**Responses to Comments on Part 1 of the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan (Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations)**
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201.002

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Foreword | Strategy will not deliver growth as the housing requirement is too low. Comment states that there is not enough consideration given to the provision of affordable housing. States that appropriate levels won't be delivered as sites are unviable. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Affordable housing provision has been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and set at an appropriate level. | No | PDSP.066.001 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Foreword | Comment states the foreword is misleading in terms of the local plan achieving carbon neutrality because there has not been consideration given to retrofitting of existing housing stock. | No change needed. The Plan plays an important role in relation to delivering the Council's net zero carbon ambitions, however it will not directly affect all aspects of achieving net zero, for example the need to retrofit the existing housing stock. | No | PDSP.102.001 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Foreword | Climate change should be introduced as a strategic policy in Part 1 alongside other thematic policies. The Plan will not contribute sufficiently to achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2030. | No change needed. Strategic policies for key themes are in Part 1, however the approach to climate change is cross-cutting as it relates to a number of topic areas. Responding to the Climate Emergency is one of the 8 Aims of the Plan. There is no need to duplicate content by drawing up an additional policy specifically on climate change. | No | PDSP.140.001 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Foreword | Document not written in plain language. | No change needed. Comment relating to plain language is acknowledged but the Plan is a technical document and has to meet the needs of a number of different audiences. The Glossary and definitions explain technical terms that are used. | No | PDSP.241.001 | Graycole |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Foreword | Concern about restrictive measures in the Plan. | No change needed as no specific issue identified. | No | PDSP.301.001 | Laura |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Foreword | No comment. | No change needed. No comment made. | No | PDSP.360.001 | RichardW |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Foreword | Rape victims would feel unsafe walking around neighbourhoods. | No change needed. The policies in the Plan aim to enable people to be able to make active travel choices and encourages neighbourhoods to be designed in a safe way. | No | PDSP.378.001 | Shez |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | Bassetlaw District Council yet to receive SOCG/draft from Sheffield Council relevant to the cross-boundary issues in the Sheffield Plan. | A letter regarding the Sheffield Plan and the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) was sent to nearby local planning authorities, including Bassetlaw, in January 2023. A draft Statement of Common Ground is being prepared for the Sheffield Plan. | No | PDSP.009.001 | Bassetlaw District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | The plan period should be extended to 2040 as adoption could be delayed. | The Local Development Scheme shows adoption of the Plan in 2024. There is no requirement in the NPPF or guidance to factor in potential delay. | No | PDSP.009.002 | Bassetlaw District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | States that there is no comment to make in regard to the Local Plan and related evidence base. | Noted - no comment to make. | No | PDSP.010.001 | City of Doncaster Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | In paragraph 1.27, the word 'waste' should be in bold. | Agree - correct typographical error. | Yes | PDSP.014.001 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | The Sheffield City Region boundary overlaps with SYMCA and is therefore unclear. | Agree - amend notation on Map 2. | Yes | PDSP.014.002 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | The spatial strategy does not set out sufficient change as it only allocates brownfield sites. The strategy will not provide enough specialist housing and will maintain an unfair housing market. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing requirement aligns with the jobs growth target for the city. | No | PDSP.042.001 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | States that plan is not in accordance with NPPF and so it is misleading to state so. States that plan cannot be sound as it does not use the Standard Method to calculate housing need. | The Plan does accord with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. | No | PDSP.042.002 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | The spatial strategy does not set out sufficient change as it only allocates brownfield sites. The strategy will not provide enough specialist housing and will maintain an unfair housing market.  States that plan is not in accordance with NPPF and so it is misleading to state so. States that plan cannot be sound as it does not use the Standard Method to calculate housing need. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing requirement aligns with the jobs growth target for the city.  The Plan does accord with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. | No | PDSP.065.001 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | Comment is the online form submission of comment PDSP.066.018. | No change needed. This is the online form related to another comment. | No | PDSP.066.002 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | States that plan is not in accordance with NPPF and so it is misleading to state so. States that plan cannot be sound as it does not use the Standard Method to calculate housing need. | See the response to comment number PDSP.042.002 above. | No | PDSP.066.003 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations – Specific reference should be made in this section to acknowledge the important role burial provisions plays for all communities, and the continued recognition of the special religious and pastoral requirements of the Muslim communities. | No change needed. The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised and noted in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. No change is needed as the Local Plan does not allocate land for new cemeteries; however, planning applications brought forward to meet this need will be considered under existing national planning policy. | No | PDSP.095.001 | Baitulmukarram Ja'me Masjid |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | Repeats comment number PDSP.095.001 above. | See the response to comment number PDSP.095.001 above | No | PDSP.108.001 | Guzar-E-Habib Education Centre |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | States there is a typographical error in the text of the policy. | Unable to find minor error made in response - no change. | No | PDSP.116.001 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | Notes support for creating a Local Plan and shows willingness to want to work to progress work forward. | Support welcomed and noted. | No | PDSP.134.001 | Sheffield Property Association |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 1: Introduction | Disagrees with the concept of climate change and requests the removal to references such as net zero and climate emergency. | Climate change is based on widely accepted science and is referenced in the NPPF. The NPPF requires that local plans include appropriate policies relating to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change. | No | PDSP.222.002 | Dystopia247 |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The vision should include reference to the role of Sheffield's heritage assets in creating attractive places. The vision in paragraph 2.2 should reflect the vision in Figure 1. | Accept the proposed amendment ensuring that the vision set out as a diagram in Figure 1 is the same as the vision outlined in text in paragraph 2.2. The vision and aims which should be read together; Aim 8 'a well-designed city' refers to strong local identity and quality buildings, valuing heritage assets. This is further referenced in the objectives for a well-designed city. | Yes | PDSP.003.001 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Welcome Aim 8 with reference to buildings with heritage and/or archaeological value. | No change needed. Comment welcome. | No | PDSP.003.002 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The clear aim should be for the implementation of the plan to significantly and demonstrably  improve the environment, including air and water quality and wildlife interests during the plan period. The Plan should include policies to facilitate and support the restoration and enhancement of Sheffield’s wildlife. | No change needed. The vision, aims and objectives should be read together. Aim 2 clearly includes reference to a sustainable city that encompasses the natural environment, while the following objectives set out the targets on how it will be achieved including reducing air, water and soil pollution. In addition, Aim 7 'a green city' includes enhancement of biodiversity and green and blue infrastructure. Proposed amendments to Policy BG1 reference the protection and enhancement of blue and green infrastructure and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The restoration and enhancement of Sheffield’s wildlife is further supported by policies GS5 Development and Biodiversity and GS6 Biodiversity Net Gain. | No | PDSP.006.001 | Natural England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support the objectives. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.007.001 | Sport England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Vision and objectives do not align with spatial strategy. | No change needed. The spatial strategy in SP1 flows from the vision. | No | PDSP.009.003 | Bassetlaw District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Comment supports vision and aims. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.013.001 | North East Derbyshire District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Correction of a typographical error in one of the bullet points under 'Objectives for an environmentally sustainable city'. | Typographical error in the second bullet point should be corrected. | Yes | PDSP.014.003 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Plan will not deliver the vision to provide a good quality housing offer meeting different household needs. Plan will not meet the needs of families living in less central locations such as Chapeltown. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need. | No change needed. Acknowledge the distribution of new homes will limit growth in some suburban areas but Green Belt release would be contrary to the spatial strategy which promotes sustainable patterns of development. | No | PDSP.019.001 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Comment suggests that housing requirement and supply is too low and will not deliver the necessary numbers. Also that current allocations will not deliver a mix of housing tenures and will not provide adequate levels of affordable housing. Suggests that the housing market won't be competitive with current and future provision. | No change needed. The Plan's aims and objectives are based on the vision for the city. New homes will be developed to meet a range of needs, with allocations consistent with the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.019.002 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Carbon Zero plans are unrealistic. | No change needed. It is recognised that the Council's commitment to carbon net zero is challenging. The Local Plan plays only one part in the steps needed for the city to meet its target of being net zero by 2030. | No | PDSP.042.003 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Objective will not deliver a broad mix of housing types and tenures to meet a range of needs. | No change needed. The Plan allocates land to deliver new homes as part of a wider housing market including existing stock. | No | PDSP.042.004 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan will not meet the city's housing requirements. | No change needed. The housing requirement is based on evidence of the need for new homes in Sheffield, taking account of future jobs growth and Sheffield’s role in the wider region, as well as constraints to development. | No | PDSP.042.005 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Allocations and policies will not meet the needs of specialist housing requirements such as for families or older people. | No change needed. The Plan objectives are to deliver a broad range of housing to meet different needs, including policies to support development of appropriate accommodation for older people. | No | PDSP.042.006 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The allocations in the Plan will not deliver sufficient affordable housing. | No change needed to the objective, which remains to increase the supply of affordable housing and to increase the level of affordable housing required on development sites, taking account of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.042.007 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan does not allocate land to deliver homes to meet the diverse needs of the people of Sheffield. Not enough housing for older people, young professionals or families. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A variety of new homes will be delivered making use of the opportunities available. In particular, there is policy support for affordable and older people's housing. | No | PDSP.042.008 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Comment supports the Vision and Aims but more specifically Aim 3 of the Local Plan. | The support welcomed. | No | PDSP.046.001 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan does not allocate land to deliver homes to meet the diverse needs of the people of Sheffield. Not enough housing for older people, young professionals or families.  Carbon Zero plans are unrealistic particularly in relation to existing housing stock.  Objective will not deliver a broad mix of housing types and tenures to meet a range of needs.  The Plan will not meet the city's housing requirements.  The allocations in the Plan will not deliver sufficient affordable housing. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A variety of new homes will be delivered making use of the opportunities available. In particular, there is policy support for affordable and older people's housing.  No change needed. It is recognised that the Council's commitment to carbon net zero is challenging. The Local Plan plays only one part in the steps needed for the city to meet its target of being net zero by 2030.  No change needed. The Plan allocates land to deliver new homes as part of a wider housing market including existing stock.  No change needed. The housing requirement is based on evidence of the need for new homes in Sheffield, as well as taking account of its role in the wider region, and constraints to development.  No change needed to the objective, which remains to increase the supply of affordable housing. The Plan seeks to increase the level of affordable housing required on development sites, taking account of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.065.002 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Carbon Zero plans are unrealistic particularly in relation to existing housing stock. | No change needed. It is recognised that the Council's commitment to carbon net zero is challenging. The Local Plan plays only one part in the steps needed for the city to meet its target of being net zero by 2030. | No | PDSP.066.004 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | There is not a justified requirement for the housing type and tenure mix that the Plan will deliver. | No change needed. The Plan allocates land to deliver new homes as part of a wider housing market including existing stock. | No | PDSP.066.005 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Housing requirement below the standard method will not ensure an adequate supply of housing. | No change needed. The housing requirement is based on evidence of the need for new homes in Sheffield, as well as taking account of its role in the wider region, and constraints to development. | No | PDSP.066.006 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | There are not enough affordable housing allocations. | No change needed. The objective, remains to increase the supply of affordable housing, taking account of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.066.007 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Lack of opportunities in the Plan for family housing will result in less sustainable travel patterns as people move out of Sheffield and travel in for work. | No change needed to the objectives which informs the spatial strategy that utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.066.008 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan does not allocate land to deliver homes to meet the diverse needs of the people of Sheffield. Not enough housing for older people, young professionals or families. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A variety of new homes will be delivered making use of the opportunities available. In particular there is policy support for affordable and older people's housing. | No | PDSP.066.009 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Comment is the online form submission of comment PDSP.066.006-009. | No change needed. This is the online submission for comments that are dealt with under PDSP.066.006-009. | No | PDSP.066.010 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support the vision for integrated public transport and better active travel options but active travel routes should be identified on the Policies Map. Highlight Stocksbridge, student areas to the SW of the City Centre and suburbs in the SE of the city as having little or no cycle infrastructure. Suggest inclusion of extensive network of active travel routes throughout the city. | Support noted. No change required. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and SYMCA Active Travel Implementation Plan. A network of cycle routes is shown on the Policies Map. | No | PDSP.100.001 | Cycle Sheffield (Submitted by Sheffield CTC ) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggests removing the word 'Objectives' from the title of Figure 1. | Accept suggestion. | Yes | PDSP.102.002 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Plan does not include a Green Network map or Nature Recovery Network. | Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. | Yes | PDSP.103.001 | Friends of Parkwood Springs |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggests amendment to wording of first bullet point under objectives for a green city - to emphasise nature recovery and adaptation to climate change. | Agree - amend objective as suggested. | Yes | PDSP.120.001 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The objectives do not make provisions for sustainable development of local food infrastructure. It also does not plan to achieve sustainable development of local food infrastructure. | The plan protects allotments (Policy GS1) and gives significant weight to the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land (Policy GS4). However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1. | Yes | PDSP.121.001 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggest additional text is added to the introduction: ‘The city’s resilience to the effects of climate change, biodiversity loss and geopolitical instability negatively impacting the food system will be achieved by protecting land capable of producing food’. | The plan protects allotments (Policy GS1) and gives significant weight to the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land (Policy GS4). However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1. | Yes | PDSP.121.002 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggest an additional objective:   * To safeguard land capable of producing food, in recognition of the local food system’s fundamental role in both providing nutrition for a healthy population and as a cornerstone of a resilient economy - one that is less vulnerable to geopolitical and climatic instability - and where public procurement purchasing power is used to reward the most sustainable farming practices | Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication. | Yes | PDSP.121.003 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggest an additional objective:   * To position equitable access to healthy food at the heart of every community, by ensuring that land capable of producing food is identified and made available to the community, and that the development of related food infrastructure, e.g, local independent retail, is sufficiently supported.’ | Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication | Yes | PDSP.121.004 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggest an additional objective:   * ‘To prioritise land capable of producing food for agroecological food production, to not only ensure the resilience and sustainability of Sheffield’s food supply but also mitigate against climate change; manage flood water; realise Biodiversity Net Gain; achieve net zero carbon by 2030, and reduce soil erosion and water contamination. | Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication. | Yes | PDSP.121.005 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggest additional objectives are added:   * Provide access to land for multipurpose use i.e. Agroecological food production linked with habitat improvements to increase biodiversity * Link agroecological food production with a culture and economy of outdoors-based learning around land based skills * Work with local partners to create diverse land-based businesses that promote health and wellbeing, and build nature-focused leisure opportunities | Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication. | Yes | PDSP.121.006 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | An additional plan objective should be added:   * To protect and create community gardens, allotments, urban and periurban farms, and edible landscaping within open spaces, all of which contribute to the livablity of neighbourhoods and support residents’ physical health and mental wellbeing. | Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication | Yes | PDSP.121.007 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | * This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.004 | See response to PDSP.121.004 | Yes | PDSP.121.008 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | * This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.003 | See response to PDSP.121.003 | Yes | PDSP.121.009 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.005 | See response to PDSP.121.005 | Yes | PDSP.121.010 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.006 | See response to PDSP.121.006 | Yes | PDSP.121.011 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.007 | See response to PDSP.121.007 | Yes | PDSP.121.012 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Plan not worded strongly enough to address Nature Emergency or role nature plays in combatting climate change. Suggest amends to text, see Response Modification. | Sustainability is at the heart of the Vision and Aim 7 refers to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and blue and green infrastructure.  Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy | No | PDSP.125.001 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Suggest vision objective to be worded more strongly to meet NPPF definition and aims of nature recovery. | Accept proposed amendments to the objectives for a Green City. | Yes | PDSP.127.001 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | There is a failure to recognise the heritage and value of waterways and biodiversity and the possibility of conflict between environmental policies and the protection of waterways. Areas of Special Character are not mentioned in the Local Plan. Would like to see the industrial past of Sheffield made clearer. There should be reference to sustainability of tall buildings and identification of tall building zones. Reference should be made to the Local Heritage List with associated policy statement. | No change needed. It is unclear what change is required in relation to the potential conflict between policies in the Green City chapter and protection of waterways. Policy D1 specifically acknowledges the heritage value of buildings, structures and settlement forms associated with the city’s water powered industries.  Areas of Special Character were set out in the UDP with the intention of being assessed as potential Conservation Areas. Any review of existing Conservation Areas or designation of new areas would be outside the Local Plan process. The ASCs have been reviewed in the past and potential new Conservation Areas identified.  There is sufficiently robust wording within the Development Management policies in Part 2 to achieve good design within the city whether sites are within Conservation Areas or not.  The same sustainable design requirements would apply to tall buildings as to other buildings.  In relation to the Local List, work is ongoing to consider protection of assets at a South Yorkshire level. The Plan contains appropriate policy hooks to enable this. | No | PDSP.129.001 | Sheffield Conservation Advisory Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon. Suggest amendments in Chapter 2 to:   * refer to need to transition to a net zero emissions economy. * the need reduce transport emissions. * to minimising embodied carbon and ongoing carbon emissions in meeting effects of climate change. | The Aims already refer to the Climate Emergency. The objectives make clear the ambition for the City to be net zero carbon by 2030.  The objectives for a Connected City already refer to creating a sustainable transport network that improves air quality.  A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Policy ES1 in Part 2 strikes a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this level of requirement sooner would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. | No | PDSP.140.002 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The vision statement should make specific reference to mitigating and adapting to climate change. The plan does not appear to be compatible with the Council’s policy of reducing carbon emissions to net zero by 2030. | The Vision Statement already refers to a "sustainable city" and specific reference to climate change is made in Aim 2. The Plan (Policy ES1) includes a requirement for new development that is granted permission from 1 January 2030 to be net zero carbon for both operational and embodied carbon. The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal does not support setting a requirement for developments granted permission before that date to be net zero carbon (when taking account of other policy objectives). | No | PDSP.140.003 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Would like to understand how much heritage assets and the historic environment contributes towards the economy of Sheffield. | The Plan supports protection and re-use of heritage assets which in turn allows for them to continue to play a role in the economy of the city. Policy D1 (in Part 1) and Policy DE9 (in Part 2) are particularly relevant. | No | PDSP.147.001 | The Victorian Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Would like to see an overall Heritage Strategy that includes all heritage assets in Sheffield and considers how these would be better utilised. The Plan should reflect comments made by Joined Up Heritage Sheffield relating to better utilisation of heritage assets. Support for a range of Plan policies. | Support for referenced policies is welcomed. The Heritage Strategy as currently drafted is wider than simply matters relating to planning. The Local Plan would allow for future strategies. Having worked collaboratively with Historic England we are comfortable with the scope of the policies as drafted, subject to proposed minor amendments. | No | PDSP.147.002 | The Victorian Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Delighted and relieved that environmental sustainability lies at the heart of the Vision as well as of Aims 2 and 7. | Support noted | No | PDSP.188.001 | Boo |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Vision should specifically reference biodiversity. | No change needed. The vision and aims should be read together. Aim 7 'a green city' includes enhancement of biodiversity and green and blue infrastructure. Additional wording in policy BG1 references extending blue and green infrastructure. | No | PDSP.191.001 | Carol Collins |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Biodiversity not given sufficient priority. | See the response to comment number PDSP.191.001 above. | No | PDSP.191.002 | Carol Collins |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Plan should enhance and expand greenspaces as well as protecting existing spaces. Should include vision for linking green spaces together. | Proposed amendment to BG1 adds the word 'extended' to 'blue and green infrastructure' for the avoidance of doubt. We propose additional text after paragraph 5.24 to explain the role of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and associated mapping of connected green and blue infrastructure. | Yes | PDSP.193.001 | Caroline Quincey |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Electric charging facilities at cycle parking provision at appropriate destinations. People will need to charge E-bikes at places other than just their home. | No change needed. | No | PDSP.194.001 | Caroline88 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.201.001 | Claire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.201.002 | Claire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.201.003 | Claire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Would encourage adoption of higher target of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Need to ensure the City Council works with ecologists to measure site baselines. | The minimum 10% BNG requirement was assessed as part of the policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher percentage BNG requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  The Council employs ecologists who have provided input to the Sheffield Plan and who advise on planning applications. | No | PDSP.210.001 | Dave Applebaum |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Reaching Net Zero and declaring Climate Emergency will damage economic prosperity.  Population data in terms of household projections should be updated to the 2021 figures.  