

## Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

### Respondent details

**Comment ID number:** PDSP.255.001

**What is your Name:** JadeClarke11

**If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:**

N/A

**If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:**

N/A

### Document

**Which document to you wish to make a representation on:**

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

**Which section of the document is your representation on:**

Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives

**Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:**

N/A

### Representation

**Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant:** No

**Do you consider the Local Plan is sound:** No

**Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate:** No

**Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:**

The Local Plan would ascribe a significant pathway for placemaking and shaping Sheffield. I am a resident within Sheffield, a student, an employee, a volunteer and family member. I actively engage with and observe social, cultural, economic, behavioural, psychological, ecological, emotional and experiential elements emerging in Sheffield. There is a strong sense of identity for people in Sheffield that relates to Sheffield as a place to exist and live within as well as to constitute. People have an intimate personal and collective relationship with place. As an active, conscientious citizen I am disappointed to hear of this consultation on a proposal for huge scale development just 4 days prior to the closure date of the consultation. I have not been sent a letter, nor an email, nor has this development proposal been

mentioned in my Development modules that I have participated in at my undergraduate within Human Geography at the university 'of' Sheffield. This is missed opportunity for the city. There are students who are studying matters of place and space at a major university that is a significant part of the city yet planning possibilities have not been communicated to this population of people, who have an interdisciplinary interest in the ways of society. I appreciate the videos provided to support the pedagogy of the proposed plan however, they are vague, with the important details of this proposal contained within several documents that are too large to make detailed constructive commentary upon in such a short space of time. The digital survey method of representation or comment upon the plan is not and has not been inclusive. I have seen very little effort to engage different voices in the cityscape. From the rapid reading I have done thus far I am concerned that the global scale impacts of such a city plan would not create a net biodiversity gain, nor would they generate long term good quality livelihoods. There is a lack of intersectionality within the plan and it also follows particular imaginaries of relationships between city and countryside, people and non-human life forms, employment patterns and educational formulations. The main metric used to measure success is GDP and capital growth whilst there is scope for more health metrics to be utilised. This plan could consider the central issue of waste as a design opportunity within the systems and networks of the city and consider the implications of local resource flows much more globally and ecologically. For example, what building materials and regulations will be followed and have they been reviewed to see if they are of a high enough standard for climate integration and bio-regeneration at a global scale? From reading the latest building regulations for residential purposes, I am skeptical that these regulations are sufficient. Skepticism is important for bringing forward the best quality and innovation. I have not been given sufficient access to the planning process in order to make a detailed representation for this plan. I am certain that I am not the only person who has this experience as every resident I have spoken to did not know that such plans for the space they are a part of, are in existence. I contest that the consultation process is and has been democratic and inclusive. This plan needs to be carefully analysed and given approval by the people of the city before a slither of it is implemented. Because that's the kind of city I seek to live in; one where the design process is convivial and inclusive.

**Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:**

This 'City Plan' document should at this stage be considered entirely a proposal that is to be put forward to schools, students, residents, public and private organisations, 3rd sector organisations and social enterprises for their analysis and consideration. Workshops that record people's reactions and responses to the plan should be carried out to build a picture of the ways in which the plan would need to be modified in order to meet the Sustainable Development Goals. A thorough consideration of where life cycle assessments could be applied to the plan needs to take place. A survey of economic models that could be utilised, such a donut Economics, circular economics, and degrowth economics which would help determine and decipher the nature of metrics being implemented should be carried out and modelling should take place to consider how appropriate fundamental assumptions within the plan are

for climate and social wellness. Definitions of ' biodiversity net gain' need to be explored. The Nature Recovery Plan is co-ordinated as a sign-up/membership to a set of goals that 30% of resources should be great for nature, this goal could be interpreted as arbitrary. The method of nature recovery mobilisation appears to rely upon volunteerism to clean up major pollution, as well as alter behaviour and practices that generate harmful ecological consequences. Multi-stakeholder analysis of the efficacy of this approach should take place.

I have several questions:

For processes of remediation for a contaminated ex-landfill site, what counts as remediation? What are the standards of acceptance/compliance? Do these standards serve a long term, sustainable, global scale ecology? Or do they remediate sufficiently for residential purposes, with a level of exposure to toxins kept within a certain risk probability? Is a 10 metre space between contamination and residential sites sufficient, since it is unlikely that pollutants will remain static? Bat and swift boxes are an important token, but the mining and manufacturing of materials for buildings is a huge factor in ecological stability. These materials will likely be outsourced from the UK and it is essential that global responsibility is taken. Sheffield is a global city, if it is to be reshaped by the resources of the Earth, it needs to be done so with the utmost awareness of and sensitivity to the consequences of mining, manufacturing, installing and maintaining buildings. Grey to Green frameworks in the city need to be developed further. The ability for people to grow their own food and to have carefully designed kitchens that support wholefood diets are important factors not detailed in this document. How people will keep their dwellings mould-free and how well insulated a building is are vital elements to long term health for all. Green roofing and soil-based urban agriculture can be integrated to produce health interventions that can tackle cardiovascular disease and other non-communicable diseases. It is good to see floodplains are not going to be residential. Closer assessment of flood and water management should take place with different important actors engaged in this. I have not been able to give as deep a consultation as I know is necessary and there are many people who have not had a say in how the city could transform. It is clear that transformation is required, but lessons from displacement, pollution and inequality resulting from previous development patterns can be considered and measured, for identifying best practice approaches with future changes in and around the city.

Homelessness and mental health are key crises that we face in the city, these circumstances could be addressed carefully with city changes, however, they are barely mentioned in the report. Is the supporting document for the issues and priorities truly representative, what kind of questions were asked? What kind of engagement occurred at the stage of outlining issues and priorities? Who responded and how? How do we cross reference the current version of the development proposal with the issues and priorities to ensure that these match up?

This is a brief critique due to restricted time to give the plan thorough attention. It is our responsibility to protect the ecosystems and people that I dwell with. To allow this plan to go ahead without appropriate due diligence would be harmful. I would like to know what systems of diligence are in place and then supply ideas for how to democratise these systems.

**If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):**

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**

As I have begun to detail in the brief responses I have given, I can see that this plan requires critique and processes that allow for more democratic critique. One of the main drivers of ecological and social damage is not designing systems, processes an