

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.027.001

What is your Name: Richard Wood

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

Richard Wood Associates

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:

Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST)

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: 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:

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:

POLICY SP1: OVERALL GROWTH PLAN

The Sheffield Plan does not provide for a sufficient amount of housing. The NPPF requires that a sufficient amount and variety of land should be brought forward to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing.

“Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan” sets out that “The Sheffield Plan will realise the vision for a ‘an economically stronger, fairer, more inclusive and sustainable city’ by promoting growth that delivers the homes, jobs, employment floorspace, infrastructure, and community facilities to meet Sheffield’s identified needs.” Criterion a) of Policy SP1 proposes that the Sheffield Plan will deliver 35,530 new homes by 2039, 2,090 homes per annum from 2022 to 2039.”

The Sheffield Plan takes an economic led approach as the proposed number of new homes will support the target for creating new jobs set out in the Sheffield Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Strategic Economic Plan (2021 - 2041) (SYMCA SEP). Paragraph 3.8 of the Sheffield Plan explains that it will deliver a level of growth that will support the city’s economic growth ambitions, as evidenced by the Council’s latest Housing, Economic Growth and Demographic Modelling (ICENI 2021).

This modelling work establishes that the required labour supply increase suggests a need for up to 2,323 dwellings per annum. It is then noted this could be reduced by around 300 dwellings per annum (dpa) to 1,994 dpa, if further improvement to economic activity rates could be achieved. The modelling work (Housing, Economic Growth and Demographic Modelling, ICENI, 2021) (ICENI report, para 8.13) states that “overall, it is difficult on the basis of this analysis to say exactly what has been happening to economic activity rates since 2011” and that “there may be some potential for Sheffield to see improvements to economic activity over and above that forecast at a national level by OBR”.

There is therefore much uncertainty as to whether there will be improvements in economic activity rates, economic projections generally will also change over time. If an economic led approach is to be maintained then the 2,323 dpa requirement would provide a more appropriate housing requirement figure for Sheffield and economic activity levels should then be monitored to see if any changes occur.

The standard method uses a formula to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for, in a way which addresses projected household growth and historic under-supply. The urban uplift aims to support development in sustainable locations. Sheffield has experienced past population growth (above regional level growth rates) and it is important that the needs of a growing population are met. In 2019, it is estimated that the population of the city had risen by 14% from 2001 levels, this is in contrast to an 11% rise across the region and 14% nationally (ICENI 2021, paragraph 3.6). ICENI’s Table 4.2 Projected population growth (2021-2038) – 2018-based SNPP (alternative internal migration assumptions) shows growth for Sheffield higher than for Yorkshire and the Humber and England.

Paragraph 1.4 of the Sheffield Plan states that “It is vital that the Sheffield Plan reflects the needs and aspirations of every person in the city, no matter who they are, where they live, or what stage they are at in their life” Paragraph 2.9 of the Sheffield Plan sets out an ambition that as part of “The Vision – Our City in 2039” that “the city will provide a good quality housing offer meeting the needs of different household types and sizes”. “Significantly increase the supply of affordable housing, accessible market housing and specialist housing for older people, disabled people and other vulnerable groups, particularly in places of greatest need” forms one of the objectives for thriving neighbourhoods and communities (page 16).

The Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2019 estimates that there is a shortfall in affordable units of 902 per annum in Sheffield (SHMA paragraph 8.5). There is therefore a pressing and significant need for affordable housing in Sheffield. The SHMA (8.11) identifies how policies and plans must anticipate the need to increase the supply of decent, affordable housing in a

sustainable and long-term way. The consequences of not meeting the levels of affordable housing are summarised in the SHMA (para 8.14) as:

- likely further substantial increases in the level of affordable housing need;
- increased pressure on the new Homeless Reduction duties on local authorities;
- increased levels of social and economic polarisation within authorities and between constituent market areas; and
- increased down-stream pressure on other services such as supported housing, adult health and social care as households are increasingly unable to meet basic needs (for example, to enable independent living).

The Government's Standard Method establishes that there is a requirement to provide 49,691 homes in the 2021-38 period at an average rate of 2,923 dwellings per annum. The proposed level of housing in the Sheffield Plan is well below the standard method and should be increased taking this into account and the requirement of 2,323 dpa to provide the required labour supply based on an economic led approach.

Criterion h) of Policy SP1 is "Protection for existing Green Belt boundaries around existing built-up areas, with one strategic land releases on a predominantly brownfield site at the former Norton Aerodrome (for residential use) (see Policy SA6)." The level of housing that should be planned for in the Sheffield Plan provides exceptional circumstances for altering Green Belt boundaries.

