

Draft Planning and Design Brief for the Site at Former Westfield School, Westfield Crescent, Mosborough

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 22 January 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 on the 17 February and 4 March 2014; and
- (ii) A mailshot was sent out to existing contacts via email; and
- (iii) Leaflets were delivered to around 1500 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.

The comments received have been broadly grouped into the following categories alongside officers' responses and subsequent proposed changes to the Brief. Responses from consultees ranged from a single issue to numerous issues. In terms of numbers of comments received there were particular concerns regarding highways (in particular about the proposed access to the site and the potential impact of additional traffic on highway and pedestrian safety on the local road network), the potential impact on the residential amenity of existing residents, the design of the development and the type of housing.

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

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Overall comment</p> <p>Generally favourable impression; no objection as long as bungalows are part of the project.</p>	2	<p>Information on density and mix is included in 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of the draft Brief. There is a need for elderly person's accommodation in the area, as well as family housing, and the precise mix and type of dwellings to be provided will be determined by the developer at planning application stage. It could include bungalows.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Outright objection to the development (should be a park instead of being developed).</p>	1	<p>The site has been identified as being appropriate for new housing development in the development plan, and was formerly occupied by a school, so the principle of residential development is established and generally accepted. Informal use of its current function as open space has developed over the years. There is no planning policy requirement to provide informal open space on the site as there is sufficient informal open space in the area. A future developer may, at their discretion, want to provide some open space in a scheme to enhance the proposals or possibly help protect on-site trees; however they would need to provide a suitably funded management and maintenance programme if this was the case.</p>	No change to draft Brief.
<p>Highways, access, road safety, noise pollution</p> <p><i>Congestion/road safety:</i> Sheffield Road, Moss Way, Station Road and High Street already have high levels of traffic, any more will be dangerous; traffic queues currently lead to drivers jumping lights and driving on pavements; road safety in general; increased congestion, including on Mosborough Moor and Station Road and junction with Mossdale Avenue with the number of vehicles increasing by 500-600; increased congestion at Queen Street/Station Road junction; possibly another 300 cars; concern about traffic backing up at Moss Way/Station Road junction; can the road</p>	13	<p>Movement, Transport and Highways issues are included in section 5.2 of the draft Brief.</p> <p>Given the size of the proposed development, a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) is required as part of any planning application for housing on the site. The concerns about highway safety raised with regard the current situation are acknowledged. It will be a requirement of the TA as part of any planning application for the site to assess these issues and propose recommendations to address them; it is likely that some level of pedestrian improvements will be recommended. The TA will determine the impact the development will</p>	<p>Additional wording for new paragraph 5.2.2 as follows:</p> <p>"Following the public consultation events a number of highways issues have been raised as concerns by local residents. Some of these concerns relate to the proposed access to the site and highway and pedestrian safety, including at the junction of Moss Way and Station Road. It will be a requirement of the Transport Assessment (TA) as part</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>network support additional traffic?</p>		<p>have on vehicle movement at nearby junctions, which may then require mitigation works. However, it is anticipated that special attention should be given to the junction of Station Road and Moss Way; if the development is projected to have a significant negative effect on this junction in particular, there may be a need for substantial mitigation works by the developer. There may also be a need (depending on anticipated transport modes) for contributions to public transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>of any planning application for the site to assess these issues and propose recommendations to address them; it is likely that some level of pedestrian improvements will be recommended. The TA will also determine the impact the development will have on vehicle movement at nearby junctions, which may then require mitigation works. However, it is anticipated that special attention should be given to the junction of Station Road and Moss Way; if the development is projected to have a significant negative effect on this junction in particular, there may be a need for substantial mitigation works by the developer. There may also be a need (depending on anticipated transport modes) for contributions to public transport infrastructure."</p>
<p>Access : Moss Way access should be further down Moss Way with joint access to sports fields; Moss Way has lighter traffic (than Mosborough Moor) so it's good that greatest volume of traffic access is predicted to be off Moss Way; path needed along Moss Way where new road is proposed; need a pedestrian crossing on Moss Way; Mossdale Avenue not suitable for increased vehicular access; will add to difficulties at junctions off Moss Way and Station Road; access from Moss Way would increase congestion at Station Road junction; proposed access to the site is from a 40mph speed limit and should be no rat-run through the</p>	<p>17</p>	<p>Movement, Transport and Highways issues are included in section 5.2 of the draft Brief.</p> <p>Accessibility is an essential element of any Transport Assessment and although it may not suggest a signalised crossing on Moss Way it is very likely that pedestrian improvements will be suggested. The reason for limiting access from Mossdale Avenue to only part of the site is to ensure that any increase in traffic is limited to an acceptable level.</p> <p>There is no indication that to retain access to the sports fields via Westfield Crescent would be cost prohibitive; ground maintenance access to the Mosborough Miners'</p>	<p>As above.</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>proposed estate; to retain access to sports development via Westfield Crescent will be cost prohibitive; need to allow room for ground maintenance access to MMW sports fields; concern about Moss Way proposed access; Mossdale Avenue should not serve as a through road; should be no vehicular access to the site via Green Belt/open space during/after construction; Moss Way access is after blind bend, should be 30mph/yellow lines; prefer option 2 as it will keep more of the traffic away from High Street</p>		<p>Welfare sports fields would not be compromised and there would be no road constructed in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The primary access to the housing site is from Moss Way as shown on Figure 6 (Movement and Access Plan) on page 10 of the Brief. This has been assessed as the most appropriate primary access, and was the access proposed as part of the previous outline planning permission for residential development on the site.</p>	
<p><i>Speed reduction/traffic calming</i> measures required; construct a roundabout on Station Road; concern about speed on Moss Way; need traffic islands to slow traffic; traffic control measures required at junction of Moss Way/Station Road; have been promised traffic calming but nothing has happened.</p>	6	<p>Movement, Transport and Highways issues are included in section 5.2 of the draft Brief.</p> <p>Given the size of the proposed development, a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) is required as part of any planning application for housing on the site. The concerns raised about the current situation with regard to highway safety are acknowledged. It will be a requirement of the TA as part of any planning application for the site to assess these issues and propose recommendations to address them; it is likely that some level of pedestrian improvements will be recommended. The TA will also determine the impact the development will have on vehicle movement at nearby junctions, which may then require mitigation works. However, it is anticipated that special attention should be given to the junction of Station Road and Moss Way; if the development is projected to have a significant negative effect on this junction in particular, there may be a need for substantial mitigation works by the developer. There may also be a need (depending on anticipated transport modes) for contributions to public transport infrastructure.</p>	As above.
Noise pollution.	2	Planning policy should ensure that there is no	No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
Increased pressure on bus services; need to look into provision of improved bus services.	3	unacceptable impact from noise, or any other pollution. This is included in paragraph 5.6.1 of the draft Brief.	
Heavy construction traffic.	1	The Council will continue its regular dialogue with South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive to establish the need for new or improved bus services in the area.	No change to draft Brief.
Highways Agency comments:- "The Highways Agency's key concern is to protect the primary role of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and to ensure its safe and efficient operation and we would have concerns over any development proposals, policies or plans that may have an impact on this. Within this area the M1 forms part of the SRN managed by the Agency. "The Agency has reviewed the consultation document provided and has no comments to make due to the distance of the site from the M1. It is also recognised that the vision for the site is to provide sustainable residential development which integrates with the local area and provides access to local facilities. It is therefore not considered that the site would have a significant impact on the M1. It is noted that a Transport Assessment would need to be provided as part of the planning application process and therefore the Agency would be interested at this stage should the Assessments for any reason show significant movements to/from the M1 from this site."	1	This is an inevitable part of any development of this size. However, disruption and disturbance will be kept to a minimum through the use of planning conditions as part of any planning permission for residential development. Comments noted.	No change to draft Brief.
Type of housing/affordable housing			

