

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

#### 1. Application Number: 11/03972/FUL

**Address: Sandstone Road.**

#### **Additional Representations.**

Twenty two late representations objecting to the proposal including ones from, David Blunkett MP, Councillor Price, Sheffield Ramblers, and RESCUE – The British Archaeological Trust have been submitted. These mainly repeat the points already covered in the summary of representations.

A petition signed by 1 person against the proposal has been received. The grounds of objection are “We call on you to preserve this much-abused historic site for Sheffield and for the nation so that current and future generations can benefit from a highly-valued educational, recreational and environmental resource and understand how it relates to the heritage of the region. This site has been neglected and dumped on in order to impede access but it is a path that has been trodden for thousands of years. Please preserve this special place”.

New points raised in the additional representations include.

The community would like to get a grant to purchase the site and turn it into green space and play space.

The community and city council has agreed to the site being designated as open space through the development plan process, and more recently rejected it as a site for inclusion within Additional Site Allocations Options for housings, since when nothing has changed.

The officer’s judgement that the site is not of high amenity value is subjective. The hillside is of high amenity value for residents who lack open space in the Grimesthrope area on Skelwith Road/Rothay Road or Wensley St/Upwell St. areas.

English Heritages comments are standard ones saying that they do not wish to comment and that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of specialist conservation advice. This is different from the committee report which says they have not objected to the proposal.

There is speculation about the original ground levels on the site suggesting that the archaeological investigation could not have reached natural ground level.

Reference is made to old photographs and historic accounts in respect of the alignment of the Roman Ridge.

Wincobank Hill has the potential to be important in attracting visitors to Sheffield.

### **Response to additional representations.**

This application has to be considered on its merits and the fact that other proposals could be brought forward is not a reason for resisting the current scheme.

The open space issues including the development plan allocation and the changes in policy such as the shortfall of a five year supply of housing sites are fully assessed in the report. The site was not proposed as an additional housing site in the Additional Site Allocations Document. This document has little or no weight at the moment and individual planning applications need to be considered on their merits regardless of whether they are included or excluded from this document.

It should be noted that the planning inspector in the 2004 appeal also accepted that there was surplus open space in the locality. He also considered that the quality of open space on the application site contrasted marked with the higher quality open space immediately to the west of the site and concluded that such areas provide local residents with ample opportunities for a range of recreational activities.

The application has been assessed in accordance with the advice set out by English Heritage. It takes into account an archaeology field investigation carried out by professional archaeologists working to a brief prepared in line with the advice from the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service, who advise all the South Yorkshire Authorities on planning applications that have archaeological implications. English Heritage were contact at pre-application stage and during the application, they were provided with copies of the scheme and encouraged to consider the impact on the Scheduled Monument and its setting. If they had any concerns or objections they have had ample opportunity to make these known.

The archaeological investigations were overseen by the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service who were satisfied that natural substrata was reached in the trenches and this is fully documented in the archaeological report.

The photographs and historic accounts referred to about the alignment of the Roman Ridge were reviewed and considered as part of the archaeological assessment. It should be noted that the Council needs to base its decision on whether to grant or refuse permission on evidence. The archaeological investigation does not provide evidence that the Roman Ridge passes or passed through the site. Therefore the Council would not be able to substantiate a case for refusal on this basis.

It should be noted that it is clear from the content of a number of the representations that they are from individuals who have limited understanding of the location of the site or the details of the proposal. A common mis-understanding seems to be that the proposal relates to the hill fort itself or the higher quality public open space around the fort or to the north and west of the site.

### **Amendment to Informatives.**

Directive number 3 on the decision notice is on in error and normally applies to tree works applications affecting Tree Preservation Orders and trees in Conservation Areas. It is not appropriate in this instance and should be removed.

**2. Application Number: 12/01165/FUL**

**Address: Norton Church Halls, Norton Lane**

**Amendments to Conditions**

**Amended Condition 16** – To be amended to read as follows: “...A comprehensive and detailed hard and soft landscape scheme for the site including specifications covering vehicle circulation areas and parking spaces...”

**Amended Condition 28** – List of items to also include; Ridges, Valleys and Rainwater Goods

**Delete Condition 30** – Details instead to be amalgamated into amended Condition 28.

**Amended Condition 27** - To be amended to read as follows: “...proposed natural roofing materials”, (specific reference to slate deleted).

**Add following Condition** - The surface water discharge from the site shall be reduced by at least 30% compared to the existing peak flow and detailed proposals for surface water disposal, including calculations to demonstrate the reduction, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development, or an alternative timeframe to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In the event that the existing discharge arrangements are not known, or if the site currently discharges to a different outlet, then a discharge rate of 5 litres / hectare should be demonstrated. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In order to mitigate against the risk of flooding.

**Amendment to Deadline given for completion of Legal Agreement** - Deadline within the recommendation to be extended to 23 July 2012.

This page is intentionally left blank