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:

The proposed level of housing in the Sheffield Plan is well below the level that results from the standard method - 2,923 dwellings per annum (dpa). The housing requirement for Sheffield should be increased to this level or at least to a requirement of 2,

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.027.002

What is your Name: Richard Wood

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

Richard Wood Associates

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:

Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST)

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 SP2: Spatial Strategy

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:

POLICY SP2: SPATIAL STRATEGY

Policy SP2 establishes that the majority of future growth will be on previously developed sites within existing urban areas. These are the Main Urban Area of Sheffield, and the two Principal Towns of Stocksbridge/Deepcar, and Chapeltown/High Green. The spatial strategy has been defined by considering the future of the Sheffield across nine 'sub-areas'. The sub-areas will deliver a pattern of sustainable development within the existing settlement hierarchy of Sheffield (Main Urban Area), and the identified Principal Towns, Larger Villages and Smaller Villages.

Policy SP2 does establish a broad settlement hierarchy for Sheffield and a focus on previously development land. The policy does not convey a spatial approach beyond this, it is left to the sub area development strategies to do this. A more developed overall spatial approach would convey how the spatial strategy could achieve more sustainable development, address climate change and support more inclusive communities, in a local Sheffield and city wide context.

Policy T1 sets out how the Sheffield Plan's will enable more sustainable travel, including seven Mass Transit Corridors (MTCs) at the City Level. There is a key opportunity for Policy SP2 to establish and use the MTCs as a spatial focus for future development, adding to and refining the more general settlement focus of the spatial strategy. Such an integrated land use and transport planning approach would shape the nine sub area strategies and importantly make a key difference in achieving climate friendly, sustainable and inclusive places.

Policy H1 of the Sheffield Plan very much focuses on the central area. A combined focus on the central area and sustainable transport corridors would provide a more balanced and Sheffield/city wide spatial strategy. The priorities for locating growth are set out at paragraph 3.5 of the Sheffield Plan and these include:

- enabling homes to be located within easy reach of the main employment areas;
- matching opportunity and need by concentrating new development in locations that are, or could be, well served by the tram/rail network or key bus corridors, as well as other essential infrastructure;
- supporting existing public transport services, and enabling the provision of new infrastructure that enables active travel;
- maximising accessibility by directing higher density developments and those that generate significant numbers of trips to the City Centre, District Centres and other locations close to railway stations, Supertram stops and high frequency bus routes

A spatial strategy focus on sustainable transport/transit corridors would deliver and support the above priorities. This would work alongside the priority to support distinctive and thriving District Centres and Local Centres that act as a focus for the development of a network of '20-minute neighbourhoods' across the city. Overall, a more balanced 'across the city' spatial approach would result. The countryside and the Green Belt are also not uniform areas in terms of character, land use, value and locational sustainability and transport corridors provide a helpful focus for making such distinctions.

Policy SP2 should include the Mass Transit Corridors as a spatial focus for future development, adding to and refining the more general settlement focus of the spatial strategy. A focus on sustainable transport corridors also provides a more effective means of identifying sustainable locations for development as opposed to a distinction between previously developed and greenfield sites.

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:

Policy SP2 should include the Mass Transit Corridors as a spatial focus for future development, adding to and refining the more general settlement focus of the spatial strategy.

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 a landowner and developer CST is committed to quality and takes a responsible approach to development; as such, it measures performance in financial as well as social and environmental terms. CST comments on Policy SP2 provide a perspective as to how t

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.027.003

What is your Name: Richard Wood

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

Richard Wood Associates

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:

Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST)

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 SA7: Southwest 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: 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:

Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area

Paragraph 4.72 of the Sheffield Plan describes the countryside in Southwest Sheffield sub area as follows "The area includes extensive areas of attractive countryside, which is designated as Green Belt, and popular parks and woodland. The very small village of Ringinglow straddles the boundary with the Peak District National Park and is within the Green Belt (on the Sheffield side of the boundary). The sub-area provides some of the main 'gateway' routes into the Peak District National Park with the Porter Valley providing a major recreational route linking the urban area to the countryside."

The countryside and the Green Belt are variable in terms of character, role and value. The urban or settlement fringe is often a case in point, with a mix of land uses and proximity to existing built form and local services and facilities. Land uses to the north of Dore uses include disused sports grounds to the north and east, private residential property, a care home, and the HSBC sport club.

The following text should be added to paragraph 4.27.

Parts of the landscape around Dore provide a transitional landscape between the uplands of the Peak District to the west and the dense urban area of Sheffield to the east. The setting of the national park is not strictly defined and not all of the landscape falling within mapped national park landscape character areas form the setting to the park.

The evidence for this statement is set out in a Landscape Technical Report that was prepared by Gillespies LLP, specialists in landscape and urban design, master planning, and landscape planning issues. This Technical Report was submitted by CST to Sheffield City Council in response to consultation on the draft Dore Neighbourhood Plan (and can be resubmitted if required).

Paragraph 4.73 of the Sheffield Plan makes the following limited references to transport in the Southwest Sheffield sub area: "There is a railway station at Dore but the sub-area is not served by the tram and does not have an outer ring road; there is frequent congestion on main routes into the City Centre." The Transport Case Report submitted by CST in support of the representation to Policy T1 identifies, based on the Sheffield Plan's Core Public Transport Network, that in 2023 the A625 would be a medium frequency bus corridor. Improvements in service frequencies between 2020 and 2023 highlight the scope for the corridor to form part of the MTC which is identified as part of criterion g) of Policy SA 7 - "a Mass Transit Corridor from part of City Centre to the Southwest". This is supported. The MTC should be referred to in paragraph 4.73.

Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area includes the requirement to: "Deliver a housing requirement figure for the two neighbourhood plan areas.....Dore - at least 40 homes...." The Policy SA7 - Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area Site Allocations are listed in Appendix 1 of the Part 1 document with further details set out in the Annex A document, Site Allocations Schedule.

Further site allocations may need to be considered for the Sheffield Plan. This could be as a result of a higher housing requirement and the demonstration of exceptional circumstances (see CST response to Policy SP1) and/or a refined spatial strategy (see CST response to Policy SP2) that responds to the role of Mass Transit Corridors as a focus for development. Either or both circumstances could respond to the way in which the countryside and the Green Belt in Sheffield is variable in terms of character, role and value. Some greenfield land in the existing Green Belt is well related to existing settlements, services and facilities and sustainable transport. Relatively limited allocations in such locations could contribute to a balanced and sustainable spatial approach.

A concept masterplan and a series of supporting technical studies were submitted to Sheffield City Council by CST in February 2020 for the CST's site at Dore. This included:

- Access appraisal: Fore Consulting
- Geotechnical constraints: Patrick Parsons
- Preliminary drainage assessment: Arup
- Preliminary heritage assessment: FAS Heritage
- Preliminary ecological assessment: BL Ecology

- Landscape and visual appraisal: Gillespies

Subsequently a Transport Addendum Report and a Biodiversity Metric Assessment Report were submitted in 2021. As an alternative site, the Concept Masterplan Report summarises that the CST land is located on the edge of the sustainable settlement of Dore. Public transport services are convenient and nearby. There are bus stops and services on routes adjoining the site and Dore & Totley rail station is located approximately 2.5 km walking distance from the centre of site. Rail services to Sheffield and Manchester Piccadilly provide extensive access to local, regional and national destinations. Cycling and walking routes provide other sustainable transport choices. With National Cycle Route 6 to the north-west of the site, Sheffield city centre is approximately a 30-minute cycle from the site. Local shops, cafes and services in the village centre, a supermarket, two primary schools, a medical centre and bus services are all in walking distance from the proposed allocation (which is further highlighted in the Transport Addendum report).

The design concept for the site is focused on achieving a high-quality development that responds to site constraints and opportunities. The landscape in this area is less sensitive being of settlement fringe in character, given also the other land uses present such as the adjacent disused sports fields to the north and east. Although the eastern part of the site lies within a much larger Ecclesall Wood Local Wildlife Site (LWS) most of the land concerned in this part of the site is semi-improved grassland used for grazing and of lower ecological diversity compared to the grassland and scrub mosaic to be retained and managed as part of this development. Without timely intervention the higher diversity habitats to be retained will soon succeed into denser woodland and scrub habitats; the development therefore provides an excellent opportunity to enhance, but most importantly manage, the LWS within the site for future years. The impact on the designated area overall will be limited given its wider extent and that the site does not form part of the Ecclesall Woods Local Nature Reserve. There are no strategic heritage constraints, and the site is not an area of flood risk. Vehicular traffic associated with the proposed allocation can be safely and efficiently accommodated on the wider network. There are no significant impacts on the site and surroundings.

Importantly in response to an amended housing requirement and/or spatial strategy for Sheffield, development of the CST site at Dore can deliver a number of immediate and wider benefits to both future residents and the local community which include:

- Widening the choice of housing in Dore with a mix of house types and sizes on the site.
- Providing around 100 homes in an area of strong housing demand (there has been strong interest in the site from a major housebuilder).
- Enabling future residents to use sustainable modes of transport to access local amenities and services and wider opportunities.
- Securing a well-designed 'outward looking' development, with development frontages onto roads and open space and a layout tied into the village edge of Dore.
- Planting hedgerow and trees and reinstating stone walls on the boundaries.
- Delivering an opportunity to manage and enhance part of a LWS which is currently unmanaged for ecological purposes and to make this publicly accessible open space (currently private land).
- Providing public footpaths and cycle paths within the open space, linking to public rights of way and publicly accessible land outside the site, with the potential to link to Ecclesall Wood.

- Retaining woodland habitat in the north of the site and extending it, as well as providing other new ecologically beneficial habitat grassland and open water habitats.

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 following text should be added to paragraph 4.27.

Parts of the landscape around Dore provide a transitional landscape between the uplands of the Peak District to the west and the dense urban area of Sheffield to the east. The setting of the national park is not strictly defined and not all of the landscape falling within mapped national park landscape character areas form the setting to the park.

The MTC should be referred to in paragraph 4.73.

Further site allocations may need to be considered for the Sheffield Plan. This could be as a result of a higher housing requirement and the demonstration of exceptional circumstances (see CST response to Policy SP1) and/or a refined spatial strategy (see CST response to Policy SP2) that responds to the role of Mass Transit Corridors as a focus for development. In such circumstances the CST site at Dore should be included as an allocation.

