

From: [Johnson Michael \(DEL-Planning\)](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line
Date: 31 January 2019 13:14:48

Hi [REDACTED]

Following up on the below I am writing to confirm that we are intending to invalidate the application owing to the missing FRA and Sustainable Urban Drainage Design Statement. Another alternative would be for the scheme to be withdrawn at this stage given our concerns. Would you mind dropping me a note by tomorrow lunchtime letting me know what option you wish us to take.

Regards

Michael.

Michael Johnson
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2039678

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Web: www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or
www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingcontrol

Location: Planning Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street, SHEFFIELD S1 2SH
Building Control Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street (Tel. 0114
273 4168)

Apply for planning permission online at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

From: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning)
Sent: 17 January 2019 11:58
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for your response and we will take the comments on board as we begin prepare our committee report. Please be aware that at this stage we are aiming to present a report at the committee meeting to be held on the 2nd of April and I will let you know if this changes.

I have politely declined a meeting several times and will continue to do so based on our view that we fundamentally consider any proposal for housing on this site to be unacceptable. We have outlined the reasons for this clearly.

In respect to the FRA and Sustainable Urban Drainage Design Statement we are

yet to receive these and, whilst I am reluctant to invalidate the application, if these are not received before the end of January we will have to offer this our serious consideration. Both are set out as validation requirements on our website via this link <http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/content/sheffield/home/planning-development/local-planning-guidance.html>.

Regards

Michael.

Michael Johnson
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2039678

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Web: www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or
www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingcontrol

Location: Planning Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street, SHEFFIELD S1 2SH
Building Control Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street (Tel. 0114
273 4168)

Apply for planning permission online at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 January 2019 16:32
To: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning)
Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Good morning Michael

Thank you for your response. Firstly, I strongly feel that whilst you have raised some interesting points we cannot agree with you because, at this stage, many of them have not been justified. Particularly in regards to established Sheffield methodology, Green Belt benefits and the scope required for the FRA/ SUDs assessments.

In the consideration of your initial assessment, the delivery of housing under paragraph 143 (Very Special Circumstances) and 145 (Exceptions) of the NPPF can be rendered pertinent to the application. The benefits of development, which there are many and are detailed within the application, are substantial enough to outweigh harm which is the reason the development should occur. Primarily, the preservation of land which does not function well as Green Belt, a site within a sustainable location not in isolation and is readily available to contribute to the housing supply should be considered very special circumstances. Fundamentally, releasing the site will not do harm to the surrounding Green Belt functions. Additionally, as in planning terms the site is indefensible as Green

Belt and there is a moral case for releasing such a site, as it is preserved to do nothing when there is a clear social and justifiable reason of developing on-site affordable housing in wealthy areas to alleviate multiple levels of deprivation and damming socio-economic factors. This too is also considered within the application and I note that your response has not covered the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) which is a statutory obligation to consider the needs of protected characteristics as they are most likely to require affordable housing.

The exceptions test for affordable housing does apply here. (1) Simply 10 houses is a limited amount it must be paired up with the planning balance of delivering an additional 12 for viability purposes. We will be more than happy to evidence this through a viability assessment. Weighed up in the planning balance and considering any harm will be balanced out through the benefits, this part of the exception can be applied. (2) Sheffield policy on affordable housing is limited and must be drawn together through outdated policies.

(3) The lack of specific affordable housing provided is because we are committed to providing what is the preferred affordable housing Sheffield City Council require. Since this is an outline application this would have been detailed through reserved matters and is another reason why a meeting is so vital.

In terms of the methodology used to assess Green Belt, applying the principles of Option E Multiple Green Belt Releases from Citywide Options for Growth document (2015) and the Sheffield City Region's Common Approach to Green Belt Review are the only documents locally to consider how Green Belt should be assessed or released. Therefore, for local compatibility they have been employed on the Green Belt assessment, particularly in regard to the purposes of Green Belt and selective site release. Taking the five purposes of the Green Belt as the assessment shows the site performs poorly against them.

