



## **SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE: ADAM CHAPMAN**

### **Town and Country Planning (Inquiries Procedure) (England) Rules 2000**

#### **ON BEHALF OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY**

**APPEAL BY:** DLP on behalf of Hallam Land Management

**SITE AT:** Land at Junction With Carr Road

Hollin Busk Lane

Sheffield

S36 1GH

**APPEAL AGAINST:** Sheffield City Council

**LPA REFERENCE:** 17/04673/OUT

**PINS REFERENCE:** APP/J4423/W/21/3267168

**DATE:** May 2021

- 1.0 My proof of evidence addresses key planning policy matters related to the determination of this appeal and must be read alongside the evidence of my colleagues, Laura Stephens (Housing Land Supply), Ricardo Ares (Landscape and Visual Impact) and Ruth Masood (Heritage). Taken together the submitted evidence addresses the two reasons for refusal related to planning application ref: 17/04673/OUT (CD1.9)
- 1.1 I provide an analysis of the appeal proposal in the context of the policies and issues identified in the reasons for refusal (CD1.9) other relevant local development plan policy's (CD3.1-3.4b) and the guidance in the Framework (CD3.1) considered most important to the determination of the appeal.
- 1.2 I demonstrate that when considered as a 'basket of policies' the relevant local policies are not out-of-date within the meaning of the paragraph 11 of the Framework, retain significant weight in the determination of this appeal and are breached by the appeal proposals.
- 1.3 I consider the claimed social, economic and environmental benefits of the development (identified by the appellants) and conclude that they do not outweigh the significant and demonstrable harm caused to the character and visual amenities of the appeal site, the wider landscape - including the adjacent green belt, and substantial harm to the setting of adjacent heritage assets.
- 1.4 I confirm that the 'tilted balance' is not automatically in play in accordance with footnote 7 of paragraph 11 d of the Framework, as the Council can demonstrate a 5.4-year housing land supply and has passed the required housing delivery tests.
- 1.5 Furthermore, as designated heritage assets are identified in footnote 6 of Framework Paragraph 11 as 'protected assets'; the claimed benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the substantial harm caused (when considered against paragraphs 195 or 196 of the Framework) and the related policies of

the Framework provide a clear reason for refusing the proposal, the tilted balance is not engaged.

- 1.6 My conclusion places the proposal in the context of the decision making Framework having regard to Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The planning balance demonstrates that the proposal will cause demonstrable and irreversible harm which clearly outweighs any benefits. I conclude that the development does not comply with the development plan when taken as a whole. Nor does it gain support from the Framework. As such the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss this appeal.