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>4 bed homes are not affordable; the 40% of homes being 4 bedroom properties is not proportionate; there should be some 3 bed homes.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The suggested mix of size of new, affordable homes is included in the section on Affordable Housing (page 7 of the draft Brief). This is for the affordable housing element only and is not confirmed – if there is new evidence of need for, for example, 1 and 3 bed dwellings, then this will be taken into account. Providing affordable housing makes it easier for local families and young people to buy a new home if they want to stay in the area. Overall, there is likely to be a wide range of sizes and types of new homes throughout the site, catering for a variety of ages – family homes and older persons' accommodation is likely to form part of that mix.</p> <p>A definition of affordable housing is proposed to be included as new paragraph 5.1.4.</p>	<p>Change wording in paragraph 5.1.3 to "The current suggested affordable housing mix on the site is for 40% 4 bed homes and 60% 2 bed homes, based on current available evidence. This relates to the affordable housing element of the development only. Large properties are in short supply across the city and 2 bed homes are becoming more popular as a result of welfare reform. However, this suggested mix of affordable homes is flexible and demand is changing all the time especially with the impact of welfare reform. Evidence at the time of a planning application may point to a different mix and the appropriate mix will be discussed and agreed with registered providers at that time."</p> <p>Insert new paragraph 5.1.4:</p> <p>"Affordable housing is defined as "Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision."</p> <p>See above.</p>
<p>Need to consider 1 bed housing.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>As above.</p>	

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
1 and 2 bed bungalows for elderly on the edge of the estate.	1	As above.	See above.
Must include needs of young people.	1	As above.	No change to draft Brief.
Welcome proposal for affordable housing but current infrastructure will not support more housing.	1	Traffic and highways issues are covered above. In terms of capacity of schools and health services, the Council will continue to monitor the situation in conjunction with the appropriate authorities e.g. NHS – at present, there are no capacity issues that would mean that planning permission should be refused for new housing.	No change to draft Brief.
Concerns that area will become a "Council estate".	1	<p>The majority of new homes provided on the site will be private market homes for sale. Affordable housing is provided as a percentage of the overall development to help people buy new homes at an affordable price. The affordable housing can be provided on site or a financial contribution provided to ensure provision on a suitable site elsewhere. If on site, affordable properties can be spread throughout the development to avoid creating a situation where there is a perceived or real separation of communities based on affordability of dwelling.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (policy CS40) requires new housing developments to contribute to the provision of affordable housing across the city where practicable and financially viable. The policy is supported by Affordable Housing Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) which has recently been updated to reflect differences in viability between different Housing Market Areas. The IPG reduces the expected developer contribution in this part of the city to 10% of the total floorspace in the development. The Brief should be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amend paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of the Brief to read as follows:</p> <p>"Core Strategy policy CS40 seeks to deliver affordable housing across the city where practicable and financially viable. The Affordable Housing Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) has recently been updated to reflect differences in viability between the Affordable Housing Market Areas.</p> <p>The previous version of the IPG had a city-wide target of 30 – 40% affordable housing on all sites of 15 or more dwellings. Westfield is in the South East Affordable Housing Area, in which the expected developer contribution is now 10%. See Appendix 4 for further guidance."</p> <p>Amend part of Appendix 2 (CS40 Affordable Housing) of the draft Brief to read as follows:</p>

Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>“Appendix 2 of the IPG has a formula for calculating the amount that may be due: Developer contribution = (A - B) x (C x D) Where: A = Market value of the development per square metre^[1] (Estimated Gross Development Value / Gross Internal Area) B = Transfer Price (£850 per square metre) C = Percentage expected level of affordable housing (10%) D = Gross Internal Area of units” No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Must include needs of the elderly (including bungalows).</p>	<p>4</p> <p>The precise mix and type of dwellings to be provided will largely be determined by the developer at the planning application stage. However, developers will be encouraged to take account of the need for elderly persons' accommodation and the need to establish where certain types and sizes of dwellings should best be located on the site, including appropriate access and avoiding potential impact on residential amenity for both current and future residents. As above.</p>	
<p>Elderly person's accommodation should be developed off Mossdale Avenue, limiting</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
increase in traffic and maintaining the quiet and secure nature of this part of the development			
Ecology and open space Loss of open space.	3	This is included in section 5.4 of the draft Brief. Whilst the site is now used informally as open space by some local residents, the site was formerly a school where the buildings have now been demolished and where the site has been established as being appropriate for residential development through the development plan and by previous planning permission. There is no planning policy requirement to provide informal open space on the site as there is sufficient informal open space in the area. A future developer may at their discretion want to provide some open space in a scheme to enhance the proposals or possibly help protect on site trees; however they would need to provide a suitably funded management and maintenance programme if this was the case. Development must also ensure that there is no unacceptable impact on residential amenity such as loss of privacy and security, and designed to take account of the site characteristics and topography.	No change to draft Brief.
Existing hedgerow will be lost; impact on wildlife.	2	This is included in section 5.5 of the draft Brief. A key factor in developing the site will be to ensure that features of nature conservation value are protected and where possible enhanced, and where this isn't possible mitigation measures take place. Para 5.5.4 of the Brief states that a preliminary ecological appraisal and survey should be carried out.	No change to draft Brief.
Ensure provision for wildlife/green corridors; retain existing trees on site; potential impact on nature conservation.	3	As above.	No change to draft Brief.
Retail The area is in desperate need of a shop such as a convenience store; need a local shop.	2	Should a proposal for a small convenience shop be put forward by the developer as part of any new residential development this would be considered by the Council against current planning policy and any other material	No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>Impact on Residential amenity</p> <p>Privacy of houses at Mossdale Avenue must be maintained; potential impact on properties on Cragdale Grove and Kildale Gardens; Support for bungalows near Toll House Mead; need to ensure no adverse impact on views from, and privacy of, homes on Toll House Mead; potential impact on value of homes on Toll House Mead; concerns about overdevelopment; concerns about playground/skate park up to boundary with Toll House Mead; concern about use of higher buildings as markers.</p>	7	<p>considerations.</p> <p>Section 6.3 of the draft Brief (Urban Design Framework) covers the main design principles for the development of the site and thereby issues of residential amenity. It is essential that there is no unacceptable impact on residential amenity. Para 6.3.6 states that development edges must carefully address neighbouring uses and para 6.3.8 states that new development should be in keeping with the scale of the surrounding neighbourhood. Para 6.3.2 states that new development should seek to optimise the value of long views of the green and open spaces. Any layout for residential development must not impact on the privacy of existing dwellings, whether on Toll House Mead, Mossdale Avenue, Cragdale Grove, Kildale Gardens or elsewhere, and this includes the location of any higher "marker" buildings.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief (but see "Design of the proposed development" section below).</p>
<p>Design of the proposed development</p> <p>Additional footways near Toll House Mead will cause security issues in terms of safety for children and also noise problems; will impact on the privacy and security of nearby homes; there is no need as there is more than adequate access from Westfield Crescent.</p>	5	<p>Design issues are covered in section 6.3 of the draft Brief. The particular concern about suggested additional footways near Toll House Mead has been raised by a number of residents on Toll House Mead.</p>	<p>It is recommended that reference in paragraph 6.3.4 of the draft Brief to the potential new pedestrian route through to Toll House Mead, on the western boundary of the site, be deleted and that corresponding changes be made to Figure 6 (Movement and Access Plan) and Figure 15 (Urban Design Framework).</p>
