

f.a.o The Planning Directorate, Sheffield City Council,
1, Union Street, Sheffield, S1 2SH.

cc. Highways Dept, *(Please forward the enclosed via internal post)*

The Clerk, Ecclesfield Parish Council

4th November 2021

Submission in respect of PA 21/04480/FUL (replacement of 20/02096/FUL) re land at the top of Holly House Lane, Grenoside.

I own land accessed via Holly House Lane and partly adjoining site to the south, and to the east of the proposed ménage area.

This is a revised version of the comments submitted earlier for 20/02096/FUL

This submission comprises,

- 1) Information given in the Application.
- 2) **Comments on the application for publication.**
- 3) An Appendix, additional comments on access issues, f.a.o. the Highways Department.

1) Points arising from the information in the application.

The location is described as *Hill Top Stables* and the current use as *Equestrian*. As far as I am aware, there have been no permanent equestrian buildings on the site since the old farm complex of buildings was abandoned for occupation in the 1950's. That is, before the current temporary buildings shown in the application were erected by the present owners. I have lived nearby since 1966 and seen the land used variously over time for grazing, initially, in the 1960's, for cattle, for crops and for grazing and exercise for horses.

Re. point 10, adjoining trees. The windbreak cluster of Trees on the western boundary of the site at the top of the Lane is a prominent local landscape feature, although suffering from age, vandal and wind damage. **The present owners have made efforts to protect the area from further vandal damage and they should be supported in this work. The maintenance of this tree cover should be a requirement of planning consent. Enhancement of the protection of these trees by a TPO (if one is not already in place) should be considered.**

Re. Point 19, Opening Hours. Current use involves access mostly in the hours of daylight. The possible impact of any lighting scheme on visual and environmental aspects, should be considered.

(1of3)

Re. Point 22, The site is visible from both Holly House Lane and the ridge footpath linking Lane Head with Prior Royd. Both are very popular walking routes and use has increased significantly in the last 12 months.

2) Comments on the Application for Publication

As a near neighbour sharing a common boundary, I have been kept informed of the work carried out and the intentions for the future use of what is recognised as a prominent part of the Grenoside Landscape, visible to the many walkers using the boundary rights of way to the north and west.

I support the proposal to use the site for *private* equestrian use, with a limited number of horses (6 has been mentioned), stabled in the retained temporary, and proposed buildings and with activities confined, as they are at present, to daylight hours, (subject to animal welfare and emergency considerations.)

On balance, **the work carried out so far by the applicant,** in terms of land clearance, the erection of temporary buildings and maintenance of boundaries, **has improved the appearance of the area.**

However, **I am opposed to the development of a commercial scale equestrian centre on the site** and would expect **any planning consent to prevent this.**

The primary reason for this view is the limited access to the site. All horse and vehicle traffic to and from the site has to pass up and down Holly House Lane, which in turn runs into Topside. Topside is a curved lane with housing on all sides and is already congested. Even prior to the activity of the owners of the site, there have been incidents when access on Topside for emergency, refuse collection and normal traffic has been difficult.

This is further compounded by the dangerous blind exits from Topside and Middle Lane on to Stephen Lane. There are difficulties created by the ‘pinch’ with narrow pavements, combined with the speed of vehicles coming down –hill and often ignoring the give way line above Topside.

A further concern is **the impact of any further increase in traffic on Holly House Lane itself.** Already a very popular leisure route, there has also been a marked increase in use by families over the ‘COVID’ period. This seems unlikely to decline as more people have ‘discovered’ the role of the Lane in the footpath network. **The appropriate Public Rights of Way contacts should be consulted.** Doubtless the current issues of surface and verge maintenance will be improved from their present state when the Council enters the ‘post COVID’ era.

Yours faithfully,

(please use for tracking)

3) Appendix: Additional comments on access issues f.a.o Highways Dept.

In addition to the factors relevant to this PA, the traffic issues raised must be placed in a broader context.

The existing E-W traffic through the upper part of the village, (particularly at commuting times), is likely to increase as a result of the extensive housing developments in the Upper Don Valley, unsupported by improved E-W routes.

It is considered that the minimum requirements, for improving the problems created by the Stephen Lane 'pinch' are as follows. Road narrowing signs should be placed further upper the hill, to take account of the varying road and verge widths encountered. A 20mph limit should be imposed on the Lane at the junction with Skew Hill. (This is considered to be *particularly important* given the very narrow pavement strip on the downhill side at the Topside junction. Vehicles may accelerate, or be passing each other, near this point.)

--- & ---