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:

CST has actively contributed to both the development of the Sheffield Plan and the Dore Neighbourhood Plan. As a long established local landowner CST has a strong understanding of the Southwest Sheffield sub area and the need for a development strategy th

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.027.004

What is your Name: Richard Wood

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

Richard Wood Associates

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:

Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST)

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 H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing

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:

Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing

The distribution of development, particularly for new homes, is a key means for achieving more sustainable development and delivering national policy requirements set out in the NPPF which include:

- Ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations (paragraph 8, the social objective)
- Promoting a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to meet the development needs of an area (part of the presumption in favour of development, paragraph 11)
- Preparing plans that aspirational but deliverable (paragraph 16)

- Provide a sufficient amount and variety of land (paragraph 60)
- The size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies, including families with children (paragraph 62)

The Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2019 provides detailed evidence on the structure and operation of the local housing market. This evidence includes a housing needs model, housing demand analysis and secondary data on the local population and household growth; house prices, turnover and rental levels; and migration, labour market and economic indicators. A large survey of households resulting in 3,836 valid responses and a range of qualitative research with various groups are also reflected. The SHMA identifies that:

- Local migration patterns are quite localised and there is a high degree of 'place attachment' in each Housing Market Area (HMA) as submarkets (SHMA page 18).
- Whilst the market operates fluidly across the internal boundaries of the market area, housing needs arise more locally, and policy needs to consider how such needs can be met locally (SHMA paragraph 8.3).
- A clear preference for detached and semi-detached housing across the SHMA (SHMA Para 5.39) – in Sheffield 50.5% of respondents to the Household Survey expected to move to a semi-detached property and 39.6% a detached property (SHMA Table 5.13)
- There is a wide spread of HMAs that people are looking to move to (SHMA Table 5.16)
- The most popular HMAs in Sheffield are those to the Southwest of Sheffield (11.2 per cent of respondents) and out into the Peak District Fringe (10.4 per cent) (SHMA para 5.420)
- The indicative estimate of backlog, newly arising need, supply and overall shortfall by Housing Market Area (HMA) at Table 6.7 – with the shortfall spread across HMAs and the highest shortfall in the Sheffield Urban West area.
- As a guide, an HMA's needs can be potentially met in immediately adjacent HMAs (SHMA para 6.43)
- 61% of new demand is for three and four+ bedroom dwellings (SHMA Table 8.1)
- Current housing stock provision and demand are different - Table 8.1 shows that the current dwelling type profiled is flats/apartments 25%, terraced 29%, semi-detached 32% and detached 12% - the profile of new demand is 20%, 18%, 35% and 28% - thereby detached has the biggest mismatch and greater new demand. Table 2 in Section 5 of the Sheffield Plan sets out the 'Distribution of Housing Supply by Sub-Area' for 2022-2039. 67% of the 'Potential Number of Homes' are located in the Central Sub Area. Distribution levels to the other eight sub areas range from 0.1% to 10%. A very uneven distribution of development across Sheffield results from the Sheffield Plan's approach. It is important that there is a development emphasis on the Central Sub Area but this should not be to such an extent to significantly limit both choice as to where people live and the ability to address local needs for housing and affordable housing across the different communities in different housing market areas across Sheffield. The Council has also recognised that there will be a reliance on neighbouring authorities to meet needs for family housing.

A more balanced distribution approach to new housing development should be made in the Sheffield Plan. Spatial Option C set out in the September 2020 Issues and

Options Consultation document would provide a more balanced but still aspirational approach as 10,000 additional homes would be provided in the central sub area in the plan period. Importantly Option C also serves to provide for more family housing, detached and semi-detached properties and responds for people not wanting to live in a city centre/central location, amongst a wider mix of housing. This would deliver a greater choice of housing across Sheffield and the thirteen different housing market areas. Option C would:

- Help to meet local housing needs in different communities across Sheffield.
- Provide a greater spread of affordable housing across the City.
- Still promote walking, cycling and public transport use (through the selection of sustainable locations/sites that relate well to local centres and mass transit corridors)
- Reduce out migration from Sheffield by providing a greater mix of housing with less reliance on the City Centre.
- Provides opportunities for local living – as people will also look for homes with space and gardens and greater access to the countryside, away from town and city centres.
- Supports small/local businesses and local services in local neighbourhoods with increased local customer bases.
- Maintain a focus on the Central Area – as 10,000 new homes would still be provided and a further 10,000 new homes could still be provided in the Central Area over a longer period of time alongside the delivery of transformational place making change which is likely to require more than one plan period to achieve.

A further critical factor is the deliverability of the spatial distribution of new homes.

Paragraph 5.6 of the Sheffield Plan states that

“Public intervention will be needed to enable much of the former employment land to transition to sustainable, desirable residential areas. Within these areas, major improvements to neighbourhood facilities and services, highway infrastructure and flood defences will help raise land values and this is expected to improve the economic viability of development sites over time. Many of the potential development sites have multiple owners and the Council intends to work with landowners, tenants and other stakeholders to promote high quality new residential development.

