PROPOSED SECOND VARIATION OF STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY AT HUNSFIELD ROAD, STOCKSBIDGE, SHEFFIELD S3 6JA

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 To seek authority to make a "no objections" response to the Department of Transport’s formal consultation on a proposed variation Order, Stopping-up part of a public footpath at Hunshelf Road, Stocksbridge, Sheffield.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 An application to make a variation Order to stop-up part of a public footpath at the Fox Valley Retail Development, Hunshelf Road, Stocksbridge, Sheffield, under Section 247 and 333 (7) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, has been made to the Department for Transport’s National Transport Casework Team (NTCT)

2.2 NTCT has contacted the City Council, as a statutory consultee, in respect of the proposed closure referred to below.

2.3 The applicant is seeking the closure of the length of public footpath shown between points E to F on the plan included as Appendix A.

2.4 The Original Section 247 Order for this site was made on 18th April 2013. Its plan is shown at Appendix C. This was amended by a variation Order, made 19th March 2015, which is shown at Appendix B. This provided for the section of footpath/cycle track shown as F to E in Appendix B to be diverted to run F to G, albeit also with a new footpath-only route F to H. It is this new footpath-only route, shown as E to F in Appendix A, which the currently-proposed further variation Order seeks to remove.

2.5 Planning permission was granted by the City Council on 16th November 2011 under REF 11/02480/FUL for a mixed use development within the area outlined in red on the plan included as Appendix D.
2.6 The original planning permission allowed for a range of uses within the retail units. The applicant concedes that at the time of the previous Orders they could not anticipate the type of establishments that would utilize the area. The subject path will pass through an area of predominantly cafes, bars and restaurants with outdoor seating and communal areas. The applicant feels that it would be inappropriate to direct pedestrians through busy dining areas and contends that to facilitate their development it would be more appropriate not to have a footpath in this position.

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 In this particular case the NTCT of the Department for Transport is the Order-making body, therefore it is not the role of the City Council to consult the statutory organisations and other relevant bodies. However, as part of the process of making the application to NTCT, the applicant should have consulted the usual sources and been in discussion with affected parties concerning the resiting and protection of their equipment. As with all Section 247 Orders, the applicant for this variation is subject to local public advertising and consultation, organized by the NTCT.

4.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The Director of Legal Services has been consulted and has advised that, assuming the subject path needs to be stopped up to facilitate the approved development, it would be appropriate for the NTCT to vary the existing Town & Country Planning Act 1990, Section 247 Order to do so.

5.0 HIGHWAY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Though not currently constructed, the subject path is intended to be 38m in length and provide an entry point to/from the westernmost end of the Fox Valley Retail Park. The alternative route is 60m longer, and provided over a wide, level route that enters/exits at the main retail park entrance.

5.2 This additional length is not felt to be significant in the context of the length of the route through Fox Valley as a whole. The the loss of the subject path should not affect the public’s enjoyment of this area and will have no detrimental effect on the surrounding highway network and its users.

5.3 The Council is satisfied that it is necessary to close the existing highway as shown on the plan included as Appendix A, to facilitate the approved development.
6.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

Verbal comments have been received from a local resident and business owner regarding the loss of a flat route suitable for disabled users. However, the alternative route is level, step free, and has a minimum width of 2m – though this is 3m through the retail development – and, although slightly longer, it is not thought to be problematic, bearing in mind that it forms part of a lengthy continuous route through the development as a whole.

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 No particular environmental implications arise from the proposal in this report.

8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There will be no future maintenance costs for this section of footpath once closed. The effect on the Highway Maintenance Revenue Budget is considered to be negligible.

8.2 All costs associated arising from the application will be met by the applicant.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 Based on the above information, I have no objections to the proposed second variation of stopping-up of highway at Hunshelf Road, Stocksbridge, Sheffield S36 as shown between points E to F on the plan included as Appendix A.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 No objections are raised to the proposed second variation of stopping-up of highway at Hunshelf Road, Stocksbridge, Sheffield S36 as shown between points E to F on the plan included as Appendix A., subject to satisfactory arrangements being made with the Statutory Undertakers with regards to such of their mains and services that may be affected.

10.2 Authorises the Director of Legal Services to notify N.T.C.T. of this decision.

Mark Reeder

Senior Technician
Highway Records.
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