

KN34: 132 Rugby Street, S3 9PP	
9.23	What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
9.23.1	The site was identified through a capacity study (CC02) undertaken by Deloitte and Planit-IE in 2020.
9.24	How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
9.24.1	The site capacities for allocation sites without planning permission within the Central Sub-Area (which are not in the Priority Location or a Catalyst Site), were informed by the capacity study (CC02) undertaken by Deloitte and Planit-IE in 2020. The study took a density-led approach to each neighbourhood within the Central Area, taking account of townscape character appraisals. Analysis identified appropriate building heights within different areas, and used benchmarked typologies to inform appropriate densities which inform the capacity testing. The work in the capacity study has been incorporated into the HELAA, where appropriate.
9.25	What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the employment and mixed-use sites? Is it justified?
9.25.1	N/A
9.26	What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions, and completions/construction?
9.26.1	The site has no current planning permissions or applications.
9.27	What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?

KN34: 132 Rugby Street, S3 9PP

9.27.1

The site selection methodology (CD56) identifies potential adverse impacts of developing this site for housing, including insufficient open space in the surrounding area, provision of affordable housing, proximity to incompatible uses, archaeological constraints, impact on air quality, proximity to regulated waste sites, and the likelihood of existing land contamination.

The conditions on development (CD36) in order to address the above identified potential adverse impacts requires an assessment to determine the impact of the nearby Environment Agency waster permit site and any mitigation measures required, a detailed assessment of the extent of any land contamination and sufficient mitigation and a staged archaeological evaluation and building appraisal. New open space though identified as insufficient in this locality will be provided on the nearby allocation sites in the Priority Location (i.e.: KN03 and KN36).

Other potential and unidentified adverse impacts, including those on the local environment and communities would be avoided or mitigated through compliance with the Sheffield Plan's development management policies, notably GS5, GS9, GS10, DE1, DE2, DE3, DE 4 and DE9.

This includes mitigating any reduction in air quality in accordance with policy ES5, provision of affordable housing in accordance with policy NC3 and mitigating potentially contaminated land in accordance with policy ES6.

9.28

What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?

KN34: 132 Rugby Street, S3 9PP

9.28.1

The site is situated completely within flood zone 1. It is at partial risk from a design flood level of surface water flooding.

The site was assessed in the Level 1 (FR01 & FR09) and Level 2 (EXAM 38 & 40E) Strategic Flood Risk Assessments. These assessments conclude that the site is broadly appropriate for more vulnerable uses subject to suitable mitigation.

We consider the site suitable for allocation, subject to compliance with national and local flood risk policies and the following requirements:

- A joined-up approach should be carried out with neighbouring sites KN18 and KN35 to ensure surface water risk, maintaining existing flow routes and drainage are considered cumulatively.
- All points within section 5.3 of the Level 2 SFRA site assessment should be addressed through a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment at or before planning application stage.

In order to ensure the identified risks are fully mitigated, the following condition on development should be applied to the site allocation: "Due consideration should be given to any impacts of flood risk identified in the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. All mitigation matters identified in the "LPA conclusions" section of the Level 2 SFRA site assessment should be addressed at or before planning application stage".

9.29

What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

KN34: 132 Rugby Street, S3 9PP	
9.29.1	<p>Infrastructure schemes to support the Sheffield Plan are set out in the Infrastructure Schedule within Annex 1 of Part 2 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (EXAM 43). The IDP identifies developer contributions that may be required on this site for the following schemes: ED04, ED05, ED06, ED07, HE01, GI10, GI11, GI12, GI14, CF05. The IDP also notes that further appropriate developer contributions may be necessary for transport schemes through CIL and S106 agreements at the time individual planning applications come forward.</p> <p>The IDP concludes that costs for schemes should not be set out at present, due to the incremental nature of infrastructure needs, the current inflationary environment and the absence of a prescriptive cost apportionment approach (EXAM 43 Paragraphs 2.3.5 – 2.3.6).</p> <p>Physical and other constraints to development are identified within the Site Selection Methodology Site Appraisal (CD56). Potential constraints relating to this site are: Nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites, land contamination, and archaeological evaluation. These have been addressed through the various Development Management policies (Part 2, CD02) and the application of specific conditions on development for the site within the Annex A: Site Allocations (CD36) document.</p> <p>The Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified that a further condition on development should be applied to this site, to provide suitable flood mitigation. The Council is now proposing a modification to reflect the findings and details of this are set out within the response on flooding above.</p>
9.30	Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
9.30.1	The site has existing occupiers, but was submitted in the 2019 Call for Sites, with the current land promoter being supportive of allocation.
9.31	What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
9.31.1	The site is expected to come forward later in the Plan period, in 2036/37, once existing users have relocated.
9.32	Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?
9.32.1	We propose a modification PS14 (EXAM1A) to add a condition on development for this site in response to the flood risk issues identified above in 9.28.