Financial support from the Government could enable sites to come forward sooner.”

The above aspirations and the transformation of the central area are supported but there remains uncertainty as to the delivery of such major urban transformation over one Local Plan period. A lot needs to be done/changed in a relatively short period of time (2022-2039) to deliver the strategy and the concentrated distribution of development focused on the central area. Significant public investment will be required at a time of great pressure on public finances. Development strategies/policy approaches are set out in the Sheffield Plan for six character areas that make up the Central Sub Area. These draw on the City Centre Strategic Vision and the City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks. The ‘vision’ document sets out a “roadmap for positive change that can reset and shape the future direction of this great city”. Vision principles and strategic ambitions are set out to achieve this. The ‘frameworks’ document sets out concept Masterplans and outlines design principles to help shape 5 new distinctive neighbourhoods and to guide future development in each of those areas”.

The preparation of a Delivery Plan for the City Centre Strategic Vision remains a next stage of work. This will “enable key sites to be brought forwards for delivery that will catalyse regeneration in their respective priority neighbourhoods.” The

Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Sheffield Plan (Arup, January 2023) sets out a “Part 1 Infrastructure Needs Assessment” and states that this should be read in conjunction with the “Part 2 Infrastructure Delivery Schedule” - to be produced in due course. This Part 2 document is anticipated to include detailed infrastructure schemes and costs, infrastructure prioritisation, apportionment of needs and costs between individual sites and developers.

The IDP (3.5, page 22) states that given the scarce funding environment in which new development operates, it is likely that there will be a funding gap between the total cost of potential infrastructure schemes and the funding mechanisms available to pay for them. It is recognised in the IDP (page 17) that “an increased number of people living in the centre will result in a more significant demand for infrastructure to support the developing economy and related improvements in local leisure, recreation, transport, employment and education provision.” The Sheffield Plan itself sets out that for the ‘Broad Locations for Growth’ (which are already transitioning or have potential to transition from employment uses to housing) “further work is needed to assemble sites, relocate existing uses, and plan for new infrastructure.” The extent to which new homes on sites and in broad locations will be delivered over the Plan period needs to be demonstrated, and critically the timing of this. The City Centre Strategic Vision Delivery Plan and the Part 2 Infrastructure Delivery Schedule will be critical to understanding how delivery risks will be managed mindful of the amount of intervention/level of investment that will be needed to support place making and ensure that sites are viable in the central sub area. The deliverability of the Sheffield’s Plan’s distribution of development as set in Table 2 has not at this stage been demonstrated.

The distribution of development (in terms of new homes) should follow Spatial Option C as set out in the September 2020 Issues and Options Consultation document. This would provide a more balanced but still aspirational approach as 10,000 additional homes would be provided in the central sub area in the plan period.

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 distribution of development (in terms of new homes) should follow Spatial Option C as set out in the September 2020 Issues and Options Consultation document. This would provide a more balanced but still aspirational approach as 10,000 additional homes would be provided in the central sub area in the plan period.

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:

CST has provided a considered assessment of the spatial distribution of development/new homes across Sheffield, the implications for housing markets and the way in which deliverability has been addressed to date. As such CST would make a constructive cont

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

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.027.005

What is your Name: Richard Wood

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

Richard Wood Associates

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:

Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST)

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: 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:

Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel

The Sheffield Plan sets out (para 5.17) that “to strengthen the role of public transport within the city, there are proposals to deliver a series of Mass Transit Corridors (as highlighted in Policy SP1). These will be dedicated, high-speed public transport corridors, initially focused on priority bus routes to establish critical mass, and with the intention to investigate a transition from private car-based journeys to tram, tram-train extensions, or rail where lines exist. Where appropriate these will incorporate park & ride on key gateways to the city”.

In the Sheffield Plan seven Mass Transit Corridors (MTCs) are set in Policy T1 and shown on Map 16, Transport Opportunities. Criterion k of Policy SP1 also refers to

the MTCs as part of an approach to securing greater use of public transport. Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area includes criterion g) “Help realise projects (including Connecting Sheffield) that deliver sustainable transport improvements, including: a Mass Transit Corridor from part of City Centre to the Southwest”.

The Sheffield Mass Transit Corridors have been considered and assessed for CST by transport consultants Fore, in the Transport Case Report submitted with this representation on Policy T1. In relation to Southwest Sheffield this report notes that with relation to Dore & Totley, an MTC follows the A625 until Ringinglow Road where it terminates at Bents Green. An MTC also runs along the A621 where it begins / terminates at Dore Road. It is unclear and questionable as to why the MTC routes begin / terminate at the locations proposed.

