, loitering youngsters and drug dealing.	4	Issues of people gathering in the area are understood. The site by the tram stop is constrained by the gas pipes and further work is required to understand how much of the site is developable.	Add further information into the Brief regarding gas mains.
In addition, the site is on the Green Corridor, this area of green land has been maintained by local community volunteers together with SCC, Parks& Countryside including the planting of eleven mature trees, and it is on top Gas Mains.		The tree planting is acknowledged. An alternative proposal for the site is to use it as a location for play facilities or park and ride.	
Must consult on identified commercial developments.	1	If proposals for commercial development develop, consultation will happen as part of the Planning process.	No change to draft Brief.
Suggestion for a supermarket or garden centre for example.	1	Small scale retail would be considered (for the potential commercial sites)	No change to draft Brief.
Strongly opposed to commercial (quoted industrial) usage on any site.	2	There is no mention of industrial use in the Brief. Some commercial use may be acceptable as discussed in section 5.12 of the draft Brief.	No change to draft Brief.

Other issues	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Concerns regarding youth/anti-social behaviour/drug dealing problem in area; i.e. the dead ends that currently exist because the road has not been completed are a magnet for fly tipping, drinking, drug dealing and sexual activity.</p> <p>Concerns that the proposals will increase the likelihood of crime; Issue in Woodland Heights estate of burglary, car theft and items being stolen from cars. Depending on the houses built on plots C, D and E, this may continue in the new developments too. Suggest that CCTV cameras linked to the Police are installed at the entry to Moorthorpe Way and near to the proposed playground area.</p>	10	<p>Applying the urban design principles discussed in the brief (such as development fronting onto open space) should help to reduce the behaviour described.</p> <p>The Brief is unable to require the installation of CCTV – this is not a Planning issue.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Concerns regarding the consultation process, very limited. Development is being imposed on local residents; Urge SCC to listen to the people of this area and re-think plans. Can you provide evidence that you are prepared to hear our voice and that this whole project is not only to “ensure that the enhanced capital value can be realised within a short time-scale” i.e. prioritising the maximisation of the profitability of development to make it a more attractive proposition to any potential developer.</p>	3	<p>Consultation about the allocation of the sites for housing took place as part of the local plan process. The consultation about the Planning Brief, which has been publicised by door to door leafleting, is the start of consultation about the development of the sites. The consultation ran for 6 weeks, allowing plenty of time for comment.</p> <p>Realising a capital receipt for the sites is just one of the aims of the process. Achieving quality, sustainable development is a high priority of the Brief.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Suggested a reduction in Council Tax while construction taking place.</p>	1	<p>The Planning and Design Brief cannot influence Council Tax.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Query how planning conditions will be enforced?</p>	1	<p>There is an enforcement team within the Planning Service which follows up any complaints about suspected non-compliance with Planning Conditions.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Requested to see a copy of the surveys, drilling reports and tests etc. that have been undertaken.</p>	1	<p>Background information and supporting submissions will be available for the public to view as part of a planning application.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Query why it is necessary to “complete the Owlthorpe Township” as this land was originally going to be a school?</p>	1	<p>The land is not required for a new school. The sites are allocated for housing which there is a need for in the city.</p>	No change to draft Brief.

Querying whether the lie of the road/old mine workings/marshiness will affect landslips of properties in future? Query regarding safety measures for the water sump/collection sites? Concerns regarding extension of the building site through pressure from developers and activity outside of the footprint of the building site including the movement of construction equipment and the dumping of construction waste. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, the Coal Authority would seek prior extraction of the coal, removing any potential land instability problems. The site has been subjected to coal mining. Whilst most past mining is generally benign, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered by development. Development should recognise these problems and how they can be positively addressed. Coal Mining Referral Area' is however not the up-to-date categorisation. The terminology now used following feedback is called 'Coal Mining Development High Risk Area' which people find clearer to understand. If you wanted to cite more detail in the brief to help the implementation of the site you could add: Parts of site C, D and E are underlain by a coal outcrop which may also have potentially been worked in the past. A Coal Mining Risk Assessment will need to be undertaken to assess the impact of mining legacy and determine what mitigation measures may need to be undertaken. Given the nature of the risks	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
Querying whether the lie of the road/old mine workings/marshiness will affect landslips of properties in future? Query regarding safety measures for the water sump/collection sites?	1	Full ground investigations and mitigation proposals will be required. Coal Authority has not objected to allocating the sites for housing. This will be considered in the design of the landscape.	No change to draft Brief.
Concerns regarding extension of the building site through pressure from developers and activity outside of the footprint of the building site including the movement of construction equipment and the dumping of construction waste.	1	Large developments such as this usually have Planning conditions attached to them which deal with such issues. Any extension to the building site would require permission from Sheffield City Council.	No change to draft Brief.
The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, the Coal Authority would seek prior extraction of the coal, removing any potential land instability problems. The site has been subjected to coal mining. Whilst most past mining is generally benign, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered by development. Development should recognise these problems and how they can be positively addressed. Coal Mining Referral Area' is however not the up-to-date categorisation. The terminology now used following feedback is called 'Coal Mining Development High Risk Area' which people find clearer to understand. If you wanted to cite more detail in the brief to help the implementation of the site you could add: Parts of site C, D and E are underlain by a coal outcrop which may also have potentially been worked in the past. A Coal Mining Risk Assessment will need to be undertaken to assess the impact of mining legacy and determine what mitigation measures may need to be undertaken. Given the nature of the risks	1	Comments noted.	Brief to be amended to reflect recent information from the coal authority.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>present it may be necessary to undertake intrusive site investigations to determine the significance of risk.</p> <p>Concern that the Community Funding element collected for the site might not be spent here and could be used elsewhere in the city.</p>	1	<p>Appendix 7 provides further information on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). CIL is collected and put into a city-wide pot and could be spent elsewhere within the city, depending on overall priorities.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Query whether the standard of the local schools will attract developers and the target owners of higher value properties?</p>	1	<p>Whilst access to and standards in local schools appear to be locational factors in decision-making by some property purchasers it is not possible to predict or quantify the impact of these. It is also not possible to predict how developers will view local schools and there will be many other issues that developers will focus upon. .</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Additional queries including; Page 1 – 1.1 What are “... Other sites with medium to long term development...”? – Please advise.</p> <p>Page 12 - 5.0.3 What is the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)? – Please advise.</p> <p>How is it different to Section 106 (S106)? – Please advise.</p> <p>Page 19 - 5.4.8 “...according to local priorities...” Who defines local priorities? - Please advise.</p> <p>Page 20 - 5.6.3 “...demonstrate that the scheme of sound attenuation installed achieves the required levels...” What is the scheme of sound attenuation? - Please advise.</p>	1	<p>These are the sites adjacent to Donetsk Way put forward as an idea for commercial development and the Moor Valley site.</p> <p>CIL will largely replace S106 from 2015. It is a charge per m² of development that is used to provide infrastructure within the city. Appendix 7 of the Brief provides further information.</p> <p>Background levels of noise in this predominantly residential area are likely to be low. The kind of measures for sound attenuation are likely to relate to the fabric of the new homes, their ventilation, glazing, etc. although each planning application is decided on its individual merits and a noise survey carried out as part of the planning application process. Acoustic screens/fences can be considered but are generally only used in extreme cases and in areas where there are significant noise sources.</p>	No change to draft Brief.

This page is intentionally left blank