The aim to substantially reduce car use is unreasonable and undemocratic, especially at a time of declining public transport. Measures to reduce car use will lead to economic decline and hurt lower income groups. | Acknowledge that responding to the Climate Emergency is a challenge, however the spatial strategy seeks to deliver sustainable growth.  The starting point for assessing housing need is based on the Government's standard method which uses 2014 based household projections. However, additional analysis has been carried out to consider different approaches to understanding Sheffield's likely growth over the Plan period and this is reflected in the housing requirement.  The transport strategy in the Plan is needed in order to reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality and reduce congestion. The challenges in relation to public transport services are recognised but this is not something the Plan can directly influence. However, the Council is working with the Mayoral Combined Authority and public transport service providers to try and improve services. | No | PDSP.214.001 | DavidRS |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The policy of achieving 'Net Zero' carbon by 2030 is an example of the council going further than their remit as there is no legal requirement for this. 'Net Zero' will run contrary to other policies in the Local Plan such as 'reflecting 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' and affect housing, industrial and retail policies. | The aim for the City to be net carbon zero by 2030 is an established target for the city. The Plan clearly sets out how it should help the Council meet this target, how it can be achieved and how this will benefit the people of Sheffield. Viability work has determined that these policies will not put undue burdens on the economy and can be deliverable. | No | PDSP.222.003 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Council’s own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon and Air Quality. Terminology is too ambiguous and needs to be strengthened. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this level of requirement sooner would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Vehicle exhaust emissions affect levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and cause air pollution that impacts on health. We do not consider that there is any ambiguity in the plan in relation to this issue. | No | PDSP.223.001 | emilyg |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan should consider the role of libraries. | Library services are delivered outside the Planning system, although recognise the important roles that they play economically and socially. New libraries, if required, would be an acceptable use in most Policy Zones in the city. | No | PDSP.236.001 | Glyn Hawley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Broaden the vision to give more emphasis to sustainable city and the Outdoor City.  The Plan should address the differing roles of the City Centre and Meadowhall given the impact that Meadowhall has had. It should promote better access to and experiences within the City Centre.  City Centre car parking should be considered in the Plan, particularly in relation to opportunities for electric vehicle charging as part of public car parks not new developments.  The Plan should consider ongoing maintenance of new developments and spaces.  The use and function of libraries needs to be reviewed including the relationship to commercial business development. | The Vision already refers to sustainability and the Outdoor City.  The Plan provides an appropriate framework for considering planning applications in the City Centre and Meadowhall. The City Centre is identified as a ‘Town Centre’ but Meadowhall is within a General Employment Zone – where town centre uses have to be justified through the sequential test.  Policy CO2 and Annex B set out car parking requirements. Policies CO1 and CO2 seek to improve connectivity and promote the provision of electric vehicle infrastructure.  Acknowledge that ongoing maintenance is important for place-making. This is often dealt with through management agreements or conditions on development but does not require a reference in the Plan.  Also agree that libraries are an important element of social infrastructure within the city, particularly in relation to inclusive economic growth. The provision and planning of library services does not fall within the scope of the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.236.004 | Glyn Hawley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Duplicate of comment PDSP.236.004 | See response to comment PDSP.236.004 | No | PDSP.236.005 | Glyn Hawley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan should include a policy for ongoing maintenance of buildings and spaces. | Acknowledge that ongoing maintenance is critical to ensuring a positive impact of new development. However, a policy is not required within the Local Plan to ensure long term maintenance of new development. This would be either a landowner/organisational contract or part of the condition on development when planning permission is granted. | No | PDSP.236.006 | Glyn Hawley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan should include a section to what Sheffield City Centre’s relationship is with Meadowhall and address and understand how Meadowhall and Sheffield city centre can coexist and offer differing experiences.  The Plan needs to develop a better, improved transport structure to Sheffield City Centre - currently the Supertram only supports half of Sheffield.  The City Centre needs areas for free parking (to compete with Meadowhall).  A shift away from private car journeys towards more sustainable ways of travelling is not inclusive (not all people can walk great distances and need to use their private vehicle). As more people buy electric vehicles they will be more environmentally (in terms of clean air) - these need to be supported particularly for business development within the city centre. Electric charging points supported by electricity generated from solar power. | The retail policies in the Plan support retail and leisure development in the City Centre by the creation of a Primary Shopping Area in the City Centre - policies that are not replicated for Meadowhall (which is designated as a General Employment Zone).  The transport policies in the Plan such as T1, that seek to improve sustainable transport and create Mass Transit Corridors, will improve connectivity to the City Centre.  Car parking charges are not an issue that can be covered in planning policies.  Policies CO1 and CO2 seek to improve connectivity and promote the provision of electric vehicle infrastructure. | No | PDSP.236.007 | Glyn Hawley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Plan and consultation process is not inclusive – failure to engage with students, documents are too long to read and not sufficiently publicised.  Concerned that the global scale impacts of the plan will not create a net biodiversity gain, nor generate long term good quality livelihood.  More health metrics should be used to measure the success of the Plan.  The 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. | Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.  The plan includes a minimum 10% requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with national policy. The Plan as a whole should help to deliver good quality neighbourhoods – Policy NC1 in Part 2 of the Plan is particularly relevant.  The Plan will deliver health benefits – e.g. active travel, access to open space, improved air quality. However, many other factors (over which the Local Plan has no control) also affect health so it is not considered necessary to include specific metrics.  A separate Joint South Yorkshire Waste Management Plan is to be prepared. | No | PDSP.255.001 | JadeClarke11 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Strongly supports the Vision in relation to transport but suggests addition of wording to make the sub-objective regarding rail connections more comprehensive – so, including references to rail connections to Nottingham & Birmingham, as well as improvements to railway infrastructure between Dore and Meadowhall | No changes needed. The wording of the objective reflects the most recent Transport Strategy. | No | PDSP.268.001 | Jim Bamford |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Supports the policy but consider it could be enhanced to include the protection of green heritage. | The Plan already provides strong protection for blue and green infrastructure. However, amendments to Policy BG1 are proposed to highlight the need to extend the network of blue and green infrastructure as part of new development. | Yes | PDSP.271.001 | JimC |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support environmental sustainability in the vision. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.285.001 | Jonathan789 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Disagrees with the Council's vision and suggests alternative investment priorities - investment in roads, not cycle lanes, to take back control of public services from third parties, plant more trees, cut back on student accommodation to further incentivise South Yorkshire residents to go to University here; to celebrate our steel heritage; celebrate that football was born here, to invest in public spaces in all areas; Investment into Green Belt protection is needed, not ‘strategic housing’. | No change needed. The Vision reflects Council priorities and is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. | No | PDSP.286.001 | Jonnygazza |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Agree with the objections made by the Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust that the Plan does not include Green Network map or Nature Recovery Network. | Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. | Yes | PDSP.331.001 | Neil99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Supports de-culverting of the River Sheaf and the increased provision of green and blue infrastructure. But questions why Council isn’t doing more. | No change needed in response to this comment. Policy GS9 in Part 2 supports development that enables the removal of any existing culverts and structures over watercourses wherever practicable. Changes are also proposed to Policy BG1 to make it clear that the objective is to extend the network of blue and green infrastructure as well as protecting and enhancing it. Changes also proposed to Policies SA1-SA8 to make it clear that public access to one bank of main rivers will be supported where there is no conflict with biodiversity or heritage objectives. | No | PDSP.332.001 | Nickyleaf |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | The Vision and Objectives do not place strong enough emphasis on the declared Climate Emergency and does not make provisions for Nature restoration and recovery. Suggest amendments to 3 of the Objectives for a Green City | Accept proposed amendments to enhance the objectives for a Green City. | Yes | PDSP.333.001 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.341.001 | PaulMaddox1960 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Vagueness of sustainability aims/language makes it difficult to enforce and monitor. Needs closer alignment with national guidance.  Parkwood Springs LWS is incorrectly displayed on the Policies Map. | Part 2 of the Plan includes a number of indicators that monitor the economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainability.  The Local Wildlife Site is incorporated within the site allocation for Parkwood Springs (Site NWS29) but not within the developable area. | Yes | PDSP.343.001 | penny71 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Comment says, they align with all objections made by Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust comments. | Accept the reference to proposed amendments from the Wildlife Trust to enhance the objectives for a Green City. | Yes | PDSP.344.001 | PeteB1951 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | No comment made. | No change needed. No comment made. | No | PDSP.360.002 | RichardW |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | No comments made but has not objected. | No change needed. | No | PDSP.363.001 | Robin |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | Support the vision and aims that incorporate environmental sustainability. | Support noted | No | PDSP.375.001 | Sean Ashton |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | 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 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. | Accept in part. Policy BG1 should be refer to the need to extend the Green Network as well as protecting and enhancing it. Although natural capital mapping has been completed for South Yorkshire, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/ Network has not yet been produced. Further references to the LNRS/LNRN should be added to the Plan but the Network (including habitat recovery areas) will need to be set out in a supplementary planning document. It would cause unacceptable delay to the Local Plan if the Council waits for that work to be completed. | Yes | PDSP.382.001 | Simono |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives | No comment made. | No change needed. | No | PDSP.411.001 | Wendy40 |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Ensure increased densities do not harm/ negatively impact heritage assets. | No change needed. Policy NC9 allows for development outside density ranges to take account of conservation areas and heritage assets. | No | PDSP.003.003 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The scope of the Vision should reflect the ecological emergency by committing to actively seek opportunities for the delivery of large-scale enhancements of the natural environment. | The Vision, Aims and Objectives should be read together. Aim 7 'a green city' clearly refers to enhancement of biodiversity and green and blue infrastructure. In addition, amendments are proposed to Policy BG1 that clarifies requirements to extend blue and green infrastructure as well as protecting and enhancing it. An additional paragraph is proposed after paragraph 5.24 in part 1 that highlights the role of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and opportunities to improve connectivity between habitats. The protection and enhancement of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy is covered further in Policies GS5 Development and Biodiversity and GS6 Biodiversity Net Gain. | Yes | PDSP.006.002 | Natural England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Support the approach to centres as the focus for 20 minute neighbourhoods. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.007.002 | Sport England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The Plan should set out what the housing requirement would be based on the Government's standard method. | The policy approach proposed is different to the standard method. The proposed housing requirement aligns with the level of jobs growth proposed in the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan. It also reflects environmental constraints. A topic paper will give more detail on the justification for the housing requirement differing from the local housing need figure derived from the Standard Method. | No | PDSP.011.001 | Derbyshire County Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Typographical in the paragraph 3.5, 4th bullet point. | Correct typographical error | Yes | PDSP.014.004 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Support policy approach to density. Potential to increase densities around tram/rail stations to support usage. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.015.002 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The housing requirement is significantly below the figure identified by the standard method and is not justified. The Iceni Demographic Modelling study fails to take proper account of the need for people to live near to the area they work in or deal with the rationale behind the ‘urban centres uplift’. The Plan does not respond to the Government’s intentions in relation to the urban centres uplift. Delivery of affordable housing is not considered within the Iceni Demographic Modelling. The scale of Sheffield’s affordable housing need identified in the 2019 SHMA represents a significant portion of the proposed housing requirement. Based on the Whole Plan Viability Assessment delivery assumptions, the Plan is unlikely to deliver the number of affordable homes needed. The Council has not identified the exceptional circumstances for deviating from the standard method for determining local housing need. The housing requirement of 2,090 dpa is not justified by the supporting evidence.  The Duty to Cooperate has not been met. Unmet housing need is not addressed. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.  The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery and the Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region. | No | PDSP.019.003 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The spatial strategy is not sound and effective and housing distribution is unequal and relies too much on the Central Sub Area. Not enough affordable housing will be delivered with the strategy. Green Belt land should be released and a site at Oughtibridge allocated. Housing need is not being met. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. | No | PDSP.029.001 | Commercial Estates Group (CEG) (Submitted by Lichfields) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Would like to see more recognition of how intimately connected new housing is with retail and office activity, especially in the City Centre. There is a concern on the reliance of nighttime industries to bolster the City Centre economy. There is little focus towards accommodating the daytime population (office workers, retailers and visitors). Sheffield is not attracting enough people into the City Centre during the day. Increasing the daytime population should be a key priority of the Local Plan. | No change needed. Accept the point that increasing daytime footfall in the City Centre is critical to success. The Plan proposes a number of priority office locations to ensure delivery of suitable new office accommodation to support an increasing workforce. The Primary Shopping Area seeks to consolidate and support retail uses as a key City Centre role, alongside the cultural and food and drink offer, although the Plan does not specifically promote nighttime uses. | No | PDSP.030.001 | Commercial Property Partners (Submitted by Urbana) |
|  | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify housing requirement figures, so not enough housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth. | No | PDSP.042.009 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The Central Sub-Area is not the most accessible location in the city and the statement is misleading. | The Central Area is a key location for employment and the nucleus of many transport routes in the city. It constitutes a highly accessible location. | No | PDSP.042.010 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The Plan does not meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method. No special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the housing requirement figure. Not enough land for housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth. Green Belt release should be considered in order to meet housing need. The IIA explored options for Green Belt release and the Green Belt Review indicates some land performs less strongly. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth. | No | PDSP.042.011 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The spatial strategy is not justified or viable. Not releasing Green Belt sites is not justified and the restriction on green field release is not based on evidence and is unsound. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that development will not be viable in most parts of the urban area. | The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the urban area including the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality. In particular, it notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure. | No | PDSP.042.012 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | As the Plan does not propose to fully meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method then the Council should have engaged in the Duty to Cooperate regarding meeting needs elsewhere. The Duty to Cooperate has not been met. | The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery. The Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region. | No | PDSP.042.013 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | No exceptional circumstances are given for the Plan not setting the housing requirement based on the level of housing need as calculated using the Standard Method. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. | No | PDSP.042.014 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The spatial approach does not fully meet the city’s housing needs figure. The proposed housing requirement based on urban capacity is not justified. No evidence is demonstrated to justify exceptional circumstances for not meeting local housing need as calculated using the standard method. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. | No | PDSP.046.002 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Planning for the housing needs of older people should be given greater priority. Policy should be amended to reference minimum provision of new homes for older people. | Whilst we recognise that there is a high level of need for accommodation from the older population, which is likely to increase over the Plan period, Policy SP2 indicates the scale of delivery of all new homes which would include older people's accommodation. | No | PDSP.056.001 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify the housing requirement figures. Not enough housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth and is not the most accessible location in the city and the statement is misleading.  The spatial strategy is not justified or viable. Justification for not releasing Green Belt sites is not justified and the restriction on green field release is not based on evidence and is unsound. Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that development will not be viable in most parts of the urban area.  The Plan does not meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method. Green Belt release should be considered in order to meet housing need. The IIA explored options for Green Belt release and the Green Belt Review indicates some land performs less strongly.  As the Plan does not propose to fully meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method then the Council should have engaged in the Duty to Cooperate regarding meeting needs elsewhere. The Duty to Cooperate has not been met. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth.  The Central Area is a key location for employment and the nucleus of many transport routes in the city. It constitutes a highly accessible location.  The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the urban area including the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality. In particular, it notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure.  The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery. The Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region. | No | PDSP.065.003 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify housing requirement figures. Not enough housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth. | No | PDSP.066.011 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The Central Sub-Area is not the most accessible location in the city and the statement is misleading. | The Central Area is a key location for employment and the nucleus of many transport routes in the city. It constitutes a highly accessible location. | No | PDSP.066.012 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The Plan does not meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method. No special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the housing requirement figure. Not enough land for housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth. Green Belt release should be considered in order to meet housing need. The IIA explored options for Green Belt release and the Green Belt Review indicates some land performs less strongly. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth. | No | PDSP.066.013 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The spatial strategy is not justified or viable. Justification for not releasing Green Belt sites is not justified and the restriction on green field release is not based on evidence and is unsound. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that development will not be viable in most parts of the urban area. | The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the urban area including the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality. In particular, it notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure. | No | PDSP.066.014 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | As the Plan does not propose to fully meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method then the Council should have engaged in the Duty to Cooperate regarding meeting needs elsewhere. The Duty to Cooperate has not been met. | The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery. The Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region. | No | PDSP.066.015 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | No exceptional circumstances are given for the Plan not setting the housing requirement based on the level of housing need as calculated using the Standard Method. | The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the *starting point* for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. | No | PDSP.066.016 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Comment is the online form submission of comment PDSP.066.001-016. | No change needed. This is the online submission for comments that are dealt with under PDSP.066.001 – 016. | No | PDSP.066.017 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | There is not enough employment land allocated to meet the need of the Sheffield Plan. New employment sites should be identified to meet the employment need including safeguarded land for longer term development. The J35 Sheffield Gateway site at Hesley Wood tip should be allocated for employment purposes. | The level of employment land identified within the Plan is sufficient and appropriate. The promoted site is in the Green Belt and release would be contrary to the spatial strategy. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach. | No | PDSP.071.001 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Support the spatial strategy. Compact sustainable city will protect green spaces. Support capacity led approach to housing. Support focus on City Centre delivery. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.099.001 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Promote re-opening of the Don Valley Railway line. Propose locations for new rail stations at Deepcar, Oughtibridge, Wadsley Bridge, Kelham Island, Victoria Station, Nunnery. | Policies SP1(j), T1, and SA8(f) provide support for improved rail links at both national and regional level. Minor amendments are proposed for consistency across the Plan, including additional reference in policy SA2, to clarify support for future re-opening of the Don Valley line. | Yes | PDSP.101.001 | Don Valley Railway |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Tighten up the wording of paragraph 3.4 by removing the word ‘largely’. | No change needed. Less than 1% of proposed new homes are on land currently within the Green Belt so the wording 'largely' is appropriate. | No | PDSP.102.003 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Inconsistency between legend/icons between sub area maps and overview maps. | The main purpose of Map 3 is to show the Settlement hierarchy and hierarchy of centres. It is felt that the colours and symbols used on this map convey those purposes clearly. Consistency with other maps was considered less important in this instance as it would reduce the clarity of the map for its main purpose. Differing legends for the different areas of the Policies Map were not considered appropriate, as the Policies map covers the local planning authority area as a whole and should therefore only have one legend associated with it. It is acknowledged that the map could become confusing in some instances where multiple layers intersect. An online version of the map has also been developed and made available to the public, to aid reading of the map and identification of specific layers. | No | PDSP.102.004 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | References to the Green Network and green infrastructure need to be strengthened and references made to the Nature Recovery Network. Policy should reference enhancement and protection of green and blue infrastructure with more vigorous measures to protect local habitat and wildlife. | Agree in part. A number of changes are proposed to part (l) of SP1 to reflect the changes suggested by the respondent, and to ensure consistency with proposed changes to policy BG1 which make it clear that the network of blue and green infrastructure will be *extended* as well as protected and enhanced. Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. | Yes | PDSP.127.002 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zerto Carbon. Suggests amendment to paragraph 3.1 - amend to refer to need for a Growth Plan that leads to a reduction in Carbon Emissions. A definition of 'Sustainable Growth' should be added to the Glossary. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this level of requirement sooner would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  However, paragraph 3.1 should be amended to make clear that sustainable growth means supporting economic, social and environmental objectives and, in particular reducing carbon emissions. | Yes | PDSP.140.004 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Support policy approach to housing growth on urban brownfield sites. Support policy approach to encouraging sustainable travel. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.191.003 | Carol Collins |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Plan doesn't look to be incorporated into the Plan. Why is there no reference to the 'Building with Nature Standards' in the draft Plan? The South Yorkshire Access to Nature maps aren't referenced. Map 17 Blue & Green Infrastructure Map - the map doesn't include the Nature Recovery Network. | Agree in part.  Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.  A reference to Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework (which incorporates Building with Nature Standards)' should be added to Policy BG1.  The title of Map 17 will be amended to make it clear that it only shows the existing network of blue and green infrastructure.  