As set out in the Transport Case Report there appears at present to be no definition or justification for the rationale of the A625 and A621 MTC routes as set out in the Sheffield Plan Policies Map and Map 16. These current MTCs appear to discount and not serve the western and southern areas of Dore & Totley, Whirlow and Ecclesall. These areas are not small, isolated villages and extended MTCs would help serve the significant existing residential populations that form part of the Main Urban Area of Sheffield and promote greater public transport use (as required by Policy SP1). It would be more beneficial for the MTCs to be extended to serve all existing residential areas of south-west Sheffield as follows:

- A625 corridor to extend 3.5km south-west and begin / terminate adjacent to where the Sheffield Tigers RUFC is located.
- A621 corridor to extend 3.0km south-west and begin / terminate at Lane Head Road.

The remaining MTC routes, as shown on the Sheffield Plan Policies Map, run to the edges of the main urban area within the Local Authority Boundary; except for towards Mosborough to the south-east. Mosborough would fall under the same ‘West and South Sheffield to City Centre, Lower Don Valley and Meadowhall’ corridor as the A625 and A621. Therefore, it is unclear why this is the only corridor proposed that doesn’t serve all existing residential areas within close proximity to the major link roads.

The Transport Case Report also highlights how the Sheffield Plan Policies Map shows proposed cycle routes on Long Line, Cross Lane and through the centre of Dore. This will help support the objectives of the Sheffield City Region ‘Active Travel Implementation Plan’ by providing a fully connected network of walking and cycling routes by 2024. An extended MTC on the A625 would directly connect to these routes and provide multi-modal connectivity as set outlined in the SYMCA Transport Strategy.

Based on the criteria used for the Sheffield Plan’s Core Public Transport Network, the Transport Case Report also highlights that in 2023, the A625 would currently be a medium frequency bus corridor. Improvements in service frequencies between 2020 and 2023 highlight the scope for frequencies to further improve and for this part of the corridor to form part of the MTC.

Extending the MTCs, as proposed above, would better deliver Policies SP1 and T1 of the Sheffield Plan, enabling more residents to use and benefit from sustainable transport in particular for accessing the City Centre. It would provide a more coherent Mass Transit system within the district. The Sheffield Transport Strategy identifies that the city’s outer suburbs will need to be connected by the MTC routes. Extending the routes to serve the residential populations of Dore & Totley,

Whirlow and Ecclesall as proposed would also therefore help to meet the objectives of the Sheffield Transport Strategy.

CST has also made representations on Policy SP2, Spatial Strategy, as to how the MTCs should form an integral and important part of the overall spatial strategy for Sheffield.

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 Mass Transit Corridors in Southwest Sheffield should be extended to serve all the existing residential areas of south-west Sheffield as follows:

- A625 corridor to extend 3.5km south-west and begin / terminate adjacent to where the Sheffield Tigers RUFC is located.
- A621 corridor to extend 3.0km south-west and begin / terminate at Lane Head Road.

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:

CST has carefully considered the Mass Transit Corridors and commissioned expert work to look at the transport basis for the extent of the Mass Transit Corridors in Southwest Sheffield. CST is therefore well placed to constructively contribute to a discuss

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Supporting Document for a Representation
Date: 15 February 2023 16:14:09
Attachments: [2023-02-09_3792 Transport Case Report_v0.1 \(2\).pdf](#)

Hi

I have just submitted five representations online to the Sheffield Plan consultation on behalf of the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees. We wanted to submit a supporting report with our representation to Policy T1 but we could not see how we could do this online. This is a new report/evidence that we haven't previously submitted. Please could you add the attached report to our submission on Policy T1. Thank you.

kind regards
Richard

Richard Wood, Director
Richard Wood Associates
[REDACTED]

Transport Case Report

9 February 2023
Version 0.1
Final



1 Sheffield Mass Transit Corridors

1.1 Policy Background

1.1.1 Emerging Draft Local Plan

As set out in Policy SP1 of Sheffield City Council (SCC) Draft Local Plan¹, the plan states the following:

“The Sheffield Plan will deliver sustainable development that promotes greater use of public transport to help secure the long-term future for the existing tram network and helps realise Connecting Sheffield’s proposals for active travel. This will include creating seven Mass Transit Corridors, enhancing the five Main Gateway Routes and the 10 City Centre Gateway Routes.”

The map of the proposed Mass Transit Corridors (MTCs) routes is shown on the interactive Sheffield Plan Policies Map². With relation to Dore & Totley, an MTC follows the A625 until Ringinglow Road where it terminates at Bents Green. An MTC also runs along the A621 where it begins / terminates at Dore Road. Within ‘The Sheffield Plan Issues and Options’ document³, these corridors are listed as ‘West and South Sheffield to City Centre, Lower Don Valley and Meadowhall’.

1.1.2 SYMCA & Sheffield Transport Strategies

MTCs within the SYMCA Transport Strategy⁴ are stated as follows:

“Expand and better integrate our mass transit system to provide multi model and affordable connectivity, between both our urban centres and our spatial priority

¹ The Sheffield Plan: Publication (Pre-Submission Draft) Part 1, Sheffield City Council, 2022.