<p>Concern about tree removal along metal fence by Toll House Mead; would the path from the top of Toll House Mead be improved e.g. wooden fence, soft landscaping.</p>	2	<p>Paras 6.3.5, 6.3.6 and 6.3.9 of the draft Brief refer to the need to have a strong green framework, carefully considered development edges and boundary treatments. It is important that the boundaries of the site are both effective in ensuring the security and privacy of residents whilst being aesthetically appealing. Details</p>	<p>No change to the draft Brief.</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
		will be worked up using these principles as part of any planning application for the site.	
Too many homes to be built – Mosborough already overbuilt.	1	The principle of residential development has been established through the development plan and previous planning permission. The number of dwellings proposed is consistent with the development plan density guidelines and the site is an important part of the city's housing land supply in meeting the housing needs of a range of people.	No change to draft Brief.
Need to include bungalows.	1	The precise mix and type of dwellings to be provided will largely be determined by the developer at the planning application stage. However, developers will be encouraged to take account of the need for elderly persons' accommodation in the area, as well as family housing.	No change to draft Brief.
Should be rustic brickwork, not common brick; need to reflect the "traditional" materials of the village e.g. stone, pale colours.	2	The choice of brick will be discussed during the planning application stage and will need to be reflective of the local context and character.	No change to draft Brief.
No 3 storey buildings on the ridge line.	1	Paras 6.3.2, 6.3.6 and 6.3.7 of the draft Brief recognise the importance of the existing topography of the area, the need to optimise the value of long views and open spaces and any potential impact on the Green Belt. Development proposals for the site must ensure that the principles set out in section 6.3 of the Brief are adhered to.	No change to draft Brief.
Ensure that public footpaths are retained.	1	Para 6.3.4 of the draft Brief states that the development should be permeable and well integrated into the surrounding movement network especially for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled people.	No change to draft Brief (although see reference to deletion of additional proposed footpath, above).
Recreation			
Need open space for recreation; should be a park instead of being developed; need to allocate space for a park; need to ensure that playing fields are not affected; no park or public space in Mosborough village; should not have children's play area with the new development;	7	The principle of residential development has been established through the development plan and previous planning permission. There is no planning policy requirement to provide informal open space on the site as there is sufficient informal open space in the area. A future developer may at their discretion want to provide	No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
need to retain sports facilities.		some open space in a scheme to enhance the proposals or possibly help protect on site trees; however they would need to provide a suitably funded management and maintenance programme if this was the case. There is no requirement for a children's play area as part of the development. With regard to the adjacent sports pitches, the Council is currently in discussions with Mosborough Miners' Welfare about improving facilities.	
Drainage			
Drainage at capacity and building more will increase water run-off; concerns about sewage and waste based on limited waste pipes.	2	Section 5.8 and Appendix 5 of the draft Brief covers drainage issues.	No change to draft Brief with the exception of Yorkshire Water comments below.
Off-site watercourse/culvert at High Street should not be altered as a result of the development.	1	Section 5.8 and Appendix 5 of the draft Brief covers drainage issues; any development on the site must ensure that it has no unacceptable impact on culverts that may result in flooding. Also see additional wording below in relation to the Environment Agency's comments.	No change to draft Brief with the exception of Yorkshire Water comments below.
Yorkshire Water comments:- "Ideally, all surface water would drain via SUDS or water course but as it's a brownfield site there may be an existing connection. In that case, Yorkshire Water would expect the developer to provide evidence of existing volumes of surface water entering the public sewerage as well as the point of discharge. Surface water draining from any new development would be limited to that volume minus 30% to allow for climate change."	1	Comments noted. The Brief should be amended to refer to the additional issues raised by the Agency.	Insert additional wording as new paragraph 5.8.11: "Ideally, all surface water would drain via SUDS or water course but as it's a brownfield site there may be an existing connection. In that case, Yorkshire Water would expect the developer to provide evidence of existing volumes of surface water entering the public sewerage as well as the point of discharge. Surface water draining from any new development would be limited to that volume minus 30% to allow for climate change."
Environment Agency comments:- The Environment Agency is satisfied with the	1	Comments noted. The Brief should be amended to refer to the additional issues raised by the Agency.	Include the following wording as new paragraph 5.8.12: "Any surface water scheme should also be