Section 2.2 of the planning application clearly considered the housing need and 5 year land supply of Sheffield. This section uses the most "recent" information of the confirmed housing targets in 2017 and the Governments standard calculation for Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN). Therefore, accepted and approved figures have been used in the detailed assessments of Sheffield's housing need.

I must take particular note of your position that Long Line is in isolation. This is simply incorrect, as supported by appeal decisions referenced throughout the application for the adjacent property (APP/J4423/W/3174270), Long Line is not in isolation. Assessments within the VSC document clearly show how key services are nearby and access to public transport is readily available. The site is not in isolation and is in a sustainable location.

I must strongly urge a meeting to develop both positions further. I respect and understand resource pressures facing local authorities but due to the scale of the

proposal, respectfully a meeting should occur. We are more than prepared to do a presentation of the application to you, Rob Murfin, the 3 Dore and Totley Ward Councillors, current MP and leadership of Sheffield City Council.

Additionally, we have submitted the site at Long Line as a representation in the Local Plan process. We are happy to re-submit this again would you be able to advise on the best approach to do this please?

Happy to see that the application will be going to committee and I look forward to continuing this work into the New Year. On that note, the 21 day request for an FRA will time out on New Years Day. Is it possible to agree an extension of time in respect of holidays and leave?

Kind regards

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Planning
ADAS

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

www.adas.uk

www.adas.uk

[@ADASGroup](#)



From: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning) [mailto:Michael.Johnson@sheffield.gov.uk]

Sent: 11 December 2018 10:49

To: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Hi [Redacted]

Following on from our recent email correspondence the below is intended to set out our position with respect to the current planning application to erect 22 dwellinghouses at the land adjacent to 127 – 139 Long Line (18/04034/OUT).

Green Belt land and the balance of considerations

The NPPF is very clear that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (para 143). Paragraph 145 sets out that new buildings are regarded as inappropriate, with specific exceptions a-f. The development 22 new homes at Long Line is not considered to fall within any of these exceptions. Part (f) refers to 'limited

affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exceptions sites). We do not think that the proposal does not fall within this exception as it is (1) not 'limited' (2) not within any policy parameters set out in our development plan (3) non-specific about the type of affordable housing proposed. This clause is more generally used to meet very specifically local needs within village settings, where local housing needs assessments have identified a specific need that can be tailored to.

Your Very Special Circumstances Report (VSC Report) highlights concerns about housing affordability nationally and in Sheffield, and most particularly in Dore and the south west of Sheffield. It uses evidence from the 2013 SHMA and 2017 Housing Market Bulletin to evidence that the south west is an area of market pressure with very high property values, and a shortfall of up to 265 affordable homes per year.

The VSC report asserts that Long Line fits within the category of 'E – Multiple Smaller Green Belt Releases' as described as an option in the 2015 Citywide Options for Growth document. There are 2 fundamental problems with this. Firstly, that option relates to approaches to be taken in the Sheffield Plan, which has not yet been subject to further consultation, and therefore whether or not Long Line fits in that category is, as yet, immaterial. The suggestion is premature, pending the Sheffield Plan. Secondly, the very description of option E is that it pertains to *extensions* around the urban area, which would not therefore suggest a 'standalone' development on Long Line which is demonstrably not part of the urban area. For reference, the key pointer to Long Line not being within the urban area can be found in the UDP where policy GE5, which talks about housing development in the Green Belt, clearly lists Long Line within the category of 'substantially developed road frontages', thus setting it apart from the urban area by the very nature of it being washed over by the Green Belt.