²

<https://sheffieldcc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/sidebar/index.html?appid=2bb7e6bcb78d4141816cbf8611f0bd5b>, Sheffield City Council

³ The Sheffield Plan: Issues and Options, Sheffield City Council, 2020.

⁴ Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy, Sheffield City Region.

growth areas. This includes providing high quality cycle and walking infrastructure to provide sustainable access to sites of employment and transport interchanges.”

MTCs within the Sheffield Transport Strategy⁵ are stated as follows:

“Will need to provide fast, prioritised, limited stop services from the city’s outer suburbs, together with P+R will enable those arriving by car to avoid bringing the car into the city centre.”

1.1.3 Sheffield City Region Mass Transit OBC

An executive summary of an Sheffield City Region Mass Transit OBC⁶ is publicly accessible online. The document was prepared by the Sheffield City Region and South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and states the following:

“The OBC identifies a range of options for the renewal of the Sheffield City Region Mass Transit system, including an assessment based on a range of criteria. It identifies a preferred scheme option to take forward, informed by detailed modelling and appraisal, in this case a renewed network with an improved frequency.”

The OBC identified a list of options for the future of the network as follows:

- Delayed Closure - Refurbish the fleet and maintain operations as long as possible at minimum cost. The network would either close or operate at reduced frequencies.
- Reduced Network - Renew network with service frequencies similar or less than existing network.
- Renew - Similar or improved services to existing network.
- Replace - Replace trams with Bus Rapid Transit.

It was concluded that renewing the existing Mass Transit system would be the best option, assessed against an option assessment framework based on TAG guidance.

Therefore, the Mass Transit OBC only provides justification and recommendations for Sheffield’s existing Mass Transit system, and not the proposed MTC routes as identified in the Draft Local Plan.

⁵ *Transport Strategy*, Sheffield City Council, 2019.

⁶ *Sheffield City Region Mass Transit Outline Business Case - Executive Summary*, Sheffield City Region, 2020.

1.2 The Case for Extended South-West Mass Transit Corridors

1.2.1 Emerging Draft Local Plan

At present, there appears to be no definition or justification for the rationale of the A625 and A621 MTC routes as set out in the Sheffield Plan Policies Map.

The current MTCs as outlined in the Draft Local Plan appear to discount the western and southern areas of Dore & Totley, Whirlow and Ecclesall. These areas are not small isolated villages and extended MTCs would help serve the significant existing residential populations.

It is recommended that it would be more beneficial for the MTCs to be extended to serve all existing residential areas of south-west Sheffield as follows:

- A625 corridor to extend 3.5km south-west and begin / terminate adjacent to where the Sheffield Tigers RUFC is located.
- A621 corridor to extend 3.0km south-west and begin / terminate at Lane Head Road.

The existing MTCs and proposed extensions as above are shown on Figure 1.

It should also be noted that the remaining MTC routes as shown on the Sheffield Plan Policies Map run to the edges of the 'outer suburbs' within the Local Authority Boundary; except for towards Mosborough to the south-east. Mosborough would fall under the same 'West and South Sheffield to City Centre, Lower Don Valley and Meadowhall' corridor as the A625 and A621. Therefore, why is this is the only corridor proposed that doesn't serve all existing residential areas within close proximity to the major link roads.

Extending the MTCs as recommended above, whilst also recognising the corridor towards Mosborough would provide a more coherent Mass Transit system within the district, and also fill in any 'gaps' currently shown in the Draft Local Plan.

1.2.2 SYMCA & Sheffield Transport Strategies

The Sheffield Plan Policies Map shows proposed cycle routes on Long Line, Cross Lane and through the centre of Dore. This will help support the objectives of the Sheffield City Region 'Active Travel Implementation Plan'⁷ by providing a fully connected network of walking and cycling routes by 2024.

⁷ *Active Travel Implementation Plan*, Sheffield City Region, 2020.

If the MTC was extended on the A625 as recommended at section 1.4.1; then the corridor would directly connect to these routes and provide multi-modal connectivity as set outlined in the SYMCA Transport Strategy.

As outlined in the Sheffield Transport Strategy, the city's outer suburbs will need to be connected by the MTC routes. Therefore, it is questionable why the MTC routes in the Draft Local Plan begin / terminate at the locations proposed. Are the western and southern areas of Dore & Totley, Whirlow and Ecclesall not classed as 'outer suburbs', and why is it that they appear to be excluded from the proposed routes? By extending the routes as recommended at section 1.4.1, all residential populations would be served by the MTCs, including the CST site, and this would help meet the objectives of the Sheffield Transport Strategy.

2 Core Public Transport Network: Sheffield Plan Site Selection

2.1 The Sheffield Plan Site Selection Methodology

As stated within the 'The Sheffield Plan Site Selection Methodology' document⁸, public transport accessibility for defining allocation sites was assessed using an established Land Use / Transport Interaction Model (LUTI) framework. The Core Public Transport Network (CPTN) was defined as including the existing medium (6+ buses per hour) and high frequency (10+ buses per hour) bus corridors. Bus frequency based data from February 2020 was used. 400m walking distance catchments between the bus corridors and allocation sites were created, to sort sites into three categories:

- Green - Entire site is within the CPTN buffer;
- Amber - Some of the site is within the CPTN buffer;
- Red - Entire site is outside the CPTN buffer.