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>information provided in section 5.8 and Appendix 5 of the draft Brief but has the following additional comments:-</p> <p>“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” and</p> <p>“The site layout for any future development should be designed to shed surface water flows away from properties”.</p> <p>Capacity of doctors/dental surgeries</p> <p>Concerns about the capacity of doctors/dental surgeries.</p>	4	<p>The impact of additional households on local health services will be taken into account with relevant service providers at this consultation stage of the Brief and at the planning application stage and phasing of any future development. NHS England and the Sheffield Primary Care Commissioning Team are involved in this consultation and will be consulted on any future proposals in order to address service capacity issues arising from new housing development.</p>	<p>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” and</p> <p>“The site layout for any future development should be designed to shed surface water flows away from properties”.</p>
<p>School capacity</p> <p>Secondary schools at capacity; primary schools appear close to capacity; impact on schools.</p>	4	<p>Information is included in Section 5.3 of draft Brief and Appendix 4. The situation at both secondary and primary level will be kept under review and a formal response will be provided at the point of a planning application being submitted, based on the most up to date forecasts available at that time.</p>	<p>No change to draft Brief.</p>
<p>Ground conditions</p> <p>Potential ground contamination.</p>	1	<p>This is included in paras 5.6.2 – 5.6.3 of the draft Brief. Following site investigations, it has been established that there is no significant ground contamination; just some burnt shale to relocate.</p>	<p>Replace existing paragraphs 5.6.2. and 5.6.3 with:</p> <p>“UDP policy GE25 requires the</p>

