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Dear Roland,

RE: Land off Moorthorpe Way, Sheffield (Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/20/32558555)

Further to your letter dated the 6th November, I respond to your points below.

As stated in section 5.6, 5.19 and 5.24 of the statement of case and also within the statement of common ground, the principle of developing the site for housing is not contested.

With reference to Policy H13, as detailed in paragraph 5.3 of the statement of case, the policy will be put into practice by providing appropriate advice, including planning briefs. We do not consider the proposal to be in compliance with section 3.2.6 of the planning brief and it is therefore contrary to Policy H13. This will be expanded upon in the proof of evidence.

We agree that we can narrow down the focus of Policies H14 and H15. We will refer specifically to parts a, b, c, f and g in relation to H14 and part d of H15. In relation to the brief, as detailed in the statement of case we refer to part 3.2.6, G1 and G2.

There is an error in paragraph 5.6 of the statement of case as identified, this should read north and west not north and east.

With reference to 5.6 this will be expanded upon in the proof of evidence. However, we will seek to demonstrate that the appropriate balance must be struck between built form and green infrastructure to create an acceptable character. The Council considers that the appeal proposal does not strike that balance appropriately.

Similarly our stance with regards to design in paragraph 5.7 will be expanded upon in the proof. However we are not seeking to identify issues with individual house types but rather the layout in relation to the green infrastructure and character as detailed in the reason for refusal. Again paragraph 127 will be expanded upon in the proof but will include parts a, b, c and e.

In relation to paragraph 5.10, the objection is not an ecological one and the Council will not present ecological evidence. This issue relates to quantity and quality of green infrastructure resulting from the development.

In relation to your question about paragraph 5.11 I refer you to paragraphs 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10.

Paragraph 5.14 refers to the green and open character not the quantitative amount of open space provided.

With reference to CS40, paragraph 9.3 states ‘the policy will be delivered through a Supplementary Planning Document’. The scheme is contrary to Policy GAH5 of the CIL and Planning Obligations SPD as stated in 5.16.

I note your comments in relation to the housing land supply. It seems to me that we may be able to prepare a specific statement of common ground alongside the preparation of evidence to assist the inspector in addressing this issue.

I trust the above adequately addresses the points raised in your letter.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Hull

Principal Planning Officer

Development Management