Table 1 in your report sets out the VSC and the weight you consider should be given to the various elements. We offer the following comments on several key sections:

- 1. No impact on the Peak District National Park.** Given the form that Long Line currently takes, which is linear, and made up of single and small group clusters of homes, it is unlikely that a block development of 22 homes would have no impact on the Peak District. The PDNP authority have previously discussed with us the importance of 'fringe landscapes' that flow from the National Park and impact its setting. Their Landscape Character Appraisals cover this. We have sought their views on this matter.
- 3. No impact upon the five purposes of Green Belt** We would strongly contest this point, and also suggest that it is actually beside the point. Simply not strongly meeting Green Belt purposes would not be a VSC for allowing development. However, in this case, we would suggest that firstly, development here would constitute urban sprawl (Green Belt purpose a, NPPF para 135), bringing a significant development to an area of scattered homes that is physically isolated from the main urban area. Secondly, we suggest that the proposal site would be considered 'countryside' and therefore certainly meets that Green Belt purpose (Green Belt purpose c, NPPF, para 135). In addition, almost all land within Sheffield's Green Belt

can be considered to meet Green Belt purpose e, which relates to assisting urban regeneration by encouraging recycling of urban land – as by protecting land in the Green Belt, development is naturally funnelled in to the urban area. Furthermore the site is clearly open in nature, and the fundamental aim of Green Belts (NPPF para 133) is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.

5. Development will contribute to the housing land supply within the city.

While doubtless any new homes in this location would contribute in a small way to housing land supply, that would be insufficient to justify VSC. In particular, with reference to the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in para 11 of the NPPF, the guidance is very clear that Green Belt land is one of the situations in which there is a clear reason for refusing development proposals even where there is not a 5-year supply of housing land.

6. Contribution to the affordable housing need in Sheffield. Whilst we would agree that there has been under delivery of affordable housing in relation to needs in Sheffield, that would not lend itself to being a VSC in this situation. As noted above, we do not agree that this development falls within part (f) of NPPF para 145.

7. New housing development in Dore. As noted in the table, this argument is of limited weight. Whilst new homes are needed in all areas of the city, and this is doubtless a strong market area, it would not provide a sustainable approach to delivering housing in the neighbourhood.

8. On-site affordable housing provision in Dore. There is insufficient detail to judge whether this affordable housing would be of the type or tenure needed in the area. In addition it would be isolated from Dore village. isolated.

19. New social mix. Whilst we would agree that new affordable homes would assist in achieving a wider variety of homes in the area, that does not constitute VSC. Firstly, as noted above, this is an isolated development and arguably not contributing to housing mix within the Dore neighbourhood anyway. Furthermore, there are opportunities for development within or closer to the urban area, where a mix of new homes could make a greater impact than this.

Table 2 within the VSC addresses harm to the Green Belt, by setting out two potential considerations and judging them both to have a negative impact, as the proposal is inappropriate and therefore harmful, and there would clearly be an impact on openness. However, Section 3 then appears to attempt to explain that the proposal would cause no harm to the Green Belt, as you consider that the site is not conforming to the 5 purposes of Green Belt and therefore there cannot be harm. As I note above, we would strongly disagree with this, and are confident that the site does in fact meet several of the purposes of Green Belt, and that any development here would cause harm by virtue of inappropriateness.

Section 4 – demonstrating VSC to balance out harm

The first part of this section (4.1) seems to conflate Green Belt purposes with landscape character and visual impact. It states that the landscape and visual impact assessment assesses the site against Green Belt policy in line with Sheffield City Region's Common Approach to Green Belt Review (which whilst providing examples of how Green Belt purposes might be assessed, is in itself not an assessment tool). The same paragraph also concludes that the site does not meet all the purposes of Green Belt. We would argue that land does not have to meet *all* the purposes simultaneously to be considered to be fulfilling a Green Belt role. Taking your points in table 3, one by one.

Purpose 1: To check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas – whilst you have looked at how well contained the site is in relation to other built form along Long Line, you have failed to have sufficient regard to (a) Long Line is not a large built up area so assessing the site in that way doesn't make sense – rather it would be considered sprawl in itself (b) Long Line is washed over by the Green Belt (and merely considered as a frontage in the UDP policy above) and therefore regardless of the linear settlement pattern, any further development constitutes further urbanisation of an essentially non-urban area.

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another – We would disagree with the text, which misses the point of this purpose, focussing instead on the linear nature of the existing settlement. However, we would agree with the score; this site does not assist in this purpose.

Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – There appears to be recognition that the site can be considered 'countryside'. Whilst we would agree that boundary features might prevent further encroachment, it does need to be recognised that for the purposes of this report, you have concluded that the site doesn't fulfil Green Belt purposes, and here, it definitely does.

Purpose 4: To preserve the setting of a historic town – Agree with the score on this one.

Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration – We would agree with the point here about the fact that most Green Belt land performs well against this purpose. Interesting, given that you say elsewhere that the site performs no Green Belt purposes when clearly it does.

Following table 3, the report concludes that the site is an untenable anomaly within the Green Belt. We would strongly dispute this, especially as 'untenable anomaly' is a very specific term generally relating to issues over the clarity of the existing Green Belt boundary rather than to 'sites' with the Green Belt.

In section 4.2 you discuss the issue of housing, beginning with the (correct) fact that Sheffield cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year deliverable supply of housing land, and that therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. However, it then goes on, incorrectly, to look at housing need in relation to the Core Strategy target, which is now superseded by the Local Housing Need calculation set out by government. Furthermore it looks at delivery going back into the post-recession period when the housing market was recovering, rather than using our published information to look forwards. Whilst we would acknowledge

that technically any housing development would contribute positively to meeting housing need, and assist with the 5-year housing land supply, we would just restate the point that NPPF para 11 is very clear that this doesn't override Green Belt considerations.

Although you refer to the possibility that affordable housing to meet local needs can sometimes be not inappropriate in the Green Belt (NPPF, para 145 (f)), that clause does not apply on this occasion. Firstly, it clearly states 'limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan'. Sheffield's development plan consists of saved UDP policies and the Core Strategy, neither of which include such a policy and therefore this cannot be applied. Secondly, this clause is designed to deal with *local community* needs. Generally this would mean needs that are specific to a Green Belt community (i.e. a specific village). Sheffield's affordable housing need is calculated at a citywide level and also disaggregated by housing market area. However, even that need which is identified at the housing market area level (i.e. South West HMA or Peak District HMA) is not locally specific to Long Line as a 'community', and therefore would not be sufficient to justify application of this clause in the NPPF.

Although it is clearly a fair point to make that a relatively small amount of new homes have been delivered in the South West HMA in recent years, and we are in need of more affordable housing, those points do not override the fact that the proposal is fundamentally contrary to the NPPF, and should not be afforded weight. It is an inappropriate location to be meeting those needs. Firstly, there are other locations in the city and the south west that can meet these needs and secondly, it is premature to suggest Green Belt locations to meet these needs through extensions to the urban area, as the Local Plan is the correct method to assess the best locations to meet need in a sustainable way.

Section 4.6 covers social benefits of the proposal. Without more detail as to the type of affordable housing to be provided it is hard to say how strongly it would help to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. However, given that the 'community' of Long Line itself is unlikely to generate a need for 22 affordable homes, it can only be assumed that the focus of this proposal is to meet a citywide, or at the very least south west Sheffield need for affordable housing, and therefore we would argue that this does not demonstrate VSC, as those needs can and should be met within the urban area, or following Green Belt review and Local Plan adoption, on sites that are extensions to the urban area as noted above. The point made about diversifying the population of Dore through delivery of affordable homes is spurious as the site is not within Dore itself, and as it's likely that any future occupants would be totally car dependent they would not necessarily form part of the community of Dore. Undoubtedly the issues raised about inequality within the city are true, however the same point applies – that the need for affordable housing is not best met on this site, in this location.

In conclusion, given the location of this site within the Green Belt, and therefore being inappropriate for such a use, in advance of the Local Plan being prepared, it would be sensible for you to submit the site through the Local Plan process, for proper consideration. Following the next stage of consultation in 2019, any new sites submitted to the Council for potential allocation, will be considered through the Site Selection Methodology. However, it is worth noting the point made above, that a key part of the approach for any land considered for release from the Green

Belt will be to seek extensions to the existing built-up area.

