



## Statement by CPRE: Hollin Busk inquiry ref. APP/J4423/W/21/3267168

1. My name is Andy Tickle and I am Head of Campaigns at CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire. I am authorised by the trustees of our organisation to appear at this inquiry and make this statement. CPRE objected to the grant of planning permission and our previous representations to Sheffield City Council will be on file. We now wish to make some short additional points having examined the appeal documentation.
2. In summary our concerns align strongly with the arguments that the Council will be making at the inquiry, notably in relation to the importance of Core Strategy Policies CS23 and CS72. I will not repeat those arguments but wish to point out our additional emphasis on Policy CS33, which has a specific local and spatial focus and which, in that respect, i.e. for the Stocksbridge area, states “New housing will be limited to previously developed land within the urban area” [CD3.1].
3. We also agree with the Council that the policies are not sufficiently out-of-date as to trigger the provisions of paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The continued policy support for a ‘brownfield first’ approach and strong protection of Sheffield’s high quality countryside is consistent with both current Framework policies and also the direction of travel of the spatial options being consulted on in the emerging Local Plan [see pp.46-64, CD3.6].
4. We also support the Council’s arguments in respect of the calculation of current housing supply, which we agree still stands as 5.4 years for the purposes of this inquiry. We continue to say that it is inappropriate to grant permission on unallocated, greenfield sites, contrary to the statutory Development Plan, when housing supply is met and a new Plan is emerging.
5. We share the concern of the Council regarding deficiencies in both the approach to landscape and visual impacts and the underplaying of the significance of the impacts in themselves. We have also pointed out the problems engendered by the lack of photomontages and

attempted to crudely rectify this in our objection letter of January 2018. However we accept that this is a matter for evidence and your judgment, especially after visiting the site as part of this inquiry. But in relation to CS72, we say built development at this site would constitute a significant and detrimental landscape change, causing a profound loss of the green, open and rural character of this area.

6. The last matter we wish to address is the accessibility and sustainability of the site. We note the Statement of Common Ground on Highways and Transportation where the phrases “appropriately accessible” and “acceptable access to public transport services” [para.2.23] appear to us as a veneer - damning by faint praise, as it were.
7. Instead we would point to the officer’s committee report [p.46, original pagination] where it is stated “*Overall it is not felt the location of the site is particularly sustainable and whilst this can be mitigated to a degree it should be seen as a negative aspect of the overall development*”. The report also suggests “*the site is far from ideal in terms of accessibility by modes other than by private car and would indeed suggest that the vast majority of journeys to and from the site for work, leisure and shopping will be car born [sic] journeys*”.
8. We urge you to listen carefully to the lived experiences and evidence of the local community on this point before coming to your decision. We are clear that the developments fails to meet paragraphs 103, 108 and 110 of the Framework. It is not a well-connected site and we concur that residents would be heavily reliant on the use of private cars. In this sense, this is exactly the sort of development that national policy exists to prevent.
9. We respectfully request that you dismiss the appeal and refuse permission.

**22 June 2021**