

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.382.001

What is your Name: Simono

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: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

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:

The plan sets out as one of its main objectives the redensification of the city centre and wider inner city to accommodate some 18,000 new homes. This is proposed largely to protect the city's established Green Belt from incursion. However the plan does not propose a strong spatial or policy vision of how people living in the new inner city neighbourhoods will be offered access to green or blue spaces and access to nature of similar quality to those available mainly to suburbs in the west and south of the city. The river parkways of Sheffield are a distinctive and unique feature of the city but not evenly distributed. The plan fails to identify future opportunities to extend this network and presents a weaker vision than previous approved plans including the UDP 1998, Core Strategy 2009 or the Waterways Strategy 2014. This weakness

appears not just in the initial Part 1 but at every level of the plan including the detailed Development Management policies, policy maps and Priority Site Frameworks.

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:

The plan should include a much clearer spatial analysis of the existing green-blue network highlighting gaps, opportunities and exemplars and contain a much more proactive vision tying into policies on climate change, biodiversity recovery and active travel.

It should build on the visions of previously adopted plans mentioned above. It should spell out current and proposed initiatives by both the council and private and third sector partners to extend the G-B network on the policy maps and priority site frameworks.

The Natural Capital Maps referred to as the basis of interventions at a site level should be released for comment and consultation as part of the local plan process, not after it has been submitted.

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:

The success of the plan's central proposition depends on creating a liveable and attractive inner city as a longterm residential location. This requires a much stronger emphasis on creating a green-blue setting with sustainable and attractive connections