Design

The primary character of the area is rural and development along Long Line can be described as ribbon/strip development. The proposed layout is suburban and does not reflect or reinforce the rural, ribbon development character of the area. The scale of development proposed is of concern as it swamps the entire plot with suburban style housing, and cannot be supported on design grounds as such.

Ecology

The first concern is that the application site lies within 500 metres of two Natura 2000 sites. There is a responsibility for applicants to consider the implications of a project on statutory European sites. The two sites that are at the closest to the application site are: Peak District Moors (South Pennine Phase 1) SPA and the South Pennine Moors SAC and the protection of these sites is covered by relevant Habitats Directives.

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) carried out by ADAS states at 6.1 that *"No impacts upon statutory designated sites are anticipated, and no recommendations are made."* We consider that all relevant issues, such as: impacts from recreational disturbance, air quality, urbanisation, water resources/quality, drainage etc. as well as in combination effects should be fully considered and tabulated against the Natura 2000 sites vulnerabilities. If after that screening assessment process the applicants can say that there will be 'no adverse impacts from their proposals' then we can accept the conclusion based on a rational and objective process.

In addition the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal states the purpose of their assessment was to ascertain "whether the location would be suitable to construct a small number of properties in the northwestern corner of the land parcel". This is not an accurate description for a proposal to build 22 houses. The report also states the field under survey had recently been cut. As the report notes, this will have prevented accurate assessment of flora and reduced likelihood of ground nesting birds and other wildlife to be present at the time of the survey.

Based on the above it is not considered that the ecological impacts of the proposed scheme have been given appropriate consideration.

Missing Information

-
I have noted that the application has not been accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and this is a requirement of validation for a site in Flood Zone 1 and greater than a hectare in size. I will not invalidate the proposal at this stage but I would request an FRA is received within 21 days.

We also require a Sustainable Urban Drainage Design Statement as this would constitute a major development and again I would request this is provided within the next 21 days. More details of this can be found via the following link <http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/content/sheffield/home/planning-development/local->

planning-guidance/sustainable-urban-drainage-design.html.

Next Steps

I fully acknowledge your instance to meet and discuss, but again we do not see this as a sensible use of our limited time/resources given we disagree on several points that are absolutely fundamental to the outcome of the application. We do however intend to present our recommendation to the planning committee as you have suggested and I will provide you with the date when I have more certainty around this. I would anticipate this would be in February 2019 at the earliest.

Regards

Michael.

Michael Johnson
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2039678

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Web: www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or
www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingcontrol

Location: Planning Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street, SHEFFIELD S1 2SH
Building Control Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street (Tel. 0114
273 4168)

Apply for planning permission online at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 December 2018 13:35
To: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning)
Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Good afternoon Michael

Thank you greatly for the update, I eagerly await your response on Tuesday and look forward to setting a date for a meeting.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Planning
ADAS

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
www.adas.uk

www.adas.uk

@ADASGroup

From: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning) [<mailto:Michael.Johnson@sheffield.gov.uk>]

Sent: 07 December 2018 13:19

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Sean,

Sorry I have not got back to you on this but I have had to prioritise other work. Just to keep you updated I am intending to get a response across on Tuesday next week.

Regards

Michael.

Michael Johnson
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2039678

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Web: www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or
www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingcontrol

Location: Planning Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street, SHEFFIELD S1 2SH
Building Control Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street (Tel. 0114
273 4168)

Apply for planning permission online at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 27 November 2018 17:03

To: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning)

Cc: Murfin Rob

Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Importance: High

Michael

Unfortunately, I must completely disagree with your assertion that the development will have an unacceptable impact upon the openness of green belt setting and represent inappropriate development. The proposal has substantially evolved from the pre-application, consequentially the 'clear conclusions' used for pre-application can no longer be applied.

New conclusions must be drawn from the proposal particularly due to the very special circumstances. There are considerable major benefits outweighing any perceived harm. Furthermore, the provision of affordable housing is an exception development within the Green Belt the provision of which is clearly in line with the identifiable shortage of Dore and Totley; including Sheffield for that matter.