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
			<p>remediation of contaminated land. However, following detailed site investigations, it has been established that there is no significant ground contamination; just some burnt shale to relocate".</p>
<p>Problems with sinkholes due to mining activity.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Mining and potential land stability issues are included in paragraph 5.6.4 of the draft Brief.</p> <p>The mining element of the site has been thoroughly investigated and nothing detrimental has been uncovered, either shaft or workings. The gas monitoring is still underway, but this is not expected to reveal anything.</p> <p>With respect to any potential extraction of coal, there is no prospect at the site due to the thickness of rock over the seam.</p>	<p>Insert the following wording as paragraphs 5.6.4 and 5.6.5:</p> <p>"The mining element of the site has been thoroughly investigated and nothing detrimental has been uncovered, either shaft or workings. The gas monitoring is still underway, but this is not expected to reveal anything.</p> <p>With respect to any potential extraction of coal, there is no prospect at the site due to the thickness of rock over the seam."</p>
<p>Coal Authority comments:-</p> <p>Keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case the Coal Authority would seek prior extraction of the coal. This has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process.</p> <p>The site has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. It is important that new development recognises any problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Comments noted. Update Brief to reflect the latest terminology.</p>	<p>See wording on "mining activity" section above which covers the outcome of the site investigations on the site and thereby concludes on the assessment of any risk.</p> <p>Also change reference from Coal Mining Referral Area to "Coal Mining Development High Risk Area" in paragraph 5.6.4 of the draft Brief.</p>

Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
<p>new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed, the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.</p> <p>The term "Coal Mining Referral Area" is not the most up-to-date categorisation. The terminology now used by the Coal Authority is "Coal Mining Development High Risk Area".</p> <p>The Coal Authority also suggest the following additional wording for paragraph 5.6.2:</p> <p>"The site contains no recorded mine entries; however, the southern part of the site is underlain by recorded past shallow coal workings and recorded probable shallow coal workings. The northern part of the site is 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 present it may be necessary to undertake intrusive site investigations to determine the significance of risk. As part of assessing the mitigation of mining legacy on this site, consideration should be given to the practicality of the prior extraction of the remaining shallow coal resources".</p> <p>Other</p> <p>Would prefer better community use; good to see a resource for young people if possible.</p>		
2	This site is allocated for residential development and there are no plans to include any particular proposals for community use and any such proposal would also have to ensure that it would have no unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of existing and new residents.	No change to draft Brief.

	Number of comments	Officer Response	Recommendation
Need to ensure that money generated will benefit Mosborough (inc. school places).	1	<p>However, the network of footpaths on and around the site will be improved and discussions are also continuing between the Council and Mosborough Miners' Welfare about improvements to the playing pitches to the north of the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.0.3 of the Brief states the situation with regard to planning contributions and obligations which are expected to be replaced by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2015. Appendix 6 provides further information on the CIL. CIL is collected and put into a citywide pot and could be spent elsewhere within the city, depending on overall priorities. However, development will not be permitted on the former Westfield School site unless essential infrastructure (e.g. school capacity) is available. Paragraph 5.0.3 of the Brief should be revised to reflect progress on adopting CIL.</p>	<p>Replace existing paragraph 5.0.3 with the following:</p> <p>"The Council is working towards the implementation of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) with a view to adoption in January 2015. From this date all applications granted will be eligible for a CIL charge. Once implemented, the use of Section 106 agreements to 'pool' off-site infrastructure contributions will be severely limited, as CIL will then be the main mechanism for delivering infrastructure through developer contributions. Affordable housing will still be delivered through Section 106 but targets will reflect the CIL charges."</p>