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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.316.001

What is your Name: maspiers

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:

Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan

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

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

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:

Not completed by respondent

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:

I note that the Minimum service frequency standard (for buses) is defined as "at least three buses or trams per hour in each direction, between 7:30am and 6pm (Monday to Friday). A lower service frequency may be accepted, within reason, in rural areas." I presume that this implies an average timetable of 1 bus every 20 minutes, and note that this is currently not met along several of the defined mass transit corridors.

including the A6102 to Stocksbridge. It is therefore unfortunate that the Plan does not appear to contain any policies to support extension to the South Yorkshire Supertram network beyond some vague words in POLICY T1 - ENABLING SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL, or any reference the reopening of the Sheffield – Stocksbridge railway.

I suggest that the relevant parts of policies SP1, SA2 and T1 are rewritten to include the above.

Suggested wording is as follows:

Policy SP1

- j) Major new transport infrastructure, including:
- support for strategic rail investment to unlock capacity and journey time improvements between Sheffield and London, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, and the East Midlands.
 support for proposals set out in the Sheffield Midland Station and Sheaf Valley Development Framework to facilitate High Speed 2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail.
- local rail upgrades, including to the Hope Valley Line and Barrow Hill Line, and the Sheffield Stocksbridge line
- strategic highway improvements, as part of integrated, multimodal schemes, to increase connectivity between residential areas and major centres of economic activity.
- new active travel infrastructure linking new residential areas to employment opportunities, local services, and leisure facilities (see Policy T1). extension of the South Yorkshire Supertram network to serve areas of growth

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

No, I do not 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:

N/A

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.316.002

What is your Name: maspiers

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:

Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield

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

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

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:

Not completed by respondent

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:

I note that the Minimum service frequency standard (for buses) is defined as "at least three buses or trams per hour in each direction, between 7:30am and 6pm (Monday to Friday). A lower service frequency may be accepted, within reason, in rural areas." I presume that this implies an average timetable of 1 bus every 20 minutes, and note that this is currently not met along several of the defined mass transit corridors,

including the A6102 to Stocksbridge. It is therefore unfortunate that the Plan does not appear to contain any policies to support extension to the South Yorkshire Supertram network beyond some vague words in POLICY T1 - ENABLING SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL, or any reference the reopening of the Sheffield – Stocksbridge railway.

I suggest that the relevant parts of policies SP1, SA2 and T1 are rewritten to include the above.

Suggested wording:

Policy SA2

- g) Deliver sustainable transport improvements, including:
- A61 highway junction improvements and links to Penistone Road, Shalesmoor;
- Active travel improvements, including projects proposed by Connecting Sheffield;
 and
- Mass Transit Corridors at: (i) City Centre to the Upper Don Valley; and (ii) City Centre to Chapeltown and High Green.
- Extension of the South Yorkshire Supertram network to serve Stocksbridge, existing settlements and proposed developments along the A6102 Mass Transit Corridor

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

No, I do not 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:

N/A

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.316.003

What is your Name: maspiers

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:

Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel

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

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

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:

Not completed by respondent

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:

I note that the Minimum service frequency standard (for buses) is defined as "at least three buses or trams per hour in each direction, between 7:30am and 6pm (Monday to Friday). A lower service frequency may be accepted, within reason, in rural areas." I presume that this implies an average timetable of 1 bus every 20 minutes, and note that this is currently not met along several of the defined mass transit corridors,

including the A6102 to Stocksbridge. It is therefore unfortunate that the Plan does not appear to contain any policies to support extension to the South Yorkshire Supertram network beyond some vague words in POLICY T1 - ENABLING SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL, or any reference the reopening of the Sheffield – Stocksbridge railway.

I suggest that the relevant parts of policies SP1, SA2 and T1 are rewritten to include the above.

Suggested wording:

Add:

• Re-opening the Sheffield - Stocksbridbge Railway Line to passengers, including new stations to serve existing communities and areas of growth.

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

No, I do not 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:

N/A