A meeting with yourself is essential and I am also proposing to invite Rob Murfin too. It is a major housing proposal which can be exemplary to remediate many of the detrimental socio-economic factors for Sheffield. The site at Long Line is within a sustainable location having good access to public transport and other key services. The five purposes of the Green Belt do not function well on site and should be released from the Green Belt under option E of the "What are the citywide options for growth 2034?". The Council also has to consider their equality duty too, they need to ensure that the housing provision reflects the statutory requirement under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED).

Having recently spoken to Sheffield's democratic services, they have advised me that the rule of thumb for an application to trigger committee is 6+. As I am sure you are aware at the time of writing the application has received 52 public comments. Therefore, committee should be engaged.

It is imperative for us to discuss this project as the importance of this proposal is significant. I look forward to meeting you and discussing this further.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

Planning
ADAS

[Redacted contact information]

www.adas.uk

www.adas.uk

[@ADASGroup](#)

From: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning) [<mailto:Michael.Johnson@sheffield.gov.uk>]

Sent: 27 November 2018 16:20

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

[REDACTED]

We will of course take on board the information submitted when reaching a conclusion on the application, but our firm view remains that the proposals have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the green belt setting and represent inappropriate development. The reasons we have reached these conclusions have been clearly set out in our previous pre-application correspondence.

Given the resource pressures we are under and the previous advice offered we do not intend to meet to discuss the proposals further. I may be in touch over the next few weeks to seek some additional information to potentially resolve a few more minor issues ahead of a decision being issued

Regards

Michael.

Michael Johnson
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2039678

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Web: www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or
www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingcontrol

Location: Planning Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street, SHEFFIELD S1 2SH
Building Control Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street (Tel. 0114
273 4168)

Apply for planning permission online at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 November 2018 15:03

To: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning)

Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Hello Michael

Thank you for uploading the report to the file.

At this stage I respect your decision to decline a meeting. However, I would strongly advise astute consideration of the Very Special Circumstances report. The proposal has substantially evolved from the initial pre-application submission. In light of the significant socio-economic challenges facing Sheffield this application can be an exemplary strategy to remedy them. I would therefore still insist in a meeting with you so I can gain a greater understanding of your perspective.

I look forward to speaking with you about the approach you will take. Particularly in regards to how the scheme is unacceptable as the 5 purposes of the Green Belt are not achieved onsite. The scheme before you has been compiled using an objective methodology, case law and a keen understanding of socio-economic factors which support the sustainable development at Long Line. Therefore, a greater understanding of your approach will be required. Hopefully, a common ground can be established particularly in light of the Very Special Circumstances report.

Sorry I missed your call I was in a meeting. Happy to call you, however I must insist on a face to face meeting to understand your perspective in full.

Kind regards

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Planning
ADAS

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

www.adas.uk

www.adas.uk

[@ADASGroup](#)



From: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning) [<mailto:Michael.Johnson@sheffield.gov.uk>]

Sent: 26 November 2018 13:44

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

H [Redacted]

Thanks for sending this across, I will upload it to the file.

In terms of a meeting, whilst not wishing to seem obstructive, the views we expressed about a proposal for three houses on the site within the recent pre-application enquiry remain valid for this proposal for 22 houses. Based on this we really do not see a way that this scheme could be considered as acceptable from our perspective. Therefore, whilst we appreciate you have put a lot of work into the information submitted, given our views are so far different, we do not feel a meeting would be a worthwhile exercise.

I do intend to get in touch and inform you of the likely approach we intend to take in terms of the timing of any decision closer to the time.

Feel free to give me a call if you want to discuss (I tried to call but got your voicemail).

Regards

Michael.