2.2 A635 at Dore & Totley

The frequency of bus services at the A625 and Cross Lane bus stops in January 2020 and January 2023 is shown on Table 1 and Table 2.

Historic bus timetable data is difficult to obtain and has therefore been derived from Fore's Transport and Access Appraisal⁹, where bus timetables were obtained for 14 January 2020. Although, this is not February 2020 data, it is very likely that no changes were made to the bus timetables in this period.

⁸ *The Sheffield Plan: Site Selection Methodology*, Sheffield City Council, January 2023.

⁹ *Transport and Access Appraisal v1.0*, Fore Consulting, 24 January 2020.

Bus frequency data for 2023 has been derived from <https://www.traveline.info/>

Table 1: 2020 Bus Services and Frequency

Bus Stop	Service	Operator	Destinations Served	Approximate Daytime Freq.		
				Mon-Fri	Sat.	Sun.
A625	65	Stagecoach	Meadowhall - Sheffield City Centre - Tideswell	120 mins		240 mins
	81	First SY	Stannington - Sheffield City Centre - Dore	20 mins		60 mins
	82			240 mins		60 mins
	272	First SY / Hulleys of Baslow	Castleton - Sheffield	120 mins		
Cross Ln	181	TM Travel	Sheffield - Dore	120 mins	N/A	

Table 2: 2023 Bus Services and Frequency

Bus Stop	Service	Operator	Destinations Served	Approximate Daytime Freq.		
				Mon-Fri	Sat.	Sun.
A625	65	Stagecoach	Meadowhall - Sheffield City Centre - Tideswell	180 mins		240 mins
	81	First SY	Stannington - Sheffield City Centre - Dore	30 mins		N/A
	82			30 mins		60 mins
	272	First SY / Hulleys of Baslow	Castleton - Sheffield	60 mins		
	772	First SY	Schoolbus to Hope Valley College	School Bus	N/A	
Cross Ln	181	TM Travel	Sheffield - Dore	180 mins	N/A	

The above data demonstrates:

- In 2020, the bus stops on the A625 were served by 3-5 buses per hour on weekdays and Saturdays, with 2-3 buses per hour on Sundays.
- In 2023, the bus stops on the A625 are served by 5-6 buses per hour on weekdays and Saturdays, with 2-3 buses per hour on Sundays.
- Based on the above, in 2020, the A625 was a low frequency bus corridor. In 2023, the A625 would be a medium frequency bus corridor.

The indicative centre of the site is within 400m of the A625 bus corridor, as shown on Figure 2. Therefore, based on 2023 frequency data, the site would score ‘Amber’ as the entire site is not within the buffer. However, the entire site is within 400m of a bus stop (e.g. on Cross Lane / Causeway Head Road).

3 Summary and Conclusions

This Case Report has demonstrated the following:

- As highlighted at section 1.4.1, it is argued that the proposed MTCs on the A625 and A61 within SCC’s Draft Local Plan should be extended to include all residential areas of south-west Sheffield. The indicative centre of the CST site at Dore would fall within 400m of this extended A625 bus corridor.
- There are no stated definitions or justifications as to why the MTC routes begin / terminate at the locations proposed, within the Draft Local Plan, Issues and Options document, or SYMCA and Sheffield Transport Strategies. By extending the routes, all residential populations would be served by the MTCs, and this would help meet the objectives of the Sheffield Transport Strategy.
- The ‘West and South Sheffield to City Centre, Lower Don Valley and Meadowhall’ corridor appears to be the only one that doesn’t run to the edges of the ‘outer suburbs’ within the Local Authority Boundary. Extending these MTCs would provide an more coherent network throughout the district.
- There are currently 5-6 buses per hour on the A625; meaning the CST site would be within the catchment of a medium frequency corridor as defined by the CPTN. In both 2020 and 2023, the A625 has been served by 3+ buses per hour between Monday to Saturday.
- Dore & Totley forms part of the wider active travel network with cycle routes through Dore town centre and on Long Line and Cross Lane. These would provide multi-modal connections to the proposed MTC on the A625, benefitting a large number of existing residents; as well as supporting the aim of “expanding and better integrating the mass transit system to provide multi modal and affordable connectivity” as stated in the SYMCA Transport Strategy.

Based on the above, it is recommended that the proposed MTCs as set out in the Draft Local Plan should be extended to incorporate all residential areas of Dore & Totley. By extending the MTC, the CST site would fall within 400m of the A625 corridor, and score ‘Amber’ as per SCC’s Site Selection methodology.



Document Control

Client: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST)
Project Title: Site at Dore, Sheffield
Job Number: 3792
Report Title: Transport Case Report

Date	Version	Status	Author	Checked	Approved
09/02/2023	0.1	Final	BI	PI	PI