Michael Johnson
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2039678

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Web: www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or
www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingcontrol

Location: Planning Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street, SHEFFIELD S1 2SH
Building Control Service, Howden House, 1 Union Street (Tel. 0114
273 4168)

Apply for planning permission online at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 November 2018 14:57
To: Johnson Michael (DEL-Planning)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application 18/04034/OUT Long Line

Good afternoon Michael

Hope you are well. Please see the attached document as the Very Special Circumstances report which details the benefits of the proposed development in line with Green Belt policy.

Furthermore, I am wondering if you are available weeks commencing 11th or 17th of

December for a face to face meeting to discuss the proposal in greater detail.

Kind regards

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Planning

ADAS

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

www.adas.uk

www.adas.uk

[@ADASGroup](#)

ADAS exists to provide ideas, specialist knowledge and solutions to secure our food and enhance the environment.

The information is intended for the addressee and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by parties other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material. Opinions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of ADAS are neither given or endorsed by it. Where this email contains a quote for ADAS goods or services it is covered by our standard T&Cs, available from [T&Cs](#), unless otherwise specified.

ADAS is a trading name of RSK ADAS Ltd. Registered in England No. 10486936. Registered Office: Spring Lodge, 172 Chester Road, Helsby, Cheshire, WA6 0AR. RSK ADAS Ltd is part of RSK Group Ltd.

This Email, and any attachments, may contain non-public information and is intended solely for the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this Email has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this Email may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Sheffield City Council will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail

ADAS exists to provide ideas, specialist knowledge and solutions to secure our food and enhance the environment.

The information is intended for the addressee and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by parties other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material. Opinions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of ADAS are neither given or endorsed by it. Where this email contains a quote for ADAS goods or services it is covered by our standard T&Cs, available from [T&Cs](#), unless otherwise specified.

ADAS is a trading name of RSK ADAS Ltd. Registered in England No. 10486936. Registered Office: Spring Lodge, 172

Chester Road, Helsby, Cheshire, WA6 0AR. RSK ADAS Ltd is part of RSK Group Ltd.

This Email, and any attachments, may contain non-public information and is intended solely for the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this Email has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this Email may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Sheffield City Council will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail

ADAS exists to provide ideas, specialist knowledge and solutions to secure our food and enhance the environment.

The information is intended for the addressee and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by parties other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material. Opinions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of ADAS are neither given or endorsed by it. Where this email contains a quote for ADAS goods or services it is covered by our standard T&Cs, available from [T&Cs](#), unless otherwise specified.

ADAS is a trading name of RSK ADAS Ltd. Registered in England No. 10486936. Registered Office: Spring Lodge, 172 Chester Road, Helsby, Cheshire, WA6 0AR. RSK ADAS Ltd is part of RSK Group Ltd.

This Email, and any attachments, may contain non-public information and is intended solely for the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this Email has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this Email may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Sheffield City Council will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail

ADAS exists to provide ideas, specialist knowledge and solutions to secure our food and enhance the environment.

The information is intended for the addressee and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by parties other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material. Opinions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of ADAS are neither given or endorsed by it. Where this email contains a quote for ADAS goods or services it is covered by our standard T&Cs, available from [T&Cs](#), unless otherwise specified.

ADAS is a trading name of RSK ADAS Ltd. Registered in England No. 10486936. Registered Office: Spring Lodge, 172 Chester Road, Helsby, Cheshire, WA6 0AR. RSK ADAS Ltd is part of RSK Group Ltd.

This Email, and any attachments, may contain non-public information and is intended solely for the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this Email has been misdirected,

please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this Email may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Sheffield City Council will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail

ADAS exists to provide ideas, specialist knowledge and solutions to secure our food and enhance the environment.

The information is intended for the addressee and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by parties other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material. Opinions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of ADAS are neither given or endorsed by it. Where this email contains a quote for ADAS goods or services it is covered by our standard T&Cs, available from [T&Cs](#), unless otherwise specified.

ADAS is a trading name of RSK ADAS Ltd. Registered in England No. 10486936. Registered Office: Spring Lodge, 172 Chester Road, Helsby, Cheshire, WA6 0AR. RSK ADAS Ltd is part of RSK Group Ltd.