Other proposed changes to policy BG1 which make it clear that the network of blue and green infrastructure will be *extended* as well as protected and enhanced. | Yes | PDSP.193.002 | Caroline Quincey |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | New development in the city centre to contribute and deliver new open space proportionate to new development. | No change needed. Developers of new residential schemes are required to contribute towards provision of open space. The Sub-area policies for the Central Area include proposals for a significant number of new green spaces and public spaces. | No | PDSP.195.001 | Cathy203 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Support focus on brownfield sites and exclusion of Green Belt. Support Local Green Space designations. Allocation sites should exclude areas within Local Wildlife Site boundaries. | Support welcome. Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be made to make in clear that the Local Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site. | Yes | PDSP.201.004 | Claire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | The policy of achieving 'Net Zero' carbon by 2030 is an example of the council going further than their remit as there is no legal requirement for this. 'Net Zero' will run contrary to other policies in the Local Plan such as 'reflecting 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' and affect housing, industrial and retail policies. | The climate emergency is accepted as an issue by the Council and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment shows that these policies will not put undue burdens on the economy and can be deliverable. | No | PDSP.222.004 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Plan is sound, legal compliant and meets the duty to cooperate. | Support noted. | No | PDSP.269.001 | Jim M |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Site allocations that incorporate Local Wildlife Sites should be redrawn to exclude these from their boundary. | Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be made to make in clear that the Local Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site. | Yes | PDSP.285.002 | Jonathan789 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Plan has not been adequately publicised. | Consultation on the Plan was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. | No | PDSP.287.001 | Julie |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Support focus on brownfield sites and exclusion of Green Belt. Support Local Green Space designations. Allocation sites should exclude areas within Local Wildlife Site boundaries. | Support welcome. Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be made to make in clear that the Local Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site. | Yes | PDSP.341.002 | PaulMaddox1960 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Support protecting the Green Belt and utilising brownfield sites.  The word 'enhance' is used many times with no reference to monitoring or specifics.  There is a lack of accessible children's spaces in the City Centre and on public transport. The old John Lewis building could be utilised to provide this.  Cycling infrastructure is currently not properly segregated or joined up meaning people don't feel safe enough to use it. | Support noted.  An appropriate and proportionate monitoring programme is set out in Part 2 of the Plan.  The sub-area policies for the Central Area include proposals for a significant number of new green spaces and public spaces.  The Plan includes a significant number of policies and proposals which aim to improve cycling infrastructure | No | PDSP.350.001 | Polly Blacker |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Supportive of local green space allocations and the spatial strategy. The boundaries of allocations sites SES02, SES04, SES05 and NWS29 should be revised to exclude existing Local wildlife Sites. | Support welcome. Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be made to make in clear that the Local Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site. | Yes | PDSP.375.002 | Sean Ashton |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Amend part (m) of Policy SP1 to include reference to non-designated heritage assets. | Accept suggested amendment. | Yes | PDSP.003.004 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The local plan needs to be mindful of the potential wildlife and recreational value of some brownfield sites. | No change needed. The wildlife and recreational value of the Site Allocations has been considered as part of the site selection process. Where an issue has been identified, conditions have been attached to the Site Allocations. The proposed development management policies provide sufficient protection for sites of ecological and recreational importance. | No | PDSP.006.003 | Natural England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Supports policy SP1 part (l). | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.007.003 | Sport England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The approach to logistics is not justified as the Plan is silent on the need for large scale logistics. Agree with the Sheffield Logistics Study which identifies ‘a reluctance [by Sheffield Council] to promote logistics as an investment of choice against industrial development and particularly advanced manufacturing’. This contrasts with economic objective 2 of the Sheffield Plan. | No change is proposed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for logistics is considered sound and supported by the Logistics Study. There is a sufficient supply of land for larger scale warehousing within the wider property market area (covering South Yorkshire, North East Derbyshire, Bassetlaw, Chesterfield and Bolsover). Whilst the study concludes there is strong demand for logistics sites in Sheffield, the need is wider than local and potential occupiers for large warehouse units tend to have a wider area of search. The long-term need for land can be reassessed when the Plan is reviewed after 5 years, so it is unnecessary to identify a full 15-year supply. | No | PDSP.009.004 | Bassetlaw District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Question long term demand for higher density housing. Note that there are a number of allocated residential sites in urban areas are currently in active uses, some would also involve a step change from a mix of uses and require substantial resources to achieve the locally derived target to meet housing needs in the City. | No change needed. Site allocations reflect the spatial strategy. The continuation of a policy zone approach, from the current UDP policy areas approach enables residential development to come forward in many areas of the city, including within existing residential areas and transitioning areas. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing land supply. Sheffield is also part of a wider housing market area that extends into neighbouring districts (where a higher proportion of lower density housing is likely to be built). | No | PDSP.014.005 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The Plan does not fully meet housing needs, or employment needs. Therefore, it does not meet growth aspirations, meet the needs for affordable housing or present a positively prepared strategy. No exceptional circumstances are demonstrated for planning for lower housing growth than the standard method. The evidence shows shortfalls in deliverable housing land supply in relation to the 5 year housing land supply evidence base. | No change needed. Release of greenfield sites from the Green Belt would be contrary to the spatial strategy. The evidence base supports the approach taken to the Plan's housing requirement and employment land supply. | No | PDSP.016.001 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The housing requirement proposed is significantly lower than the local housing need. No exceptional circumstances or justification evidenced for lower requirement. Demographic evidence base does not account for the high level of affordable need. The Duty to Cooperate has not been met as unmet housing need is not addressed. | No change needed. There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery and the Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region. | No | PDSP.019.004 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. No justification or exceptional circumstances demonstrated for lower housing requirement. Green Belt constraint alone is not an exceptional circumstance. Strategy will result in less affordable housing and more small homes. Does not consider the full range of housing needs. The 35% urban uplift should be met in Sheffield not through headroom in other authorities. Consider allocating sustainably located Green Belt sites. | The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. | No | PDSP.020.001 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. No justification or exceptional circumstances demonstrated for lower housing requirement. Green Belt constraint alone is not an exceptional circumstance. Strategy will result in less affordable housing and more small homes. Does not consider the full range of housing needs. The 35% urban uplift should be met in Sheffield not through headroom in other authorities. Consider allocating sustainably located Green Belt sites. | See the response to comment number PDSP.020.001 above | No | PDSP.020.002 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Housing growth is not aligned with economic growth. | The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. | No | PDSP.026.001 | CEG (Submitted by Lichfields) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | 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. There is a pressing and significant need for affordable housing in Sheffield. There is therefore much uncertainty as to whether there will be improvements in economic activity rates. | The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. | No | PDSP.027.001 | Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. | The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.  The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new housing. | No | PDSP.030.002 | Commercial Property Partners (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Based on the Employment Land Review the Plan should have a higher level of ambition for planning for employment land. | The Employment Land Review provides a robust evidence base to support the approach taken in the Plan. | No | PDSP.030.003 | Commercial Property Partners (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Plan does not meet local housing need or provide sufficient employment land. A tram extension along Meadowhall- Chapeltown line should be considered. | See the responses to comment numbers PDSP.034.002 to PDSP.034.005 below. | No | PDSP.034.001 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Plan does not meet local housing need. | The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. | No | PDSP.034.002 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Plan does not provide sufficient employment land. Additional sites should be allocated for B Class employment uses. | The level of employment land identified within the Plan is considered to be sound. We consider that the Employment Land Review provides a robust evidence base to support the approach taken in the Plan. | No | PDSP.034.003 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Plan does not provide sufficient employment land – Green Belt land should be released for development | The level of employment land identified within the Plan is considered to be sound. We consider that the Employment Land Review provides a robust evidence base to support the approach taken in the Plan. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. | No | PDSP.034.004 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Tram extension along Meadowhall- Chapeltown line should be considered. | Policy T1 provides strategic support to the priority of securing the future of the tram and expansion in future where viable. There is insufficient evidence to show an extension to Chapeltown would be economically viable. | No | PDSP.034.005 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.035.001 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.037.001 | Gladman Developments Ltd |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.038.001 | Gladman Retirement Living Ltd |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Evidence and justification as to how the housing requirement was established is required. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.040.001 | Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.041.001 | Hallam Land Management (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.042.015 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Fails to address the employment land needs of Sheffield. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The level of employment land identified within the Plan is considered to be sound. | No | PDSP.042.016 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.042.017 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Broad locations are not identified on the Proposals Map or Key Diagram, in line with the NPPF. Reliance on this non designated area and the assumed housing delivery associated with these locations are unsound and both should be deleted from the plan policies. | Broad locations for growth are identified in sub-area policies SA2 (Northwest sub-area), SA3 (Northeast sub-area), SA4 (East sub-area), SA5 (Southeast sub-area), SA6 (South sub-area) and SA8 (Stocksbridge/Deepcar sub-area). The sub-area policies clearly identify the areas and policy zones in which we see a transition to residential over the longer term. The evidence base for housing delivery from these areas is built on this basis. Acknowledge that the zones should be identified on the key diagram in order to reflect paragraph 23 of the NPPF. | Yes | PDSP.042.018 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Release of the Norton Aerodrome Green Belt site only is considered unsound. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Norton Aerodrome site is the only sustainably located brownfield site identified within the Green Belt. Allocation of this site therefore meets the aims of the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.042.019 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Assessed Housing need is not being met. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.043.001 | Hartwood Estates (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. Evidence required to justify exceptional circumstances for not using need as calculated via the standard method. | The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.  The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new | No | PDSP.046.003 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Evidence and justification as to how the housing requirement was established is required. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.046.004 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Evidence required to justify exceptional circumstances to not need calculated via standard method. | The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.  The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new development. | No | PDSP.046.005 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Allocate land specifically to meet the needs of older people. Proposes allocation of a site currently the subject of a live planning application. | No change needed. The site referred to lies within the Green Belt and allocation would not be consistent with the spatial strategy. The Plan does not allocate specific sites to meet the needs of older people as this could reduce developability of those sites if a scheme doesn't come forwards. However, policies within the Plan are supportive of development of accommodation to meet the needs of older people, in appropriate locations. | No | PDSP.048.001 | Inspired Villages (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.052.001 | Lime Developments (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.054.001 | Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.054.002 | Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Planning for the housing needs of older people should be given greater priority. Policy should be amended to reference minimum provision of new homes for older people. | Whilst we recognise that there is a high level of need for accommodation from the older population, which is likely to increase over the Plan period, policy SP2 indicates the scale of delivery of all new homes which would include older people's accommodation. | No | PDSP.056.002 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The spatial strategy and housing requirement does not meet objectively assessed needs and is not deliverable. Without Green Belt release the spatial strategy will not deliver enough housing to meet housing needs in terms of numbers or types. Propose allocation of promoted Green Belt site to meet needs. The SHMA indicates strong demand for houses whilst delivery is predominantly apartments and student accommodation. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.  The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy takes account of how the land available can be utilised, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. In considering how the local housing need should be met the spatial strategy takes into account the importance of prioritising urban and other under-utilised urban sites and optimising density in these locations to make the most efficient use of land. | No | PDSP.059.001 | MHH Contracting (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Release of Green Belt Sites should be considered. Consultation process is unsound as there has only been one consultation. | There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. The Council has undertaken Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultations in line with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. | No | PDSP.064.001 | Mr Lalley and Miss Knight (Submitted by Townsend Planning Consultants) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. | The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.065.004 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. | The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.  The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new development. | No | PDSP.065.005 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure. | No | PDSP.065.006 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.065.007 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Release of the Norton Aerodrome Green Belt site only is considered unsound. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Norton Aerodrome site is the only sustainably located brownfield site identified within the Green Belt. Allocation of this site therefore meets the aims of the spatial strategy. A 5-year supply based on this level of development is set out in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.066.018 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A 5-year supply based on this level of development is set out in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.066.019 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A 5-year supply based on this level of development is set out in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.066.020 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Release of the Norton Aerodrome site only is considered unsound. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Norton Aerodrome site is the only sustainably located brownfield site identified within the Green Belt. Allocation of this site therefore meets the aims of the spatial strategy | No | PDSP.066.021 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. Development along improved transport corridors would increase the prospects of creating key pieces of infrastructure that would be more viability as a result of increasing the population and businesses in the catchment areas of the proposed new station. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Focussing growth in the Central Area is the most sustainable option in terms of reducing the need to travel and reducing carbon emissions. | No | PDSP.067.001 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. Development along these improved transport corridors would increase the prospects of creating key pieces of infrastructure that would be more viability as a result of increasing the population and businesses in the catchment areas of the proposed new station at Handsworth. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.067.002 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The employment land requirement is too low. And the Employment Land Review methodology is flawed. | No change needed. The Employment Land Review Update 2021 represents an up-to-date position of the employment land supply in the city. It is considered this is consistent with the NPPF that requires the preparation of Plans to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date, proportionate evidence, that focuses on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and takes into account relevant market signals. The employment evidence base represents an up-to-date position of the employment land supply and the economic market in the city. Employment land has been proposed for allocation on the basis of this. | No | PDSP.068.001 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. Consider allocating sustainably located Green Belt sites. | Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.069.001 | OBO Quinta Developments (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | include reference to the Sheffield Innovation Spine as a priority location for economic growth. | The development management policies, Policy Zones and Sub Area policies support the Sheffield Innovation Spine, so there is no need to provide further wording within this policy. However, it is proposed that the Innovation Spine is referenced in Policy SA1 and in the supporting text for Policy CA3. | Yes | PDSP.074.001 | Sheffield Hallam University (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Assessed Housing need is not being met. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. | No change needed. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.074.002 | Sheffield Hallam University (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More Green Belt sites for houses should be released. | Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt | No | PDSP.075.001 | Sheffield Hospital Charity (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Include a reference to the Sheffield Innovation Spine as a priority location for economic growth. | The development management policies, Policy Zones and Sub Area policies support the Sheffield Innovation Spine, so there is no need to provide further wording within this policy. However, it is proposed that the Innovation Spine is referenced in Policy SA1 and in the supporting text for Policy CA3. | Yes | PDSP.076.001 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The Employment Land Requirement should be increased to upper end of scenarios modelled in ELR. | No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the ELR. | No | PDSP.078.001 | St Pauls Developments plc and Smithywood Business Parks Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Employment Land Requirement should be increased to upper end of scenarios modelled in ELR. | No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the ELR. | No | PDSP.078.002 | St Pauls Developments plc and Smithywood Business Parks Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The Plan does not fully meet housing needs under the standard method. Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. | Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.079.001 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Additional sites should be considered along the proposed Don Valley Line. | No change needed. The site allocations reflect the spatial strategy. The potential to reopen the Don Valley Line is at an early (Strategic Outline Business Case) stage. Some significant Housing Sites in the Upper Don Valley already have planning permission. | No | PDSP.084.001 | Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The Plan is sound and based on robust evidence. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.099.002 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The Plan is sound and based on robust evidence. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.099.003 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Tables 1 and 2 are inconsistent with figures in Policy SP1. | Acknowledge that housing capacity figures should be consistent throughout the document. A schedule will be produced to highlight any changes arising in site and overall capacity. This will also take account of new planning permissions during 2022/23 and any proposed allocations that have been completed during 2022/23. | Yes | PDSP.102.005 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The housing requirement falls below that calculated using the Government’s standard method. The proposed housing requirement will not meet affordable housing need. | Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.112.001 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Amend policy and supporting text to reference non-designated heritage assets. | Accept. Propose adding a reference to non-designated heritage assets in Part (m) of Policy SP1. | Yes | PDSP.116.002 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Include amended reference to non-designated heritage sites and assets and industrial/cultural significance. | Accept. Propose adding a reference to non-designated heritage assets in Part (m) of Policy SP1. | Yes | PDSP.116.003 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Suggested wording to reference creation of new blue and green assets and link to the Local Nature Recovery Network. | Agree in part. A change is proposed to part (l) of SP1 to reflect the changes suggested by the respondent, and to ensure consistency with proposed changes to policy BG1. Changes include extension of green and blue infrastructure sites and assets with a focus on the Local Nature Recovery Network. | Yes | PDSP.120.002 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | SP1 (l) - Policy needs to reflect National (Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework) & Local Strategies. Lack of an up-to-date Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy. Amendments suggested to Policy BG1. Map 17 does not represent the Green Network and needs renaming. Blue Infrastructure needs to be made clearer and habitat opportunity areas need adding. BG1 - suggest new paragraph added referring to Ecological Networks. | A reference to Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' should be added to Policy BG1. Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats – amendments to Policy BG1 are proposed. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview but the detail is provided on the Policies Map. | No | PDSP.122.001 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The plan does not establish a green network, merely focuses on the existing green infrastructure. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats – amendments to Policy BG1 are proposed. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview but the detail is provided on the Policies Map. | Yes | PDSP.125.002 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Support the creation of ‘20-minute neighbourhoods’ where everyday needs can be met within a short walk or cycle ride. There is an absence of strategy around connections and cycle routes across the city. Fully support the first two aims of transport strategy relating to public transport and active travel. Strongly supports the objectives for a connected city. | Support noted and welcomed. No change proposed as Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and SYMCA Active Travel Implementation plan. | No | PDSP.130.001 | Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | There needs to be more emphasis on nature recovery and on extending the Green Network. Rewording of part (l) of Policy SP1 suggested. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Agree the suggested change should be made to Policy SP1. | Yes | PDSP.131.001 | Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The wording around climate change and reducing carbon emissions and building a resilient city should be strengthened. | No change needed. The Policy sets out the spatial strategy for development within the city, which in turn reflects the balance between the need to reduce carbon emissions and respond to the climate emergency, whilst ensuring that the Plan is viable and deliverable. | No | PDSP.140.005 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Housing and population projections should be based on 2021 census, not 2014 growth projections. | No change needed. The Government's standard methods stipulates the 2014 household projections must be used as the baseline. | No | PDSP.208.001 | D Smith |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Net Zero approach will have a negative impact on all aspects of life and goes beyond the Council's remit. | No change needed. Policies in the Plan will contribute towards the Council's carbon net zero aspirations. | No | PDSP.222.005 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Support the policy approach. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.260.001 | Jan Symington |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Supports protection of Green Belt. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.267.001 | Jill17 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Support policy approach in particular priority locations for economic growth, focus for retail and leisure uses and sustainable travel. Strengthen part (j) to support improvement to all rail lines through Sheffield and require new road infrastructure to enable active travel and not increase emissions. | Support welcome. Policies SP1(j), T1, and SA8(f) provide support for improved rail links at both national and regional level. Minor amendments are proposed for consistency across the Plan, including additional reference in policy SA2, to clarify support for future re-opening of the Barrow Hill line and Don Valley line. The South Yorkshire Active Travel Implementation Plan acknowledges that space will need to be created to develop active travel infrastructure, and that this may require road space to be re-allocated. Policy T1 makes provision to support the re-allocation of existing road space to more sustainable modes to reduce private car use. There is also provision to safeguard land which may be required to enable the delivery of the city’s transport programme, including active travel schemes | Yes | PDSP.268.002 | Jim Bamford |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Policy should reference to non-designated heritage assets. | Accept. A reference to non-designated heritage assets should be added in part (m) of the Policy. | Yes | PDSP.270.001 | Jim McNeil |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | The plan does not establish a green network, it merely focuses on existing green infrastructure. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Policy BG1 should provide better sign-posting to relevant policies in Part 2 of the Plan. | Yes | PDSP.271.002 | JimC |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Supports the Plan in general but asks several questions relating to housing demolition, population growth and the implications for education and health facilities. | The requirement for new homes in the plan does not include any significant areas for demolition and is based on modelled population growth over the Plan period. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been produced that identifies the need for infrastructure that is needs to support the growth proposed in the Plan. | No | PDSP.279.001 | John Wilkins |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | No comment made. | No change needed, no comment made, support welcome. | No | PDSP.282.001 | john73 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Plan should support strategic rail investment; local rail upgrades; strategic highway improvements; new active travel infrastructure; extension of the South Yorkshire Supertram network. | No change needed. Support for transport schemes are contained in other sub area and development management policies. Support for schemes will also be delivered outside the Local Plan through the Transport Strategy. The Plan supports the need to secure the future of the tram and expansion in future where viable. | No | PDSP.316.001 | maspiers |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | There is not enough future provision or protection for the existing green and blue infrastructure/ local nature network. Would like to see more provision as well as strengthening of Local Plan priorities to provide more green spaces. | No change needed. The plan provides a robust framework for considering planning applications that affect greenspace and the local nature network. | No | PDSP.333.002 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan | Policy does not set out a clear strategy for the protection, enhancement and extension of blue and green infrastructure. References to other strategies - South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. A reference to Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework is proposed to be added to Policy BG1. | Yes | PDSP.393.001 | Sue22 |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Agree with the focus on developing previously developed sites, which can include sensitive reuse and adaptation of heritage assets. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.003.005 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Support spatial strategy. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.013.002 | North East Derbyshire District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.016.002 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.018.001 | Aldene Developments (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.019.005 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Approach restricts development in Principal Town of Chapeltown/ High Green. Propose limited Green Belt release in Chapeltown/High Green to meet housing needs. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.019.006 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | The policy approach is not deliverable. Disproportionate emphasis on the Central sub area for new housing delivery which is undeliverable and unsustainable. Emphasis on the Central Area will limit the type of housing delivered. | No change needed. The distribution of allocations is consistent with the spatial strategy. The Central Area is the most sustainable location for new development in terms of reducing the need to travel/ supporting sustainable modes of transport. | No | PDSP.020.003 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | The policy approach is not deliverable. Disproportionate emphasis on the Central sub area for new housing delivery which is undeliverable and unsustainable. Emphasis on the Central Area will limit the type of housing delivered. | No change needed. The distribution of allocations is consistent with the spatial strategy. The Central Area is the most sustainable location for new development in terms of reducing the need to travel/ supporting sustainable modes of transport. | No | PDSP.020.004 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.026.002 | CEG (Submitted by Lichfields) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Policy should include the Mass Transit Corridors as a spatial focus for future development. | No change needed. The site allocations reflect the overall growth strategy of maintaining development to the existing urban areas, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.027.002 | Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Allocate additional employment land in the North East of the City (Warren Lane). | No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the Employment Land Review, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.034.006 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. The Plan does not adequately plan for provision of older persons housing. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Plan supports delivery of accommodation for older people in appropriate locations. | No | PDSP.038.002 | Gladman Retirement Living Ltd |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.039.001 | Gleeson Homes |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Use of space standards needs to be factored into dwelling estimates. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Space standards and housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.039.002 | Gleeson Homes |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Use of space standards needs to be factored into dwelling estimates. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Space standards and housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.039.003 | Gleeson Homes |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.039.004 | Gleeson Homes |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. many of the allocations fall within flood zones 2 or 3, or are on possibly contaminated land, or will lead to impact on heritage assets. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Impacts of sites by flood risk, land contamination and heritage have been assessed via the Site Selection Methodology and supporting documents (e.g. SFRA, HIA) | No | PDSP.040.002 | Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that many of the allocated sites would be unviable to develop. | No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.042.020 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that affordable housing will not be viable on many of the proposed allocated sites. The Plan will therefore not provide enough affordable homes. | No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure. Affordable homes will also be provided through the Council’s stock increase programme and through the capital programmes of Registered Affordable Housing Providers. | No | PDSP.042.021 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | The Plan will result in an under delivery of family homes and specialist accommodation. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.042.022 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | The Plan will result in an under delivery of family homes and specialist accommodation. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.042.023 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | The Plan will result in an under delivery of specialist older persons accommodation. Policy SP2 should be amended to enable this shortfall to be addressed. | No change needed. Policy SP2 reflects the Council's agreed spatial strategy which does not include release of any greenfield land from the Green Belt. The strategy supports urban renewal and delivery of new homes in sustainable locations. Provision of specialist housing for older people is addressed in policy NC4. | No | PDSP.042.024 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Reference is made to contributions to additional infrastructure including education and healthcare provision in some of the sub areas but no sites have been allocated or a clear strategy identified to ensure sustainable delivery to support growth. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Infrastructure requirements are set out within Policies IN1, DC1 and the accompanying IDP | No | PDSP.046.006 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.052.002 | Lime Developments (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. | No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.065.008 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. | No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience, in reality, and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.065.009 | Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience, in reality, and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.066.022 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5 year supply. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.066.023 | Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Allocate additional employment land in the Southeast of the City (Orgreave Park). | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The site is greenfield land within the Green Belt so its inclusion as a site allocation would not align with the Spatial Strategy. | No | PDSP.068.002 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Hesley Wood tip site should have been considered as a sustainable brownfield site within the Green Belt. | No change needed. Acknowledge the opportunity for renewal in this location. However, the land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach. | No | PDSP.071.002 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Allocate additional employment land in the Northeast of the City (Smithywood). | No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the Employment Land Review, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.078.003 | St Pauls Developments plc and Smithywood Business Parks Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.079.002 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Additional sites should be considered along the proposed Don Valley Line. | No change needed. The site allocations reflect the spatial strategy. The potential to reopen the Don Valley Line is at an early (Strategic Outline Business Case) stage. Some significant Housing Sites in the Upper Don Valley already have planning permission. | No | PDSP.084.002 | Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Support the spatial strategy and commitment to deliver growth on previously developed sites. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.088.001 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | There is a need to demonstrate that the approach will be deliverable and meet housing need. The '20 minute neighbourhood' element of the Policy should include flexibility to allow for delivery of sustainable development and not prevent development on the basis of access to existing facilities. | No change needed. The 20 minute neighbourhood concept is intended to ensure people have good access to a range of services and facilities not to prevent development - the role of larger developments in supporting services and infrastructure is acknowledged. | No | PDSP.112.002 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | 5 minute cities are imposing on freedoms. | The plan incorporates guidance on '20 minute neighbourhoods', which aims to ensure new developments are within a 20 minute walk or cycle ride of essential services and public transport connections. It doesn't involve imposing restrictions on existing communities. | No | PDSP.215.001 | debasana |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Remove all references to '20 Minute Neighbourhoods'. | No change needed. The Plan supports sustainable patterns of development | No | PDSP.222.006 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Support the policy approach to 20 minute neighbourhoods. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.268.003 | Jim Bamford |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy | Object to the site allocation SES3 Traveller site. There has not been proper public consultation on the proposal. | The site selection methodology shows that site allocation SES03 is suitable for Industrial and Gypsy/Traveller uses. Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. Issues raised by the public will be considered by the Inspector as part of the public examination on the Sheffield Plan. | No | PDSP.283.001 | JohnBarbie |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres | Draft Policy SP3 sets out a hierarchy of town centres. This does not acknowledge Meadowhall. However, Meadowhall is acknowledged and identified on the Key Diagram, which is used to illustrate the main components of the spatial strategy. This supports the case for it to be acknowledged as an out of centre regional shopping centre and key commercial area. | No change needed. Meadowhall is not considered suitable to define as a 'town centre' or a 'primary shopping area' in terms of the definitions in the NPPF and the approach to town centres as set out in Planning Practice Guidance. 'Regional Shopping Centres' are not referenced in either the NPPF of PPG, so there is no justification for a separate policy approach for Meadowhall. The General Employment Zone policy approach (EC3) allows for significant flexibility in terms of acceptable uses, so we consider that there will be no significant constraints applied to the operation of the Meadowhall Centre as a result of the Draft Plan approach. | No | PDSP.024.002 | British Land (Submitted by Quod) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres | The Queens Road Retail Park should be designated as a District Centre (another similar retail park at Heeley has been designated as a District Centre). | No change needed. Heeley Retail Park is part of a wider area that includes smaller shops and is therefore appropriately allocated as a District Centre. The Queens Road Retail Park is a stand alone retail park divorced from other shops and uses that a District Centre contains. It is therefore designated as a Flexible Use Zone rather than a District Centre. | No | PDSP.070.001 | Orchard Street Investment Management (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres | The policy zone approach does not allow enough flexibility on the range of uses that may develop over the Plan period on key regeneration sites such as West Bar. | No change needed. The policy zone approach incorporates a wide variety of uses, and with regard the specific site referenced at West Bar reflects the range of City Centre uses that could come forward on this site that is already under construction. The site falls within a City Centre Office Zone which does not preclude the current mixed-use development from going ahead. The Office Zones contain a significant amount of flexibility, given that 40% of the floorspace can be non-office use. Some requirement for office uses is necessary in order to deliver the spatial strategy of the Plan to meet the City's need for office space. | No | PDSP.088.002 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres | 20 minute neighbourhoods are part of a wider agenda seeking to control residents. | No change needed. The concept of 20 minute neighbourhoods is about people having good access to services and facilities near their homes, rather than restricting movement. | No | PDSP.222.007 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres | Support the role of Local Centres in providing facilities that will help support 20 minute neighbourhoods. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.268.004 | Jim Bamford |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | AMID proposals potentially impact on playing fields at Don Valley Bowl. | No change needed. Don Valley Bowl is proposed to be within an Urban Greenspace Zone. | No | PDSP.007.004 | Sport England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Promotes additional site allocation. Site selection process is not sound as not all reasonable alternatives have not been considered. | No change needed. Proposed site allocation is within the Green Belt and would not be consistent with the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.049.001 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Duplicate comment. | No change needed. PDSP.076.002 is the only the online submission relating to comments PDSP.049.001-007 and responses are made in relation to individual comments. | No | PDSP.076.002 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Include a greater level of information relating to each site allocation including heritage designations and historic character. | No change needed. The proposed amendment to include a list of all heritage assets near sites would add too much detail to the site allocations. However, the supporting evidence base including Site Selection Methodology and Heritage Impact Assessment incorporates this detail. These heritage assets would also be taken into account through application of policy DE9 at the planning application stage. | No | PDSP.116.004 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support policy approach that does not allocate Green Belt sites for development. Support Local Green Space designations. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.193.003 | Caroline Quincey |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support policy approach that does not allocate Green Belt sites for development. Support Local Green Space designations. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.213.001 | Caroline Quincey |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Objects to objectives relating to 15-minute neighbourhoods, climate emergency and net zero. | No change needed. The Plan aims to ensure that new development is located sustainably. It supports the Council’s objective of being net zero by 2030. | No | PDSP.222.001 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Chesterfield Road (through Woodseats) should not be designated as a Strategic HGV route. Chesterfield Road is narrow in some sections through Woodseats District centre and should be a no through road for heavy vehicles. It shouldn't be a Mass Transit Corridor. | No change required. HGV routes are an existing designation approved by Sheffield City Council and no changes are proposed in Local Plan. The purpose of the Mass Transit Corridors is to enhance public transport services and active travel infrastructure. This is appropriate for a route to and through a district centre. | No | PDSP.227.001 | firstname99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | No comment. | No change needed. No comment made. | No | PDSP.242.001 | Gwen 54/56 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support proposed greenspace designation for Bolehill Woods, Woodseats. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.261.001 | Janaspi |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support Local Green Space designation for Bole Hill Woods | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.299.001 | kittiwake |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | No comment. Support. | No change needed. No comment made. | No | PDSP.305.001 | Linda10 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support the designation of the Bolehill Wood as Local Green Space. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.318.001 | mattfalcon |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support the designation of the Bolehill Wood as Local Green Space. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.328.001 | Msdmc |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support protection of sites through Green Belt, Urban Greenspace and Local Green Space designations. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.333.003 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support the designation of the Bolehill Wood as Local Green Space. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.334.001 | Nuthatch22 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Inferred support for Local Greenspace designation at Bole Hill Woods. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.374.001 | Savegreenspace!! |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Support proposed greenspace designation for Bolehill Woods, Woodseats. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.383.001 | Snoop103 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | The Plan will not meet objectively assessed needs. The Plan is not deliverable. Additional land should be identified. Propose release of site from the Green Belt to deliver housing. | No change needed. Allocation of the proposed site would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.044.001 | Heritage Estates Yorkshire (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy |  | Inconsistent approach to referencing heritage between Central Area and other sub-areas. Site allocations do not consistently reference Conservation Areas / heritage assets. Heritage Impact Assessments identify non-designated heritage assets but sites without HIAs do not. | No change needed. The proposed amendment to include a list of all heritage assets near sites would add too much detail to the sub-area policies. However, the supporting evidence base including Site Selection Methodology and Heritage Impact Assessment incorporates this detail for relevant site allocations. These heritage assets would also be taken into account through application of policy DE9 at the planning application stage for any sites coming forwards within those sub-areas. | No | PDSP.116.005 | Joined up Heritage Sheffield |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | Comment suggests the map of Sub Central Area is too busy. | Noted. On the interactive Policies Maps online all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. | No | PDSP.014.006 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | Correct typo in footnote. | No change is needed. The document referenced is titled the Sheffield City Centre Strategic Vision. | No | PDSP.014.007 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | It is our understanding that the Main Employment Zone on Map 6 is a combination of the City Centre Office Zone, General Employment Zone, Industrial Zone, Primary Shopping area and Cultural Zones shown on the Policies Map however, this is not explained clearly within Part 1 of the Sheffield Plan. | No change needed. The Map is for illustration and does not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. | No | PDSP.055.001 | Marks and Spencer (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | Add the following wording:- "Allow for new Purpose-Built Student Accommodation in identified parts of the area but only where evidence demonstrates the demand for further supply in these locations (see Policy NC5 and Policy NC6).”. | No change needed. Suggested alternative wording is effectively the same as the wording in Policy NC6. There is no need to repeat the wording in Policy SA1. | No | PDSP.085.001 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. | No change needed. The Central Sub-Area does include Kelham Island. Map 4 depicts the City Centre and the City Centre Primary Shopping Area. | No | PDSP.116.006 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | On Map 6, page 36, correct the spelling of neighbourhood name to "Cathedral". | Please see amended Map 6 to correct the typographical error. | Yes | PDSP.116.007 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. Add that part of the Character Area lies within the Kelham Island Conservation Area. This is mentioned for the Priority Location and Catalyst Site, but for consistency with other sections should be mentioned for the area as a whole | Noted. On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document also includes more in-depth maps of the proposed neighbourhoods. Amendments to supporting text and policy criteria are proposed to address the comment and provide consistency and clarity. | Yes | PDSP.116.008 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. Character Area 3 includes the City Centre Conservation Area and a small part of Hanover Conservation Area in addition to Furnace Hill and Well Meadow | Noted. On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document also includes more in-depth maps of the proposed neighbourhoods. Please see amendments to supporting text and policy criteria to address the comment and provide consistency and clarity. | Yes | PDSP.116.009 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area |  | Part 1 • P58:  Map top left: add outlines of Priority Locations and Catalyst Sites, for consistency with other areas;  Map top right: enlarge, currently too small to be usefully legible. | Noted. The Map is for illustration and does not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Council also produced PDF Policies Maps for the areas to help with accessibility. | No | PDSP.116.010 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Sufficient evidence should be provided through the sustainability appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected. Supportive of approach for Broad Locations for Growth. However, more adjustments are needed to policy criteria to ensure policy is compliant with NPPF and recreational/heritage value of sites is retained. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Habitat Regulations Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified development needs. The proposed development management policies will provide protection for sites of ecological and recreational importance within the Broad Locations for Growth (as well as all other areas of the city) but some minor amendments to Policy GS5 are proposed to clarify the need to protect designated sites and priority habitats. | Yes | PDSP.006.004 | Natural England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Sites SV07, HC15, SV08, SV09, SU06, HC04 and SV10 are all not deliverable and there is lack of evidence for availability and viability, so we suggest the removal of these. There is insufficient housing supply so the 'Starbuck Farm, Beighton' site should be added. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is in the Green Belt and the there are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. | No | PDSP.016.003 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Disagree with the spatial strategy approach of concentrating majority of housing growth in Central Sub Area. This will not achieve a diverse housing and tenure mix for the overall provision. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Therefore, it is considered the policy requirements within the Local Plan are robust and appropriate to justify the approach taken to the housing requirement and the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.020.005 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Disagree with the spatial strategy approach of concentrating majority of housing growth in Central Sub Area. This will not achieve a diverse housing and tenure mix for the overall provision. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Therefore, it is considered the policy requirements within the Local Plan are robust and appropriate to justify the approach taken to the housing requirement and the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.020.006 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | There is not enough provision for older people's housing in Central Sub Area. | Provision of specialist housing for older people is addressed in policy NC4 and is a policy that applies to all areas of Sheffield where a need is identified. Older persons accommodation is acceptable on any of the allocated housing sites where it complies with Policy NC4. | No | PDSP.038.003 | Gladman Retirement Living Ltd |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | The need for Industrial and Logistics land identified by logistics study is not met. Disagree that there is enough logistics supply. Our site at the former Hesley Wood tip should be added as an allocation. | The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the centre of the City. Hesley Wood is not within the Central sub-area. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach. | No | PDSP.071.003 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Sites SV07, HC15, SV08, SV09, SU06, HC04 and SV10 are all not deliverable and there is lack of evidence for availability and viability, so these sites should be removed. We disagree that there is enough housing supply. Our sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and 'Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield should be added as allocations. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Therefore, it is considered the policy requirements within the Local Plan are robust and appropriate to justify the approach taken to the housing requirement and the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.003 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | There seems to be an inconsistent approach to site allocations and zoning, where a site can be allocated as strategic mixed use site but also Office Zone. | The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework in making effective use of land. The Central Sub Area is intended to aid in delivering future housing and retail growth as well as commercial activity to ensure long-term viability to the city centre. | No | PDSP.088.003 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. | An amendment has been proposed to correct the spelling of Cathedral on Map 6. | Yes | PDSP.116.011 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. | No change needed. The Central Sub-Area does include Kelham Island. Map 4 depicts the City Centre and the City Centre Primary Shopping Area. | No | PDSP.116.012 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | We wish to see a consistent approach applied to the provision of green spaces and the requirement for street tree planting across the Central Sub-Area. The requirement for street tree planting should be reinforced across all Central Sub Areas in order to meet the requirements of NPPF para 131. This would strengthen and accord with Local Plan Part 2 Policy GS7: Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows. | No change needed. Policy GS7 promotes the provision and retention of street trees in all locations. | No | PDSP.135.001 | Sheffield Street Tree Partnership (SSTP) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Remove criteria h) which required the Clean Air Zone as this could have detrimental impact on businesses within the city centre. | The Sheffield Clean Air Zone has been in effect since February 2022. The Zone is one of the essential measures that are needed to address the climate emergency and achieving net zero carbon by 2030 as per the Council's commitment. | No | PDSP.222.008 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area | Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area | Request for more provision of open and green space within the Central Sub area to be proportionate with housing growth targets. | Please see policy amendments to BG1, SA1, CA1-CA6 to address concerns raised. | No | PDSP.366.001 | Ruth Morgan |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) |  | Historic England supports and welcomes the role the Neepsend Priority Location plays in ensuring the protection of heritage assets. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.006 | Historic England |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | It may be beneficial to make it clearer what is meant as proactively manage flood risk and functional flood plain. | In order to clarify the policy approach as suggested, 'flood plain' and 'proactive manage flood risk' have been added to the Glossary. | Yes | PDSP.002.001 | Environment Agency |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already. included under Policy CA4. | Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provides further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites and assets as detailed by Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework. | No | PDSP.003.007 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. | No | PDSP.042.025 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | There is a lack of clarity in terms of where employment is projected to come forward in the area as there are currently only two allocations for employment. | The Employment Land Review represents an up-to-date position of the employment land supply in the city. It is considered this is consistent with the NPPF that requires the preparation of Plans to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date, proportionate evidence, that focuses on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and takes into account relevant market signals. | No | PDSP.060.001 | Mr A Spurr (Submitted by Spring Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | Include 'The Spine' proposal within the policy and make references to this. | Reference to the 'Innovation Spine' would not be appropriate in this policy. The proposed amendment to Policy SA1 sufficiently addresses the issue of support for the Spine proposal. | No | PDSP.086.001 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | The Clifton Works site, west of the KN01 should be a future flexible use site rather than general employment. | The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework in regard to making effective use of land. The General Employment Zones provide opportunity and flexibility for a wide range of business to expand, locate and relocate. Other sensitive residential uses are not appropriate in these areas, therefore the General Employment Zone boundary is considered to be appropriate. | No | PDSP.089.001 | Various Clients (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | Add that part of the Character Area lies within the Kelham Island Conservation Area. This is mentioned for the Priority Location and Catalyst Site, but for consistency with other sections should be mentioned for the area as a whole.. | An amendment is proposed to paragraph 4.10 - adding a reference the Kelham Island Conservation Area. | Yes | PDSP.116.013 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | Make reference to the Upper Don Trail in relevant character areas. Also to incorporate this in proposals. | Amendments are proposed to Policies BG1, SA1, CA1-CA6 to address concerns raised. | Yes | PDSP.151.001 | Upper Don Trail Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | Plan for more active travel routes and prioritise cycling and walking provision. Provide more accessible connectivity across the river and railway lines. Highlight Corporation Street leading to Bridgehouses roundabout. | Part d of Policy CA1 already refers to improved access and connectivity. The suggested amendments are overly detailed. | No | PDSP.176.001 | AndrewR |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside | The Policies Map does not match with the policy in terms of the development expected to take place. More open space provision including blue and green infrastructure should be planned for in Policy CA1. | New open space provision is covered in Policy NC15. A number of new parks and public spaces are already referred to in the policies for the Central Area. | No | PDSP.366.002 | Ruth Morgan |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend | Suggest criterion (i) is amended to include reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets to ensure importance is placed on them. | To aid the implementation effectiveness of Policy CA1A, criteria i) has been amended to reflect the points raised in the representation. | Yes | PDSP.003.008 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend | Include land north of Parkwood Road in the Neepsend priority area, which would support the Flexible Use Zone. | The Sustainability Appraisal, Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement. Please see the site's assessment in the updated HELAA for suitability. | No | PDSP.063.001 | Mr J Hartley, Arthur's Skips (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend | Include land north of Parkwood Road in the Neepsend priority area, which would support the Flexible Use Zone. | The Sustainability Appraisal, Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement. Please see the site's assessment in the updated HELAA for suitability. | No | PDSP.063.002 | Mr J Hartley, Arthur's Skips (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend | The site shown at number 8 in the diagram on page 23 of the Plan should be designated for mixed uses instead of only housing due to surrounding uses. Change the boundary of the priority neighbourhood to exclude House Skate Park and uses to the Western side of the site. | The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework to make effective use of land. The Central Sub Area will contribute to delivering future housing and retail growth as well as commercial activity to ensure long-term viability to the city centre. Flexible Use Zones allow for a wide variety of uses and are not considered restrictive to future development. They do not prevent current operational uses; any future proposals will be dealt with at application stage. | No | PDSP.083.001 | The House Skatepark |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1B: Catalyst Site Between Penistone Road, the River Don and Rutland Road | Sites included in CA1B should have an overall masterplan as to how they will come forward. KN21 should also be referenced in this. As policy stands currently, it is explicit enough to protect heritage assets sufficiently. | To aid the implementation effectiveness of Policy CA1B, an amendment is proposed referencing the emerging Kelham Island and Neepsend Masterplan. | Yes | PDSP.003.009 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1B: Catalyst Site Between Penistone Road, the River Don and Rutland Road | Part 1 - P41 Cannon Brewery is not a Listed Building, so Policy CA1B(c) should read “and nearby heritage assets including Cornish Works, Globe Works and Cannon Brewery”. | Agree – correction proposed. | Yes | PDSP.116.014 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside) | Policy CA1B: Catalyst Site Between Penistone Road, the River Don and Rutland Road | Repeats comment PDSP.116.14 | See response to PDSP.116.114. | Yes | PDSP.116.015 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) |  | In paragraph 4.19, reference should be to freight line rather than redundant railway. | Accept proposed change. | Yes | PDSP.015.003 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) |  | The area is dominated by busy roads” does not apply to all the items listed;  ▪ Castlegate is now pedestrianised, so it is not clear what is meant by “Castlegate to the north,  which restricts movement towards the Wicker Arches”;  ▪ “Wicker high street” should be just “Wicker” (its official name) or “the Wicker” (how it is  referred to locally); The railway line is in active use, so omit “redundant”. | Castlegate is part of the Council's Grey to Green scheme, Castlegate to the North means ‘the Wicker’ which is a busy road.  The reference in paragraph 4.19 should be to freight line rather than redundant railway | Yes | PDSP.116.016 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | More explicit reference to greater connectivity between the City Centre and the Canal towpath should be provided. No reference in part e) to opportunity to improve environments along the Canal as well as the river. | Agree. In order to clarify the approach taken and strengthen the application of the policy, the following amendment is proposed to Policy CA2 criteria e): Enhance pedestrian and cycle environments along main routes and improve the relationship with the river **and canal side spaces** - creating new riverside routes, supported by active building frontages, and proposals that positively interact with the river and **canal side spaces**. | Yes | PDSP.001.001 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already. included under Policy CA4. | Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provide further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites and assets. | No | PDSP.003.010 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | Historic England supports and welcomes role Wicker Riverside Priority Location plays in ensuring the protection of heritage assets. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.012 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. | No | PDSP.042.026 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | Include 'The Spine' proposal within the policy and make references to this. | Reference to the 'Innovation Spine' would not be appropriate in this policy. The proposed amendment to Policy SA1 sufficiently addresses support for the Spine proposal. | No | PDSP.086.002 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | There is an inconsistent approach to site allocations for mixed use site and an Office Zone. Policy seems to be too prescriptive for the city centre. CW03 unclear what the site allocation designation means. Capacity at West Bar for housing only reflects Phase 1 and should be 525 units. | The Office Zones contain a significant amount of flexibility, given that 40% of the floorspace can be non-office use. Some requirement for office uses is necessary in order to deliver the spatial strategy of the Plan to meet the City's need for office space. The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework in regard to making effective use of land. The Central Sub Area is intended to aid in delivering future housing and retail growth as well as commercial activity to ensure long-term viability to the city centre. Flexible Use Zones allow for a wide variety of uses and are not considered restrictive to future development. | No | PDSP.088.004 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | Repeats comment PDSP.116.016 | See response to PDSP116.016 | No | PDSP.116.017 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria | Policy supported but no comments provided | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.176.002 | AndrewR |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2A: Priority Location in Castlegate | Welcomes protection of heritage assets, proposal to new public square and new greenspace. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.011 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2A: Priority Location in Castlegate | Delete criteria c) as there is no clear of evidence of how the Innovation district will be delivered/ no masterplan. Suggest reference be added in for Sheffield Innovation Spine. | Criteria c) of the policy reflects the ambitions to deliver innovation led  regeneration in Castlegate as part of strengthening the Spine within the City Centre. This is detailed in the City Centre Strategic Vision as well as the Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks. Reference to the 'Innovation Spine' would not be appropriate in this policy. It is considered that Policy SA1 sufficiently addresses support to the Spine proposal. | No | PDSP.076.003 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria) | Policy CA2A: Priority Location in Castlegate | Welcomes protection of heritage assets, proposal to new public square and new greenspace. Welcomes the Grey to Green scheme. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.125.003 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield | None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. | No | PDSP.042.027 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield | A reference should be added in for Sheffield Innovation Spine to ensure consistency. | A reference to the Spine is proposed in an amendment to paragraph 4.28. Support for the Spine proposal is also covered under changes proposed to Policy SA1 | Yes | PDSP.076.004 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield | Include 'The Spine' proposal within the policy and make references to this. Suggest the CA3 boundary should reach further up Tenter Street and Broad Lane to touch the University of Sheffield Diamond Building to create a city centre Innovation Spine that could eventually house between two and four large, flagship Innovation buildings This could be achieved by reassigning some of the “Flexible Use” area surrounding CA3 into a city Innovation Spine. | A reference to the Spine is proposed in an amendment to paragraph 4.28. Support for the Spine proposal is also covered under changes proposed to Policy SA1. However, we consider that the Flexible Use Zone remains appropriate in dealing with future development proposals in the Spine area. Please see amended Policies Map for the new boundary of the area covered by Policy CA3. | Yes | PDSP.086.003 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield | The area includes the City Centre Conservation Area and a small part of Hanover Conservation Area in addition to Furnace Hill and Well Meadow. | An amendment is proposed to include references to the City Centre and Hanover Conservation Areas in paragraph 4.26. | Yes | PDSP.116.018 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3A: Priority Location in Furnace Hill | Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already. included under Policy CA4. | Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provides further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites and assets. | No | PDSP.003.013 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3A: Priority Location in Furnace Hill | Supports criteria d) and the approach taken. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.014 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3A: Priority Location in Furnace Hill | We question the inclusion of site SU30 as an allocation due to its scheduled monument designation and heritage value. The site may not be available. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocation site SU30 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. The site has been assessed in the HIA to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are provided for all impacted heritage assets. In response to comments from Historic England, a further condition relating to the impact on a heritage asset has been added. | No | PDSP.142.001 | South Yorkshire Industrial History Society CIO |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield) | Policy CA3B: Catalyst Site at the Gateway between Scotland Street, Smithfield, and Snow Lane | Supports criteria b) and the approach taken. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.015 | Historic England |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) |  | Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. Add text regarding Conservation Areas to match with other area policies. Ensure heritage asset is mentioned correctly. | Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provides further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites and assets. The Maps are for illustration they do not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. | No | PDSP.116.019 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | Supports criteria g) and the approach taken. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.016 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. | No | PDSP.042.028 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | o 4.35 Park Hill Flats are Grade II\*;  o Add that part of the area lies within the Cultural Industries Quarter Conservation Area. | The Maps are for illustration they do not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. Please see proposed amendments to paragraph 4.36. | Yes | PDSP.116.020 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | Reference to be made to Porter Brook Trail in CA4. Include further opportunities to deculvert, admit daylight and re-naturalise the River Sheaf and Porter Brook. | Requirements relating to deculverting are covered in Policy GS9 – there is no need to repeat those requirements in this policy. Conditions relating to deculverting are included in relevant site allocations in Annex A of the Plan. | No | PDSP.125.004 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, re-naturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.177.001 | Andy Buck |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, re-naturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.220.001 | DJGShef |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for de-culverting, re-naturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.229.001 | Gaffer |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.232.001 | Gill |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.245.001 | Hilary |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.267.002 | Jill17 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.281.001 | John59 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.284.001 | JoM |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.306.001 | LisaG |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.329.001 | nahtalix |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley | There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.346.001 | PeterB |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley) | Policy CA4A: Part of Priority Location and Catalyst Site at Moorfoot - Land between Eyre Street, St Mary’s Road, and Jessop Street | Suggests text in section c) in CA4A to be moved to Policy CA4 above as deems that more appropriate to mention de-culverting priorities. | It is considered that criteria c) is more appropriately located in Policy CA4A. No modification is required. Deculverting is also expected more generally (where practicable) under Policy GS9. | No | PDSP.125.005 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) |  | Historic England supports and welcomes mention of City Centre Conservation Area for the enhancement of the urban core of the city. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.017 | Historic England |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street | Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already included under Policy CA4. | Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provide further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites. | No | PDSP.003.018 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street | None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. | No | PDSP.042.029 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street | HC03 is deemed as not available, suitable, achievable (including viable) or deliverable as envisaged by the proposed site allocation. The ownership is questioned and there is a substation on site as well. Recommendation to remove HC03 as a site allocation. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocation HC03 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area and be delivered as part of the emerging Moorfoot Masterplan, thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Moorfoot is a priority location and public sector financial support will be sought if necessary to tackle any abnormal development costs. Therefore, it is considered that HC03 remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. | No | PDSP.051.001 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street | P56, paragraph 4.41 and P57 4.44 should refer to “Winter Garden” rather than “Gardens”. The former is its official name. | Please see policy amended to correct the typo. | Yes | PDSP.116.021 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street | Add a Map showing the neighbourhoods. | On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document also includes more in-depth maps of the proposed neighbourhoods. | No | PDSP.116.022 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5A: Priority Location in Moorfoot | HC03 is deemed as not available, suitable, achievable (including viable) or deliverable as envisaged by the proposed site allocation. Remove reference to HC03 in all of CA5A in criteria a) f) h). Recommendation to remove HC03 as a site allocation. New community proposals should focus on allocation sites HC08, HC11, HC20. | See response to PDSP.051.001. | No | PDSP.051.002 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5A: Priority Location in Moorfoot | Suggests text in section f) in CA5A to be moved to Policy CA5 above as deems that more appropriate to mention de-culverting priorities. Add more text about the Porter Brook Park proposals. | It is considered that criteria f) is more appropriately located in Policy CA5A. No modification is required. Deculverting is also expected more generally (where practicable) under Policy GS9. | No | PDSP.125.006 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5B: Catalyst Site at the Junction between St Mary’s Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road | HC03 is deemed as not available, suitable, achievable (including viable) or deliverable as envisaged by the proposed site allocation. Remove reference to HC03 in all of CA5A in criteria a). Recommendation to remove HC03 as a site allocation and as part of a Catalyst site. | See response to PDSP.051.001. | No | PDSP.051.003 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5B: Catalyst Site at the Junction between St Mary’s Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road | P61: Describe Catalyst Site as “Moorfoot”. The current description “Junction between St. Mary’s Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road” is incorrect. There is no succinct description using street names. | The title for the Catalyst site comes from the Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document. We consider this is an accurate description of the location which is also shown on the Policies Map. | No | PDSP.116.024 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street) | Policy CA5B: Catalyst Site at the Junction between St. Mary’s Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road | Repeats comment PDSP.116.024 | See response to PDSP.116.024. | No | PDSP.116.023 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen’s Road) |  | Part 1 - P65:  o Map top right: enlarge, currently too small to be usefully legible;  o Add the part of the Character Area lies within the John Street Conservation Area. This is mentioned in the policy, but for consistency with other sections should be mentioned in the supporting text. | The Maps are for illustration they do not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. No change needed as the John Street Conservation Area is mentioned in the policy. | No | PDSP.116.025 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen’s Road) | Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road | It may be beneficial to make it clearer what is meant as proactively manage flood risk  here. Functional flood plain. | In order to clarify the policy approach as suggested, 'flood plain' and 'proactive manage flood risk' have been added to the Glossary. | Yes | PDSP.002.002 | Environment Agency |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen’s Road) | Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road | None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. | No | PDSP.042.030 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen’s Road) | Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road | P63:  o Add map showing neighbourhoods;  o Add the part of the Character Area lies within the John Street Conservation Area. This is mentioned in  the policy, but for consistency with other sections should be mentioned in the supporting text. | The Maps are for illustration they do not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. No change needed as the John Street Conservation Area is mentioned in the policy. | Yes | PDSP.116.026 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen’s Road) | Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road | The reference to the Porter Brook in paragraph (d) is incorrect. This should refer to the River Sheaf | Please see proposed amendment to part (d) of the policy | Yes | PDSP.125.007 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area |  | Supports each sub-area having its own policy. However, the heritage value of the waterways should be mentioned as well as the problem of increasing public access while improving and maintaining biodiversity. | Minor amendment suggested - Amend the first sentence of paragraph 4.56 in Part 1 to acknowledge the two valleys importance for industrial heritage and biodiversity | Yes | PDSP.260.002 | Jan Symington |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | In terms of the Sub Area Strategy. The SA and HRA should provide sufficient evidence to justify the site selection process and that sites of least environmental value are selected. | It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Habitat Regulations Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified development needs. The proposed development management policies will provide protection for sites of ecological and recreational importance within the Broad Locations for Growth (as well as all other areas of the city) but some minor amendments to Policy GS5 are proposed to clarify the need to protect designated sites and priority habitats. | No | PDSP.006.005 | Natural England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA2 includes 1,015 new homes. There is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. The strategy for meeting the identified need should not prevent the delivery of other sustainable sites or sustainable developments. To address soundness matters, the Spatial Strategy should be updated to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in Northwest Sheffield and is in the Green Belt; and the there are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. Allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.004 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The Plan only aims to deliver 1,015 homes in the Northwest Sheffield (60 per Annum). This level of development is significantly less than what is necessary. It should be noted that 480 homes are delivered across two sites, NWS09 and NWS10 at a density of 67 dwellings per hectare. Removing these from the list results in all other sites being developed at a density of 40 dwellings per hectare, however many of these are significantly higher, including NWS11, 21 and 22 all broadly 150 dph. It is clear a broad range of homes are required, and in order to achieve this increased and/or alternative housing allocations are required. | No change needed. The spatial strategy uses available land efficiently while prioritising sustainable development and protection of the Green Belt. There is no valid reason to alter the strategy, density policy NC9, or the specified land use densities. The densities reflect the relative accessibility of the sites in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. | No | PDSP.020.007 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The Plan only aims to deliver 1,015 homes in the North West Sheffield (60 per Annum). This level of development is significantly less than what is necessary. It should be noted that 480 homes are delivered across two sites, NWS09 and NWS10 at a density of 67 dwellings per hectare. Removing these from the list results in all other sites being developed at a density of 40 dwellings per hectare, however many of these are significantly higher, including NWS11, 21 and 22 all broadly 150 dph. It is clear a broad range of homes are required, and in order to achieve this increased and/or alternative housing allocations are required. | No change needed. The spatial strategy uses available land efficiently while prioritising sustainable development and protection of the Green Belt. There's no valid reason to alter our strategy, density policy NC9, or the specified land use densities. | No | PDSP.040.003 | Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in policies CA1 to CA6 and SA 3,4, 5, 8 AND 9 as being unviable. While each site will of course have its own circumstances and for these allocations to be sound the council will need to demonstrate that they are capable of being delivered, if they are to be included in the five year land supply from the date of adoption or at least deliverable within the plan period. At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA2 is that they are unviable and not deliverable and as such it would be unsound to include these sites within the plan. | No change needed. While the WPVA may indicate sites in certain locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocation is viable and deliverable. | No | PDSP.042.031 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. The Sub-Area policy aims to deliver approximately 1015 homes in the named larger villages. SA2 b) talks of delivering several Site Allocations, identified by number, could these also be named here in the text? | No change proposed. The Sites allocated in the North West Sub Area are listed in Appendix 1. | No | PDSP.260.003 | Jan Symington |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Policy SA2 seeks to deliver approximately 1,015 new homes (2.8% of the proposed housing requirement). This level of growth is too low to support this area of the city and Green Belt land needs to be released. As such, a selected number of well-planned urban extension sites around the built up area of Sheffield, relating to the existing hierarchy of settlements, and not unduly harming the purposes of Green Belt, would make an important contribution to achieving this objective. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.067.003 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. policy SA2 includes 28.3ha of existing permissions and site allocations for employment land. This includes sites NWS02, NWS04, NWS05, and NWS06 are allocated for industrial; and Sites NWS01, NWS03 and NWS07 are allocated for General Employment. None of these sites will satisfy the need for Industrial and Logistics land as identified by Savills or the Council’s own Logistics Study. None of the sites are of strategic size or in a strategic location close to the Strategic Road Network or a motorway junction. To address soundness matters, Rula Developments Ltd propose the Council: reviews the Spatial Strategy and identifies sites to meet the need for Industrial and Logistics; and allocates Rula’s site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach. | No | PDSP.071.004 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA2 includes 1,015 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability or availability of the sites allocated. To address soundness, the Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.079.004 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Supports Policy SA2 definition of the sites for housing in the Northwest Sub-Area, which are mainly located in the Upper Don Valley, benefitting from long established centres of population and strong sustainable transport links. Strongly supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. Supports sustainable outdoor recreation opportunities but would welcome explicit recognition in the Local Plan that the interests of biodiversity should hold sway over inappropriate recreational pressures. | Welcome support for Policy SA2 and the decision to not allocate Hepworth's site. Agree that the Local Plan should clarify that biodiversity should usually take precedence where there is a conflict with recreational objectives; an amendment to paragraph 5.25 is proposed to make this clear. The local plan's development management policies already proportionally prioritise protecting and enhancing biodiversity over harmful development, especially Policies GS5, GS6 and GS7. | Yes | PDSP.104.001 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Despite the welcome emphasis on developing brownfield sites, some may have developed into valuable wildlife habitats. In particular, Site Allocation NWS29 incorporates part of a Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) within its boundary. The boundary of site allocation NWS29 should be reviewed to exclude the Local Wildlife Site. | Suggest minor amendment; add a condition to all allocations that include a Local Wildlife site within the red line boundary. The condition makes it clear that the developable area does not include the Local Wildlife Site (and their buffers). This potentially makes it easier to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain onsite. | Yes | PDSP.104.002 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The description of Wardsend Cemetery Heritage Park in paragraph 4.56 does justice to its unique character and location. Wardsend Cemetery Heritage Park should be designated as a Local Nature Reserve. The Upper Don Trail should be named in the Local Plan with a commitment to its development and completion. | The plan acknowledges the significance of Wardsend Cemetery in Paragraph 4.55 as a heritage asset. The Policies Map shows the Cemetery's location is within a Local Wildlife Site and a Biological SSSI. Designation of Wardsend cemetery as a Local Nature Reserve is not a planning matter and cannot be done by the Local Plan. However, this can be pursued through a separate process involving Natural England.  An amendment is proposed to Policy SA2 to include an additional criterion relating to enhancing active travel routes along one bank of the Main Rivers (this would cover the Upper Don Trail). | No | PDSP.105.001 | Friends of Wardsend Cemetery |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Typographical error. Part 1 P65, policy SA2: Correct spelling to “Worrall”, from "Worral". | Agreed, this is a typographic error | Yes | PDSP.116.027 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Support the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. | Support for the decision to not allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane in the Green Belt for development is welcomed. | No | PDSP.120.003 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Paragraph 4.56 should be amended to add reference to the importance of nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage for both Rivelin and Loxley Valleys. | Minor change is proposed to paragraph 4.46. The importance our River Valleys as part of the city's blue and green infrastructure for nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage should be acknowledged in the justification for the policy | Yes | PDSP.122.002 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Respondent supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. | Support for the decision not to allocate the Former Hepworth's site is welcomed | No | PDSP.127.003 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. | Support for the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site is welcomed. | No | PDSP.139.001 | South Yorkshire Bat Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Support the decision to designate land adjacent to 137 Main Road, Wharncliffe Side as Urban Green Space. We question why the site had not been designated as Green Belt, which is more appropriate than an Urban Green Space. | Changing the site's designation to Green Belt is contrary to our Spatial Strategy. However, support for the decision to designate the site as Urban Green Space Zone is welcomed. | No | PDSP.139.002 | South Yorkshire Bat Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Support the 2 bullet points in g), i.e., Deliver sustainable transport improvements, including:  • 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. Strongly objects to delivery of the "A61 highway junction improvements and links to Penistone Road", Shalesmoor (in point g); as the proposed changes to the Shalesmoor junction will worsen bus journeys into the City Centre (routes 81&82) and worsen the position of cyclists relative to cars – all of which is completely contrary to the thrust and specific policies elsewhere in this Spatial Strategy. | Support for the policy is welcomed. The main purpose of the Mass Transit Routes is to improve public transport and active travel infrastructure along those routes. The junction improvements at Shalesmoor are being undertaken partly to improve journey times on the tram. The needs of bus users and cyclists have been taken into account in designing the junction improvements. | No | PDSP.268.005 | Jim Bamford |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Policy SA2 recognises that Hillsborough is prone to congestion without providing a solution. Respondent suggests: - Make the A6101 a strategic Route (), and - Add an additional item to Policy SA2 condition g) Deliver sustainable transport improvements, including: "- Make improvements to highway, tram routes and junctions on the A6101 (Rivelin Vally Road), including Malin Bridge, Holme Lane and Bradfield road ( together with links to Penistone Road and Middlewood Road ) to improve traffic flows and hence reduce congestion and the resultant pollution." | These matters need to be considered as part of a new Transport Strategy which is due to be produced in 2024. | No | PDSP.271.003 | JimC |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Support the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. | Support for the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site is welcomed. | No | PDSP.271.004 | JimC |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | The Plan does not appear to contain any policies supporting an extension to the South Yorkshire Supertram network beyond some vague words in Policy T1 - Policies SP1, SA2 and T1 should be rewritten to include extension of the South Yorkshire Supertram network to serve Stocksbridge, existing settlements and proposed developments along the A6102 Mass Transit Corridor. There is no reference to the reopening of the Sheffield – Stocksbridge railway to passengers. I suggest that the relevant parts of policies SP1, SA2 and T1 are rewritten to include the above. | No change needed. Support for transport schemes is contained in other sub area and strategic policies. Support for schemes will also be delivered outside the Local Plan through the Transport Strategy. Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional references to reopening of the Upper Don Railway Line are proposed in Policies SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8. | No | PDSP.316.002 | maspiers |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield | Paragraph 4.56 should be amended to add reference to the importance of nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage for both Rivelin and Loxley Valleys. | Minor change is proposed to paragraph 4.46. The importance our River Valleys as part of the city's blue and green infrastructure for nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage should be acknowledged in the justification for the policy | Yes | PDSP.393.002 | Sue22 |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | Support Policy. | Support for the policy is welcomed. | No | PDSP.012.001 | Ecclesfield Parish Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | The Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, the Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in Northeast Sheffield and is in the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. | No | PDSP.016.005 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | Support the decision to Allocate Site NES19 Buzz Bingo, Kilner Way Retail Park (access from Halifax Road) for future residential development as site allocation NES19. Suggest change the total site capacity from 24 to 50 homes. This amendment would provide a more substantive contribution to the Council's housing requirements, recognising the challenge imposed by the Government's ambition to secure the 35% uplift. | Support for the site allocation is welcomed, however, there is no reasonable justification for increasing the expected yield to a density range outside what is specified in Policy NC9. Neither is there any justification for changes to policy NC9. This does not prevent an applicant making an application for a higher density as the policy does allow densities outside of the specified ranges in certain circumstances. | No | PDSP.031.001 | Derwent Development Management Ltd (DDML) (Submitted by Aylward Town Planning Ltd) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in policy SA3 as being unviable. While each site will have its own circumstances, the council will need to demonstrate they are deliverable within the plan period for these allocations to be sound and included within the plan. At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA3 is that they are unviable and not deliverable. As such it would be unsound to include these site allocations within the plan. | No change needed. While the Whole Plan Viability Assessment may indicate sites in certain locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocation is viable and deliverable. | No | PDSP.042.032 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | Policy SA3 proposes delivery of approximately 970 new homes (2.7% of the overall housing requirement), which is too low a proportion of growth to support Northeast Sub Area and so the amount of new housing should be increased. The Council can increase the delivery of housing by adopting the alternative spatial strategy of releasing a number of suitable unconstrained Green Belt sites, as a selected number of well planned urban extensions around the built up area of Sheffield. They would relate to the existing hierarchy of settlements and would not unduly harm the purposes of Green Belt. This alternative spatial approach would provide an opportunity to deliver sites such as on land south of Whitley Lane, Grenoside that would provide convenient access to employment areas outside the city centre. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land south of Whitley Lane is in the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify altering the Green Belt boundary. | No | PDSP.054.003 | Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | Policy SA3 proposes delivery of approximately 970 new homes (2.7% of the overall housing requirement), which is too low a proportion of growth to support Northeast Sub Area and so the amount of new housing should be increased. The Holme Lane Farm site whilst falling within the Northeast Sub Area, lies within Northwest Sheffield Housing Market Area which has a shortage of Affordable Housing Units exacerbated by a tight Green Belt. The Council can increase the delivery of housing by adopting the alternative spatial strategy of; releasing a selected number of suitable unconstrained Green Belt sites, as a selected number of well planned urban extensions around the built up area of Sheffield, relating to the existing hierarchy of settlements that would not unduly harm the purposes of Green Belt. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify altering the Green Belt boundary. | No | PDSP.067.004 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | Allocate Rula’s site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach. | No | PDSP.071.005 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | The Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. The Plan's introduction to the housing chapter acknowledges difficulties with the housing supply over the Plan period. It states: there is insufficient evidence of delivery before 2029; that public intervention will be needed to enable transition of employment land to sustainable residential areas; that many allocated development sites have multiple owners; and that financial support will be needed from the Government. Many of the proposed allocations have significant deliverability concerns and therefore are unlikely to deliver the required housing to meet the needs of the City. To address soundness matters, the Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Starbuck Farm is not in Northeast Sheffield and is in the Green Belt; and the there are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. Allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.071.006 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | The Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA3 includes 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, Strata Homes propose the Council Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Townend Lane is not in Northeast Sheffield and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.005 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | Fully Support Decision not to allocate the site adjacent to J33 (on the west) of the M1 known as Smithy Wood for development. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.120.004 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield | Support the decision not to allocate the site adjacent to J33 (on the west) of the M1 known as Smithy Wood for development. Supports the decision to designate ‘Land Adjacent 137 Main Road Wharncliffe Side Sheffield’ (see application: 22/00865/FUL) as Urban Green Space Zone rather than be allocating it for development. Supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. | The support is noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.127.004 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area |  | The AMID boundary on Map 8 is not clear, as part of it outside the area are faded. | The AMID (now Innovation District) boundary is only partially in the Northeast Sub Area (Map 8). The larger southern section is within the East Sub area (Map 9). The Interactive Online Map can be used to view the entire boundary. | No | PDSP.014.008 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | The policy fails to signpost the River Don and Sheffield and Tinsley Canal corridors and the opportunities presented by improvements to waterway corridors. Include a priority to deliver improvements to access to the River Don and Sheffield and Tinsley canal corridors through the Lower Don Valley. | Policy BG1 states that very significant weight will be given to the protection and enhancement of Sheffield’s blue and green infrastructure, specifically referencing the main river corridors, including the River Don. An amendment is proposed to include a reference to the Sheffield & Tinsley Canal. Amendments are also proposed to Policies SA1 to SA8 that refer to extending and enhancing active travel routes along one bank of the Main Rivers. | Yes | PDSP.001.002 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | We do not consider that any change is required to the Local Plan to address the road proposals. However, we do advise that the above comments should be taken into account. | No change needed. | No | PDSP.001.003 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | The Sub-Area includes 2,945 homes but there is little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Site ES25 is in open space use and unlikely to come forward in the short term. There is no planning permission in place, a deficiency of open space in the area and lack of evidence of consultation with Sport England.  Site ES27 is a cleared site that requires intervention and unlikely to come forward in the short term. Starbuck Farm should be allocated for housing to address this significant shortfall in housing. | No change is needed. The Sheffield Plan has identified sufficient deliverable sites to meet the City's Housing needs within the Plan period and there is no local requirement to identify sites in the East area of the City. Starbuck Farm is not within the East Sub-Area and has not been included in the supply of sites to meet the City's Housing needs as it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.006 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | The proposed site allocation is close to an existing BOC industrial site which includes operations that produce noise pollution. Noise emissions from operations could impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers. The proposed conditions on allocations ES25 and ES32 make no reference to noise mitigation measures. | No change is necessary. Policy NC14 requires appropriate mitigation for noise sensitive uses within areas with significant background noise including adjoining Trunk Roads/Strategic Roads and those near to industrial areas. | No | PDSP.022.001 | BOC Ltd (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | The proposed site allocation is close to an existing BOC industrial site which includes operations that produce noise pollution. Noise emissions from operations could impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers. The proposed conditions on allocations ES25 and ES32 make no reference to noise mitigation measures. | No change is necessary. Policy NC14 requires appropriate mitigation for noise sensitive uses within areas with significant background noise including adjoining Trunk Roads/Strategic Roads and those near to industrial areas. | No | PDSP.022.002 | BOC Ltd (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy | Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres | Meadowhall makes a significant economic and social contribution to Sheffield. However, the Sub Area policy does not acknowledge and fails to recognise this contribution, thus is lacking in this respect. Indeed, there is no supporting evidence to the Sheffield Plan which assesses Meadowhall’s importance. This approach is a change from the adopted Development Plan, and the Sheffield Plan Issues and Options (Regulation 18), which both recognised Meadowhall’s role. The supporting text should refer to the economic importance and positive role Meadowhall plays within the Sub Area and the City as a whole, being a key employment use and major economic destination for the City Region. | The Sheffield Retail and Leisure Study 2022 assesses the importance of Meadowhall and its contribution to the City economy in terms of retail and leisure provision. As there is no specific policy in the Plan related to Meadowhall, it is not specifically referenced in the Sub Area policy. | No | PDSP.024.003 | British Land (Submitted by Quod) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in policies CA1 to CA6 and SA3,4, 5, 8 and 9 as being unviable. | No change needed. While the Whole Plan Viability Assessment may indicate sites in certain locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocation is viable and deliverable. | No | PDSP.042.033 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | Bessemer Park (ES06) Phase 1 is complete and fully let; Phase 2 is under construction and therefore the site is only available to meet near-term demand and cannot be relied upon to deliver additional floorspace until 2039.  The Alsing Road (ES02) site has very limited capacity for strategic logistics and can hardly be considered strategic. Hesley Wood could address the shortage of employment land for large scale logistics. There is insufficient capacity in Sheffield or the wider area to meet the need for employment land. | The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the southeast of the city. Hesley Wood is not within the Southeast sub-area. The site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation. | No | PDSP.071.007 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | Site ES25 is currently in open space use with insufficient green space identified in the local area. Site ES27 is a cleared site that requires intervention to come forward and will therefore take time. | No change is needed. The site selection process has considered existing open space provision.  Not all allocated sites in the Sheffield Plan are deliverable immediately (or within the first 5 years of the Plan) but our conclusion is that there is a reasonable prospect that all the sites can be delivered by 2039. It is recognised that some sites will require public sector intervention and we are working with Homes England and other partners to support delivery. | No | PDSP.079.006 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA4: East Sheffield | Policy SA4 makes no reference to developing or enhancing green spaces despite acknowledging that there is less green space than in the rest of the city.  The plan should aim to create and enhance accessible green spaces. | No change needed. New open space will need to be provided as part of new development in accordance with Policies BG1 and NC15 as appropriate. | No | PDSP.205.001 | ClareW |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area |  | The AMID boundary is unclear as part of it outside the subareas are faded. | No change needed. Map 9 shows the Innovation District boundary within the East sub-area. The Interactive Online Map can be used to view the entire boundary. | No | PDSP.014.009 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Object to a number of site allocations within the Southeast sub-area, to which policy SA5 relates. | No change needed. The ecological value of the proposed allocations has been carefully assessed as part of the site selection process. Several of the allocations listed in detail in Annex C include conditions which require the protection of ecological corridors/site and/or assessment of the agricultural land value (where the allocation is on agricultural land). | No | PDSP.006.006 | Natural England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the overall approach to the sub-area in Policy SA5 and in particular the support given to the re-opening of the Barrow Hill Line to passengers. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.013.003 | North East Derbyshire District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Under ‘support for re-opening the Barrow Hill Line’ reference should be made to Killamarsh in the list of stations, as the station site is expected to be within the SCC boundary. | Agree that an amendment be made to include Killamarsh in the list of stations in policy SA5 part g. | Yes | PDSP.015.004 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is a greenfield site in the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. | No | PDSP.016.007 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use. | See response to comment PDSP.016.007 | No | PDSP.016.008 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | The Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need. Seeks the allocation of land at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing. Also refers to sites SES10, SES11 and SES12 as presumably not being able to contribute towards supply. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. Starbuck Farm is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.009 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Consider that the amount of new homes proposed for the South East sub area is insufficient. | The Council considers that the amount of new housing allocations in the Southeast sub-area of the city is appropriate and justified and that there is no need to release further land for development in this sub-area. | No | PDSP.020.008 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Supports the ethos of this policy but notes that greenfield land that occupies a sustainable location should not be discounted. | Support noted. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Some greenfield land that is not in the Green Belt is proposed for development. | No | PDSP.025.001 | Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Would like further investigation of the traffic impact of the proposed industrial and travellers site prior to development taking place. | The principal roads and junctions near this site allocation have all been assessed as part of the strategic transport modelling work to support the Plan. It is important to note that this work focuses on finding ways to mitigate impacts created by the growth rates set out in the Plan itself, rather than seeking to resolve existing issues on the network.  In this context the relevant roads and junctions are not being flagged up as a major issue because the rate of change caused by the proposed developments is not significant. So, from a Local Plan point of view, there is not sufficient evidence to suggest there is a need to deliver mitigation with respect to transport impacts.  However, the modelling work does show that there are existing issues on the network in this area with respect to certain junctions operating 'over capacity'. Whilst it is not the role of the Local Plan to resolve existing problems, these matters do need to be reviewed and solutions put forward. As such, there is a commitment to review these matters as part of the updated Transport Strategy for the city, which is expected to be produced by mid-2024. | No | PDSP.033.001 | Ergo Real Estate |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA5 is that they are unviable and not deliverable and as such it would be unsound to include these sites within the plan. | The Council considers that all sites can be delivered and are therefore appropriately identified as housing site allocations in the Draft Plan. | No | PDSP.042.034 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Seeks the allocation of a large area of land ("Orgreave Park" to the east of Handsworth for employment (logistics) purposes. | The site is greenfield land within the Green Belt so its inclusion as a site allocation would not align with the Spatial Strategy. | No | PDSP.068.003 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | The Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics so further sites should be identified. Allocate Rula’s site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes. | The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the southeast of the city. Hesley Wood is not within the Southeast sub-area. However, the site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation. | No | PDSP.071.008 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. All sites have been assessed using the site selection methodology. The sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield are not in the Southeast Sub-Area and are greenfield sites in the Green Belt; allocation of the sites would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.007 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Object to the designation of SES03 as a traveller site. | The site selection process concludes that site SES03 is suitable for Industrial and Gypsy/Traveller uses as a result of the site selection methodology that was undertaken. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage which will address the planning related issues raised and outline mitigation and conditions on development if required. | No | PDSP.120.005 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Supports the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.120.006 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Supports the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.127.005 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Supports the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.196.001 | CATHY99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | If SES10 (Moor Valley) this land has to be developed, it should absolutely be a last resort, with all other sites developed first. We should be protecting green fields as much as possible from development and regenerating other brownfield areas first. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. However, not all the city’s development needs to 2039 can be met on brownfield sites. The allocation of this site indicates that it is suitable for housing as a result of the site selection methodology that was undertaken. | No | PDSP.202.001 | Claire Baker |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.203.001 | Clare 32 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.238.001 | Gordon22 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.246.001 | Howard61 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.254.001 | Jade |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.264.001 | jayetea |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support designation of Local Green Space at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.267.003 | Jill17 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.290.001 | Julieanne99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.291.001 | Karl99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.310.001 | Marco Conte |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.311.001 | Margaret52 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.320.001 | Mich |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.323.001 | Mick1956 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.326.001 | MORGAN99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.347.001 | philj715 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.353.001 | Ragione |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.362.001 | Robert21 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.370.001 | Sandra |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.371.001 | Sandra140923 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.396.001 | Summer99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.400.001 | Terry |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield | Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.410.001 | wendy21 |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | Support the site allocation at the former Norton Aerodrome subject to strengthening of the conditions on the development (as set out in Annex A of the Draft Plan), to more fully reflect the potential cross boundary impacts of the development, as well as the impact on the Conservation Area. | An additional condition has been proposed in response to comments from Historic England that requires consideration of the impact on a Heritage Asset. Following discussions through Duty to Cooperate with North East Derbyshire District Council, a Statement of Common Ground will be drafted that will clarify the limited impact that development of the former aerodrome site will have on adjacent areas of North East Derbyshire. | No | PDSP.013.004 | North East Derbyshire District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | The South Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need. Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use (this is in the Southeast sub area). | No change is needed. The Sheffield Plan has identified sufficient deliverable sites to meet the City's Housing needs within the Plan period and there is no local requirement to identify sites in the East area of the City. Starbuck Farm is not within the South sub-area and has not been included in the supply of sites to meet the City's Housing needs as it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.010 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | Objects to the exclusion of land at Hillfoot Road and Penny Lane, Totley as a site allocation (Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment site ref S03070). | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.062.001 | Mr Charles Rhodes and Star Pubs (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | The South Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. This Sub-Area does not include the provision of any employment land. Review the Spatial Strategy and identify sites to meet the need for Industrial and Logistics. Allocate Rula’s site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes. | The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the south of the City. Hesley Wood is not within the South Sheffield sub-area. The site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation. | No | PDSP.071.009 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | This Sub-Area includes 765 new homes. However, as highlighted earlier there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use. | No change needed.  The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery.  The sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield are not in the South Sub-Area and are greenfield sites in the Green Belt; allocation of the sites would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.008 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | The designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space is supported. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.120.007 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | The designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space is supported. The definitions box states that the definition of ‘Local Green Space’ can be found in the Glossary but it is actually missing from the glossary. | Notes and welcome the support. Agree that a definition of Local Green Space should be included in the Glossary. | Yes | PDSP.127.006 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | There is no mention of improving the active travel provision in terms of cycle parking in policy SA6 except where there is a "development". The comments relate to Woodseats. If there was cycle parking more people might be prepared to ride, so reducing the congestion. For all the people who are walking, there is a lot that could be done to improve the street. A few trees would make a lot of difference. A couple of parklets in place of a few parking spaces would make a huge difference to the feel of the area. A few park benches would mean that elderly people, or anyone struggling, could sit down part way along the street for a rest. | Whilst policy CO1 supports the delivery of active travel infrastructure associated with new development, Policy T1 supports the broader delivery of active travel infrastructure across the city, aligned with the priorities set out in the Transport Strategies of both Sheffield City Council and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority. Policy DE3 sets out requirements for design of the public realm and landscape design. Policy DE4 sets out requirements for the design of streets, roads and parking. Policy GS7 requires developers to provide street trees. | No | PDSP.170.001 | AlisonRx |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | Supports the designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.175.001 | Andrew Rixham |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | The designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space is supported. There should however be reference to the other greenspaces in this area as follows: "Create, protect and enhance accessible green spaces and recreational opportunities to support biodiversity net gain, connect natural habitats and develop ecological stepping stones". | Support for Bolehill Wood Local Greenspace designation noted and welcomed. Creation of greenspace and support for biodiversity is covered in other citywide policies, such as BG1 in the Part 1 document and in Part 2 – polices NC15, GS5-GS7. A number of amendments to policy BG1 are proposed to highlight the importance of extending the network of blue and green infrastructure. | No | PDSP.205.002 | ClareW |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | Object to the proposed Local Green Space designation of land at Bolehill Wood. | The land is considered to meet the criteria set out in the NPPF for the designation of this land as a Local Green Space. It is an important and valued greenspace which is also a Local Wildlife Site and merits the Local Green Space protection. | No | PDSP.217.001 | Deborah and Bob Anderson |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Sheffield’s Sub-Area Strategy | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | Support for Local Greenspace designation for Bolehill Woods. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.221.001 | ds\_77 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | Supports designation of Local Green Spaces at Bole Hill Woods. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.267.004 | Jill17 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA6: South Sheffield | Supports the designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space. | Note and welcome the support. | No | PDSP.342.001 | Penny Dembo |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | The Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need. Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Starbuck Farm is not in the South Sub-Area and is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.011 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | Additional text should be added to paragraph 4.72 relating to Dore. The Mass Transit Corridor should be referred to in paragraph 4.74. 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. | No changes required. A Mass Transit Corridor from part of the City Centre to the Southwest is already referred to in policy SA7. Paragraph 4.72 refers to the extensive areas of countryside send Green Belt in the sub-area and any development proposals must take these into account, as appropriate. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.027.003 | Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | Part a) of the policy states that approximately 755 new homes will be delivered in the Southwest Sheffield Sub Area. The allocations detailed in Appendix 1 provide a capacity of 701, it is not clear where the remaining 54 (to total 755) are derived. The capacity led approach results in limited growth in this sustainable area of the city which benefits from a railway station, park and ride and existing and proposed cycle routes to the city centre. Part b) of the Policy refers to a housing requirement figure of at least 40 homes in Dore Neighbourhood Plan. The policy includes a footnote advising that the figure of 40 include 14 homes on large sites and 26 homes with existing planning permission on small sites. The requirement figure of ‘at least 10’ homes is considered vague and open to interpretation and a more robust figure and allocation should be provided to ensure delivery. | The Council considers that the amount of new housing allocations in the Southwest sub-area of the city is appropriate and justified and that there is no need to release further land for development in the Dore area.  Sites which are under construction (but where completions have not been accounted for) have not been included in Appendix 1 as proposed site allocations.  Windfalls will continue to provide additional supply in the Dore Neighbourhood Plan. The figure of 40 homes reflects known commitments and is therefore a minimum figure. | No | PDSP.046.007 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | The plan should include site reference S02442 (in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)) as a housing allocation within the southwest Sheffield sub-area. The plan should make it clear the site is capable of delivering approximately 75 dwellings within 0-5 years of the plan being adopted. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Site S02442 is a greenfield site in the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances do not exist to alter the Green Belt boundary. | No | PDSP.049.002 | Jonathan Harrison (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | Land at Little London Road should be allocated for housing under policy SA7. Policy EC3 should be more flexible and not prohibit residential development. | The site in question is separated from the nearby residential uses by the River Sheaf and is accessed through the existing business park. The site is clearly more suited to employment uses and the introduction of residential use on this site would create significant restrictions on the operation of the existing businesses. Given this, a General Employment Zone that excludes housing is appropriate. | No | PDSP.050.001 | Laver Regeneration (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | Suggests redesignation of Queens Road Retail Park as a District Centre given the range of offer and the comparable approach that the local planning authority has taken to Heeley Retail Park. If anything, Queens Road Retail Park fulfils a District Centre style offer better than Heeley Retail Park. | Heeley Retail Park is part of a wider area that includes smaller shops and is therefore appropriately allocated as a District Centre. The Queens Road Retail Park is a stand-alone retail park divorced from other shops and uses that a District Centre contains and is therefore designated as a Flexible Use Zone rather than a District Centre. | No | PDSP.070.002 | Orchard Street Investment Management (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | The Southwest Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. Review the Spatial Strategy and identify sites to meet the need for Industrial and Logistics. Allocate Rula’s site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes. | The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the southwest of the City. Hesley Wood is not within the Southwest sub-area. The site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation. | No | PDSP.071.010 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | This Sub-Area includes 755 new homes. However, as highlighted earlier there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. The sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield are not in the South Sub-Area and are greenfield sites in the Green Belt; allocation of the sites would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.009 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | Suggest several amendments/points of clarification relating to policy SA7 as it pertains to Dore:   * omission of a statement regarding protection of the Green Belt boundary (and infill on Long Line) * lacking a description of the Residential Zones, Local Centre, Conservation Area, Ecclesall Woods Local Nature Reserve/Local Wildlife Site * conflict in terminology – ‘Residential Zones’ and ‘Urban Areas’ * 40 homes housing requirement for Dore Neighbourhood Plan area (are these additional to those that have planning permission?) | No changes needed. The reference to Green Belt boundaries in SA6 is to provide clarity around boundaries that will remain unchanged when SS17 Norton Aerodrome is removed from the Green Belt. No other sub-area policies specifically mention protection of Green Belt boundaries as that is implicit in policies in Part 2. The potential for infill at Long Line does not represent Green Belt release and therefore does not specifically require stating in SA6 as it is covered within GS2; SA7 is consistent with other Sub-area policies in not listing all Local Centres separately and the Policies Map identifies the features referenced; the ‘urban area’ refers to those areas of the city that are not within the Green Belt (see Glossary) and within the urban area are many different policy zones including residential zones; the figure of 40 homes for Dore includes those within the Neighbourhood Plan area that have planning permission (this is already explained in footnote 24). It is a gross figure and also allows for the fact that windfall sites may come forward during the Plan period. | No | PDSP.102.007 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | Designation of Sheffield Hallam University’s Collegiate Crescent as student accommodation is incompatible with the Conservation Area. The Campus is currently a teaching campus. Redesignation to allow Purpose Built Student Accommodation would impact the conservation area. | No change needed. The impacts of any future Purpose-Built Student Accommodation scheme would assessed against the proposed development management policies within the Plan. It is considered that these policies will provide sufficient protection/consideration of the Conservation Area and adjacent Urban Green Space Zone designations. | No | PDSP.106.001 | Groves Community Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | No information was submitted with this representation. | Noted - no comment made. | No | PDSP.109.001 | Hallam Cricket Club |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | POLICY SA7: The “h” of Broomhill is missing in the 2nd. Line and in e). | Agree to amend the typing errors. | Yes | PDSP.140.006 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | The plan aims to improve active travel but does not go far enough in this important area. It is important in this area of Sheffield to create active travel routes (walking and cycling) between the universities and the areas where most students live. | Whilst policy CO1 supports the delivery of active travel infrastructure associated with new development, Policy T1 supports the broader delivery of active travel infrastructure across the city, aligned with the priorities set out in the Transport Strategies of both Sheffield City Council and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority. | No | PDSP.170.002 | AlisonRx |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield | The aims of the plan in section e) "Support the vitality and vibrancy of the District Centres at Banner Cross, Broomhill, Ecclesall Road, and London Road, and Local Centres" are completely at odds with the aims set out in Enabling Sustainable Travel point 5.10. As the owner of numerous commercial premises in these areas, the Plan is unable to achieve its aims in section e) if its Travel policy is enacted. | No change needed. It is not agreed that the two aims are incompatible. Enhancing sustainable transport connectivity to support modal shift, can improve the attractiveness and inclusiveness of the environment, enabling more people to access services in their local or district centre. The Plan includes policies, including SP1 and T1, which support multimodal transport improvements to enhance connectivity, and create an effective, sustainable transport network. | No | PDSP.317.001 | MattE |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area | Map 12: Southwest Sub-Area | Notes policy accords with Dore Neighbourhood Plan. | No change needed. | No | PDSP.102.006 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area |  | Suggest designation of a site at Spider Park (Fulwood / Lodge Moor area) as a Local Green Space. | Acknowledge the request for this land to be designated as a Local Green Space but the land is currently designated as Green Belt. | No | PDSP.111.001 | HCYA (Hallam Community & Youth Association) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area |  | Regarding the Former Dyson Refractories, Baslow Road site - Although a brownfield site this is not suitable for housing and the plan should identify what is and is not an appropriate land use here. An hotel or outdoor leisure use if well designed may be suitable. | The land is appropriately designated as Green Belt; should any development proposals come forward for this site, they will be assessed against Green Belt policy and other relevant planning policy. | No | PDSP.116.028 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | Suggest strengthening the recognition of population's health as a contributing factor to economic prosperity. Recognise diversity as a positive factor also that should be encouraged. | Accept proposed suggestion – amend the first objective under ‘Objectives for a fair, inclusive and healthy city’. | Yes | PDSP.015.001 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge  /Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | The Stocksbridge/ Deepcar Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, we propose the Council Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in the Stocksbridge/Deepcar sub-area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.012 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in policy SA8 as being unviable. While each site will have its own circumstances, the council will need to demonstrate they are deliverable within the plan period for these allocations to be sound and included within the plan. At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA8 is that they are unviable and not deliverable. As such it would be unsound to include these site allocations within the plan. | No change needed. While the Whole Plan Viability Assessment may indicate sites in certain locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocations are viable and deliverable. | No | PDSP.042.035 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge  /Deepcar | The Stocksbridge Deepcar Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. The Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in the Stocksbridge/ Deepcar Sub-Area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.071.011 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | There are details missing from Map 13, page 82 of Part 1, that do not reflect policy SA8. Policy SA8 sets out in Part b) that it is required to ‘deliver site Allocations SD01 to SD13 – including strategic sites: SD02, SD03 and SD05’. Map 13 shows Sites SD03 and SD05 as a Housing sites only, when they should be shown as Strategic Housing Sites to reflect the policy. | Agreed. The errors found on Map 13 will be corrected. And Policy SA8 should be amended to correspond with the amended Map 13. | Yes | PDSP.077.001 | Speciality Steel UK (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.010 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | Repeats comment PDSP.079.010 | See response to PDSP.079.010 | No | PDSP.079.011 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | The Stocksbridge/ Deepcar Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA8 includes 1,070 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To overcome the objection and address soundness matters, the following changes are proposed: Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.012 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/Deepcar Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations are very effective. | Support for Policy SA8 is welcomed. | No | PDSP.216.001 | Deborah |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar  Sub-Area | Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/  Deepcar | It is unacceptable to increase the population of Stocksbridge/ Deepcar by approximately 25% (proportionally more than other parts of Sheffield) without providing assurance of improved public transport. | No change needed. Policy SA8 sets out the delivery of sustainable transport improvements and creates a Mass Transit Corridor from the City Centre to the Upper Don Valley. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides more information on transport infrastructure projects that are needed to support the growth proposed in the Plan. Additional references to the potential reopening of the Upper Don Valley passenger railway line have been proposed as amendments to the Plan. | No | PDSP.366.003 | Ruth Morgan |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | The Chapeltown/ High Green Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy only allocates land for 25 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. We propose the Council update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan and allocates the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.013 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | The identification of Chapeltown/High Green as a Principal Town is supported. But the lack of allocations (25 dwellings) means that the localised need for this Sub Area is not being met and harms its ability to carry out its function as a Principal Town. The policy states that 145 dwellings will be delivered in total in the Ecclesfield Neighbourhood Plan Area made up of small windfall sites and large sites with planning permission. There is no discussion of the deliverability of the small sites or whether there are enough to meet local needs. It is suggested that further allocations need to be made in the area. The lack of housing delivery will have serious consequences for affordable housing delivery. Draft Policy identifies 10% of all homes on qualifying sites will be affordable. The majority of new homes delivered will be on small sites (145 dwellings) which are unlikely to provide any affordable housing. If the new homes (25 dwellings) delivered on large sites are policy compliant, a maximum of 3 affordable homes will be delivered. This could be easily rectified by taking a more balanced approach to the Green Belt in the sub-area. The lack of opportunities on non-Green Belt sites in the area means that there's inability to provide access to sufficient appropriate accommodation, including affordable housing in the sub area. It is considered that this, and the identification of Chapeltown/High Green as a Principal Town provides the exceptional circumstances required to release further Green Belt sites in this location. Land at Springwood Lane, High Green sits within parcel CN-2 of the Council’s ‘Green Belt Review’. The Green Belt Review identifies parcel CN2 as the lowest scoring of all Green Belt parcels in Chapeltown North. However, our evidence suggests that the site would have limited impact and would provide a clear defensible boundary to stop any encroachment into the countryside. This site is the most credible option for a new site allocation within the Chapeltown/High Green area. Delivery of the site would enable the provision of a mix of house types and tenures and would contribute to meeting the needs within the area. | No change needed. Support for recognition of Chapeltown High Green's status as a Principal Town is welcomed. The housing requirement is calculated on a city wide basis taking into account the number of homes needed to support the city’s jobs growth target in the Strategic Economic Plan. Sufficient deliverable sites have been allocated to meet that requirement. Applying the spatial strategy to Chapeltown/High Green sub area where there are fewer development opportunities available in than in other sub areas, has resulted in a low number of homes being delivered under the policy. However, the spatial strategy utilises the land available across the city taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The deliverability of individual sites is evidenced in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment. | No | PDSP.019.007 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | Chapeltown/High Green is correctly identified as a Principal Town within the Sheffield Plan settlement hierarchy. It is important that developments are provided within this locality to meet the demands of the growing population. Whilst an emphasis upon urban and brownfield sites is considered acceptable the lack of alternative sites within High Green means that greenfield sites adjacent to the existing development boundary should also be considered. The proposed site at Springwood Lane provides logical development site that would assist in meeting the housing needs not only of High Green but also of the wider area, including much needed affordable housing. The parcel is self-contained and would provide a strong new defensible edge to the Green Belt in this location. The site is in a sustainable location close to services and facilities and within easy reach of public transport opportunities and will promote walking and cycling. The development would respect and complement both the landscape setting and the informal woodland setting of Spring Wood, whilst strengthening the physical connection and visual relationship between both. Suggests allocation of the site at Springwood Lane, High Green. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Therefore, exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify removing the Springwood Lane Site from the Green Belt and allocating it for residential development. | No | PDSP.019.008 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | In the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Chapeltown is noted as having an under-supply of smaller and larger properties to meet a variety of needs. The lack of new housing in Chapeltown due to a tight Green Belt boundary is exacerbating these issues and further supports the need for Green Belt release in sustainable locations near key transport hubs, such as within 1.2km of train stations. Chapeltown is located on a key transport corridor, has a train station and is one of three ‘Principal Towns’ in the Sheffield settlement hierarchy. It is, therefore, a sustainable settlement capable of accommodating a larger portion of growth. This alternative spatial approach also supports the Sheffield Plan aims.  The allocation of the Warren Lane site to meet both housing and employment needs in a sustainable location. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify removing land at Warren Lane from the Green Belt and allocating it for residential development. | No | PDSP.034.007 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | The Chapeltown/ High Green Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy only allocates land for 25 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site. | No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area, and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.071.012 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | Allocate the site at Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify removing the land at Whitley Lane from the Green Belt and allocating it for residential development. | No | PDSP.079.013 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | Allocate the site at Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Whitley Lane is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.014 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | The Chapeltown/ High Green Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA9 includes 25 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, Strata Homes propose the Council Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Townend Lane is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.079.015 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | Policy SA9 Chapeltown/High Green is legally compliant, meets the duty to co-operate and is Sound. | Support for policy SA9 is welcomed. | No | PDSP.090.001 | Visionary Planning UK |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | Supports protection of Smithy Wood from development. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.267.005 | Jill17 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 4: Chapeltown/  High Green  Sub-Area | Policy SA9: Chapeltown/  High Green | The Council has moved from the 40,000 homes at Reg 18 and the 53500 suggested by the Government (which was rejected) to 35,700, which is a decision driven by political gain rather than doing what is required to help tackle the housing crisis. We therefore passionately believe this makes the plan ‘unsound’. We agree Sheffield City centre should be significantly developed to meet the growing housing and employment needs for the city. However, we also believe the Plan doesn’t deliver enough homes in the fringes of Sheffield and more should be done in these areas. Chapeltown/High Green should be targeting significantly more housing. It is a popular place to live, has good transport connections and is a key employment contributor/business growth area in the City, which adds to the demand for new housing. Only 25 new homes are proposed there. If the appropriate number of brownfield sites cannot be provided, then less sensitive Green Belt sites should be brought forward by realigning the Green Belt boundary in these areas. A site in Grenoside, Sheffield (S35 8QJ) has potential for a residential or senior living development and should be allocated. The site has capacity for up to 80 dwellings (35 units per hectare), with generous amenity and public open space provided. We also propose to enhance the Whitley Lane Road, to make it safer for road and pedestrian users. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Grenoside is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.403.001 | Tom Rusby |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Specific comments within this section relate to BG1 Blue and Green Infrastructure and IN1 Infrastructure provision. Detail is provided in other comments. | No change needed. Comments on BG1 Blue and Green Infrastructure and IN1 Infrastructure Provision are dealt with under comment references PDSP.002.004 and PDSP.002.005 respectively. There are no general comments on chapter 5. | No | PDSP.002.003 | Environment Agency |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Support the policy approach. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.007.005 | Sport England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Identify proposed Killamarsh station. | Policy T1 will be amended to add Killamarsh to the new stations list. | Yes | PDSP.015.005 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | There is not enough transparent evidence to demonstrate housing supply. Requirements in the LP will mean a housing market that is not affordable or meets the needs of the population. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.046.008 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | There is inconsistency of figures in housing supply tables 1 and 2. | Acknowledge that housing capacity figures should be consistent throughout the document. A schedule will be produced to highlight any changes arising in site and overall capacity. This will also take account of new planning permissions during 2022/23. | Yes | PDSP.102.008 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Welcome reference to Pathways to Net Zero report. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.140.007 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Comment supports commitment to prioritise sustainable travel methods. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.140.008 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Supportive of proposed future railway provision. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.140.009 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Welcomes mention of cargo bikes and consolidation hubs. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.140.010 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | There is a welcome reference to the expectation of improved viability of development sites over time. Such opportunity should be taken to require higher carbon reduction and affordable homes standards. | Comment noted. | No | PDSP.140.011 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Welcome reference to South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority’s transport role and also to Gear Change and the National Bus Strategy. It would be appropriate to mention here the Council’s support for SYMCA’s exploratory work regarding franchising of buses. | Support noted. It is unnecessary to refer to bus franchising as it is not directly related to planning decisions on development. However, we recognise the potential for public transport services to be improved as a result of franchising. | No | PDSP.140.012 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | The Nature Recovery Network plans must be included as an enforceable part of planning as soon as they are available. Suggest amending GS6 to increase the width of buffer zones to rivers & streams to 20 metres and address the need for vegetation along city's watercourses to be protected and enhanced. | Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed so it is too early to incorporate it in the draft Plan. We aim to include it when complete in an SPD and/or in the plan at next review stage. The Environment Agency set outs the following buffer distances required for watercourses: (a) at least 10 metres for rivers and streams and (b) a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is) | No | PDSP.188.002 | Boo |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Public transport provision improvements are needed, particularly in relation to bus access into the heart of the City Centre. | No change needed. As part of the Connecting Sheffield City Centre scheme, Sheffield City Council have made the decision to maintain the closure of Pinstone Street. The Sheffield Connect city centre shuttle service now provides an accessible link around in and around the city centre | No | PDSP.336.001 | Patricia Dawson-Butterworth |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Extend text to reflect the importance of sustainable travel including e-bikes. | Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. | Yes | PDSP.356.001 | Richard Attwood |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | This repeats comment PDSP.356.001. | See response to comment PDSP.036.001 | Yes | PDSP.356.002 | Richard Attwood |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Suggest amending GS6 to increase width of buffer zones to rivers & streams to 20 metres and address the need for vegetation along city's watercourses to be restored. | The Environment Agency set outs the following buffer distances required for watercourses: (a). at least 10 metres for rivers and streams and (b) a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is) | No | PDSP.375.003 | Sean\_Ashton |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | BG1 - Suggest amending BG1 to give greater ambition to meeting Natural England's national Accessible Natural Green Space standards, while also ensuring access doesn't unduly impact on biodiversity. See Response Modification. | Agree – the aim is to incorporate Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' to help strengthen policy. | Yes | PDSP.375.004 | Sean\_Ashton |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Add new ambitions to grow green spaces and natural networks within the City. Suggests a new policy to achieve nature recovery. | Agree. Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Policy BG1 should provide better sign-posting to relevant policies in Part 2 of the Plan. | Yes | PDSP.375.005 | Sean\_Ashton |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Spatial strategy will not meet housing need. Insufficient evidence to support windfall allowance. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need. | No change needed. Proposed site would not be consistent with the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.016.014 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Viability concerns on brownfield sites. Inadequate evidence base for windfall assumptions And for broad locations for growth. Distribution of supply too low in relation to needs identified in the SHMA. Uneven distribution of supply disadvantages Chapeltown/High Green. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.019.009 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Undeliverable approach due to viability concerns. Delivery of most new homes in areas where affordable housing is unviable. Supply reliant on windfalls and broad locations for growth. Uneven distribution of homes will impact types delivered. Propose Green Belt release to meet the housing needs of Chapeltown/High Green. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.019.010 | Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Target for 85% brownfield delivery is not evidenced as deliverable. Uncertainty about delivery of sites in broad locations for growth which shouldn’t be included within supply. Consider Green Belt release. Windfall allowance is too high. | No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. | No | PDSP.020.009 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Target for 85% brownfield delivery is not evidenced as deliverable. Uncertainty about delivery of sites in broad locations for growth which shouldn’t be included within supply. Consider Green Belt release. Windfall allowance is too high. | No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery, including on windfall sites. The brownfield target reflects the capacity of deliverable and developable sites. | No | PDSP.020.010 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Target for delivery of new homes on brownfield land is restrictive and difficult to monitor. Implies housing growth will be delivered only through existing planning permission. | No change needed. Take up of previously developed land is consistently monitored, and the policy clearly allows for windfall development to come forward. | No | PDSP.025.002 | Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Uneven distribution of housing development. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Provide a greater proportion of new homes outside the City Centre. Concern about the viability and deliverability of sites in the City Centre and in broad locations for growth. Impact of spatial strategy on infrastructure delivery. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.027.004 | Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Central area capacity is over ambitious, and many sites will not be deliverable. Unlikely to be enough deliverable sites to sustain the required level of delivery in the Central Area. There are exceptional circumstances to meet housing need, including family housing. | No change needed. Capacity is led by the spatial strategy and by robust analysis carried out to support the City Centre Vision. Site selection takes account of site constraints. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment takes account of likely complexity of delivery in estimating when a site is likely to be delivered. Sheffield’s housing market extends into neighbouring districts where a greater proportion of new homes are likely to be homes suitable for families. | No | PDSP.034.008 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Strong demand and preference for larger homes and houses with gardens rather than apartments. Spatial strategy focussing on the Central Area does not balance housing demand with delivery. | No change needed. Masterplanning work being undertaken to ensure opportunities taken to diversify the range of housing delivered where possible. | No | PDSP.034.009 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Most allocations will be unviable based on the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No change needed. No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.035.002 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Cost of redeveloping brownfield sites will impact on viability and reduce affordable housing delivery. Allocation of greenfield sites would contribute to delivering more affordable homes. | No change needed. Allocated sites reflect the spatial strategy. Acknowledge the likely impact on affordable housing delivery but not all affordable homes will be provided through S106 agreements. | No | PDSP.037.002 | Gladman Developments Ltd |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Target for 85% brownfield delivery is not evidenced as deliverable. Uncertainty about delivery of sites in broad locations for growth which shouldn’t be included within supply. Propose Green Belt release. | No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. Green Belt release would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy. The brownfield target reflects the capacity of deliverable and developable sites. | No | PDSP.040.004 | Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | No sites are allocated for specialist older people’s housing. The scale of need for older people's accommodation should be identified in the Plan. | No change needed. The need for older people's accommodation is citywide and does not need to be addressed spatially in policy H1. | No | PDSP.042.036 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Focus on previously developed land will be unviable and will not deliver sufficient affordable housing. Focus on previously developed land concentrates development in certain locations and will not deliver a mix of housing types. Propose alternative sustainable greenfield sites in the Green Belt. | No change needed. The allocated sites reflect the spatial strategy. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.042.037 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Broad locations for growth should be removed from the supply– insufficient evidence of deliverability. Recent high levels of windfalls incorporate high levels of student housing that won’t continue. | No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for the level of capacity likely to come forward in broad locations for growth. | No | PDSP.042.038 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | No sites are allocated for specialist older people’s housing. The scale of need for older people's accommodation should be identified in the Plan. | No change needed. The need for older people's accommodation is citywide and does not need to be addressed spatially in policy H1. | No | PDSP.042.039 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | The policy approach will not create a housing market in line with the Plan’s aims and objectives to provide quality, choice and affordability. Deliverability not demonstrated. Broad locations for growth – insufficient evidence that they are developable. Distribution of housing sites by sub area will result in an unsustainable pattern of development that doesn’t meet identified housing needs. Propose Green Belt release to meet housing needs. Not all sites with planning permission will be delivered – no lapse rate assumed. Site allocations with permission are not all deliverable and some have lapsed. Site allocations with existing uses may not be available. | No change needed. Distribution of site allocations reflects the spatial strategy. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and Site Selection Methodology set out the evidence base for inclusion of sites. | No | PDSP.046.009 | Hft (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Central Area capacity is over ambitious and many sites will not be deliverable. Unlikely to be enough deliverable sites to sustain the required level of delivery in the Central Area. There are exceptional circumstances to meet housing need, including family housing. | No change needed. Capacity is led by the spatial strategy. Site selection takes account of site constraints, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment takes account of likely complexity of delivery. | No | PDSP.054.004 | Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Terminology should reflect provision of all types of housing for older people. | Accept – an amendment to part (g) is proposed. | Yes | PDSP.056.003 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Central Area capacity is over ambitious and many sites will not be deliverable. Unlikely to be enough deliverable sites to sustain the required level of delivery in the Central Area. There are exceptional circumstances to meet housing need, including family housing. | No change needed. Capacity is led by the spatial strategy. Site selection takes account of site constraints, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment takes account of likely complexity of delivery. | No | PDSP.067.005 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Prioritising delivery of new homes on previously developed land risks loss of employment land and the impact has not been properly considered. Housing requirement falls below the standard method figure. Release land from the Green Belt at Orgreave for employment to enable further employment land to be developed for residential. | No change needed. the proposed allocation would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment takes considers both employment and residential sites and there is no double counting. Sites proposed for allocation for employment uses would not be expected to come forward as housing sites. Loss of current employment land for new homes is taken into account within the Employment Land Review in relation to 'churn' within the market. | No | PDSP.068.004 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Spatial strategy will not meet housing need. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need. | No change needed. Proposed site would not be consistent with the spatial strategy. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify the release of greenfield sites in the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.079.016 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | No alternative site identified for New Age Travellers currently living at Club Mill Road. | No change needed. Acknowledge the need for alternative accommodation for the New Age Travellers, however the need does not fall within the planning definition of travellers and there is uncertainty over the level of need and specific locational requirements for this group which has evolved over time. Policy NC7 provides a criteria-based approach for determining future planning applications for traveller sites including New Age Traveller provision. | No | PDSP.105.002 | Friends of Wardsend Cemetery |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Delivery of affordable housing - additional sites should be allocated to deliver on affordable housing need. Over reliance on windfall sites. | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment provides evidence on the supply from windfall sites. | No | PDSP.112.003 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Need for alternative New Age Traveller provision to better meet needs and open up the Upper Don Trail for walking and cycling. | No change needed. Acknowledge the need for alternative accommodation for the New Age Travellers, however the need does not fall within the planning definition of travellers and there is uncertainty over the level of need and specific locational requirements for this group which has evolved over time. Policy NC7 provides a criteria-based approach for determining future planning applications for traveller sites including New Age Traveller provision. | No | PDSP.151.002 | Upper Don Trail Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing | Support the policy approach to setting a target for 85% of homes to be delivered on previously developed land. | Support welcome. | No | PDSP.268.006 | Jim Bamford |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Concern about impact of transport proposals on historic assets. Requested involvement in development of proposals. | Transport schemes will be subject to public consultation as they are developed. Policies D1 and DE9 would be important considerations when considering transport schemes. | No | PDSP.003.019 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Need to understand the cross-boundary transport impacts particularly on the SRN (M1) and the A57. | Strategic transport modelling to establish the impacts of the proposed development on local and strategic networks, and identify mitigations, is ongoing. Discussions with neighbouring authorities are ongoing and the aim is to agree a Statement of Common Ground. | No | PDSP.009.005 | Bassetlaw District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Endorsement of Policy T1, particularly reference to reopening the Barrow Hill Railway Line to passengers and improved connectivity between Sheffield and Chesterfield/ North East Derbyshire. Mitigating traffic congestion along the route of the A61 is an important priority for Derbyshire County Council, which requires a joined up and coordinated approach between the County and City Councils. | Support noted and welcomed. Strategic transport modelling work has been presented to neighbouring Districts and we will continue to liaise with Derbyshire County Council where mitigations are deemed necessary. The aim is to agree a Statement of Common Ground. | No | PDSP.011.002 | Derbyshire County Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Collaboration required between Derbyshire County Council and Sheffield City Council to consider impact on the A61 as a priority route. | No change needed to the Plan. Transport modelling work has been presented to neighbouring Districts and we will continue to liaise with Derbyshire County Council where mitigations are necessary. | No | PDSP.011.004 | Derbyshire County Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Support for identification of the Barrow Hill line re-opening. | Support noted and welcomed | No | PDSP.013.005 | North East Derbyshire District Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | The lines are difficult to see on Map 15. | The colours of the routes on the maps will be reviewed | Yes | PDSP.014.010 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | The lines are difficult to see on Map 16. | The colours of the routes on the maps will be reviewed | Yes | PDSP.014.011 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | To ensure that development proposals have regard to any future versions of the transport strategy Policy T1 should be amended to also reference any subsequent replacement strategy. | Agreed that the additional wording suggested would provide flexibility for any future transport strategy updates to be taken account of. | Yes | PDSP.015.006 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Amend Policy T1 to support re-opening of both the Barrow Hill and Don Valley lines. | Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line. | Yes | PDSP.015.007 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Include greater reference to freight, including the rail freight terminal at Tinsley, delivery bays in city and district centres, overnight lorry parking on edges of the city. | Policy T1 encourages movement of freight by rail, and other sustainable modes at a national/ regional level. Paragraph 5.19 expresses support for local strategies such as E-Cargo bikes and consolidation hubs but is agreed this should be referenced more clearly in the policy wording and a new bullet is proposed to be added to the Local Level section of policy T1. Servicing requirements associated with new development are included in relation to 'operational' parking in Annex B Parking Guidelines. | Yes | PDSP.015.008 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Add explanation of the Enhanced Bus Partnership Plan in paragraphs 5.10-5.18. | Support for the Enhanced Partnership is stated in the City-Region level part of policy T1. It is agreed that explanatory reference should be included in the introductory paragraphs 5.10-5.18. | Yes | PDSP.015.009 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Extend the Mass Transit corridors (A625 and A621) identified in the Local Plan to serve areas SW of Sheffield. | No change is proposed as the Mass Transit Corridors have been identified as part of The Sheffield Transport Strategy and the Local Plan does not propose any changes to those. The extent of any schemes promoted along those corridors will be based upon further analysis of need at the time of scheme development. | No | PDSP.027.005 | Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Extend the Mass Transit corridors (A625 and A621) identified in the Local Plan to serve areas SW of Sheffield. | No change is proposed as the Mass Transit corridors have been identified as part of The Sheffield Transport Strategy and the Local Plan does not propose any changes to those. The extent of any schemes promoted along those corridors will be based upon further analysis of need at the time of scheme development. | No | PDSP.027.006 | Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Strongly supports the proactive approach in Policy T1. | Support noted and welcomed | No | PDSP.068.005 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Some areas are becoming less suitable for older people to live in due to deteriorating bus services. Extend and improve the Tram system. e.g. to hospitals. concern about impact of the Clean Air Zone on public transport and taxis access to city centre. | Policy T1 provides support for the delivery of improvements to bus services through the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership and the projects associated with the Mass Transit corridors. It also supports the need to secure the future of the tram and expansion in future where viable. As part of the introduction of the Clean Air Zone we have also launched a range of Financial Support Scheme and also a range of exemptions to support people that are driving older more polluting vehicles, and as a result would face a daily charge for entering the CAZ. The response to our Financial Support Scheme has been very positive and a significant number of taxi drivers have applied for assistance. At present around 300 of the nearly 400 buses serving Sheffield are compliant with the engine emissions standards and the remaining non-compliant buses are in the process of confirming their approach to upgrading vehicles and are not facing daily charges. We therefore consider that the CAZ will drive a significant improvement in the fleet serving Sheffield and improve air quality as a result, and we are not seeing any adverse effect on mobility across the city. | No | PDSP.094.001 | Age UK Sheffield/Sheffield 50+ |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Support for T1. Does not go far enough in creating a fully comprehensive network of joined up and safe active travel routes. Needs to address better public transport between Sheffield and Peak District. Need citywide plan for electric vehicle charging and cycle parking. | Support for policy T1 is welcomed. No change is proposed. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and SYMCA Active Travel Implementation Plan. The transport policies in the Plan set out the priorities for an effective transport network and seek to improve connectivity at national, regional and local levels. Local Plan Policy CO2 (e) supports the inclusion of re-charging infrastructure, in accordance with the provisions set out in the Parking Guidelines, however the strategy for electric vehicle charging is outside of the Local Plan. South Yorkshire’s Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy once developed will sit under the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority. | No | PDSP.099.004 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Object to the need to deliver improved trans-Pennine road links as this would encourage more traffic across the Peak District. Strongly supports the delivery of vital east-west rail links and the Midland Mainline Electrification Programme. | An amendment will be made to reflect the high-level support for trans Pennine connectivity as set out in the Sheffield Transport Strategy. | No | PDSP.140.013 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Support for policy T1. The policy should include reference to support for the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority’s (SYMCA) investigation of franchising. | Support is noted and welcomed. SYMCA are currently undertaking a formal assessment of bus franchising and until the outcome of that work is known it isn't appropriate to reference this in the Local Plan. However, Policy T1 specifically refers to supporting the objectives of the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership which is in place for 3-5 years whilst the assessment work continues. | No | PDSP.140.014 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Local Plan policies should support safe equestrian access to future development. Use CIL funding to improve the off-road network for higher status users of the PROW and facilities such as a community horse arena. | No change proposed as Policies C01 and DE4 provide principles for safe, inclusive access, however specific access requirements will be considered at the planning application stage. The policies proposed in the Plan provide an appropriate framework for considering planning applications for facilities such as horse arenas. | No | PDSP.146.001 | The British Horse Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes. | Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. | Yes | PDSP.153.001 | Councillor Douglas Johnson |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes. | Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. | Yes | PDSP.155.001 | Councillor Ruth Mersereau |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes. | Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. | Yes | PDSP.156.001 | Councillor Tom Hunt |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Include a statement that the built environment in redevelopment plans will be shaped to be more friendly to pedestrians and public transport. Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes. Extend the tram to Northern General Hospital. Install a segregated cycle route from the city centre to the Northern General Hospital. | Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. Policy CO1 makes provision for ensuring that development proposals maximise access by walking, cycling and public transport, with design requirements being set in policy DE4. In relation to specific cycle routes, Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield transport strategy and SYMCA active travel implementation plan. Regarding the tram system, Policy T1 supports the need to secure the future of the tram and expansion in future where viable. | Yes | PDSP.160.001 | Sheffield Green Party |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Better bus access to hospitals is needed. Greystones needs better bus services. Better access to disabled parking on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road is needed. | No change proposed. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for an effective transport network and seeks to improve connectivity at national, regional and local levels. This includes Mass Transit corridors which serve key areas of the city including the Northern General Hospital. Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road are identified as Mass Transit Corridors. The Parking Guidelines set out the requirements for disabled parking spaces in relation to new development. General on-street provision (not related to a new development) is not a matter for the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.190.001 | caro999 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Support for Policy T1 encouraging and enabling sustainable travel. | Support noted and welcomed | No | PDSP.191.004 | Carol Collins |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | The Sheffield Transport Strategy is out of date and should be reviewed. New houses require parking provision to serve the needs of residents and visitors. without it this will cause congestion. | No change proposed. Review of the Sheffield Transport Strategy is not a matter for the Local Plan. The parking standards have been developed to respond to the need to reduce reliance on the private car and increase sustainable trips, as well as responding to the Council’s declaration of a Climate Emergency and net zero ambitions. The Annex B: Parking Guidelines document confirms that car parking standards for all Use Classes are maximums. The exception is residential development outside the Central Area where an Expected standard is included to reduce the impact of overspill parking where necessary. Policy CO2 also provides criteria to allow provision below the expected level where appropriate. | No | PDSP.251.001 | Irene50+ |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Re-opening the rail line which runs from Stocksbridge would provide sustainable access to sites in the Upper Don Valley. | Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line. | Yes | PDSP.260.004 | Jan Symington |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Strongly supports Policy T1, paragraphs 5.10 to 5.18 Para 5.15 needs to be strengthened to secure upgrades to all lines to/from Sheffield, and reference re-opening of Barrow Hill and Deepcar lines. | Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line. | Yes | PDSP.268.007 | Jim Bamford |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Support for elements of T1. Strengthen the policy by referencing powers beyond the Enhanced Partnership e.g. referencing franchising. Strongly oppose supporting delivery of trans-Pennine road links. | Support noted and welcomed. An amendment is proposed to reflect the high-level support for trans Pennine connectivity as set out in the Sheffield Transport Strategy. The South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) is currently undertaking a formal assessment of bus franchising and until the outcome of that work is known it is not appropriate to reference this in the Local Plan. However, Policy T1 specifically refers to supporting the objectives of the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership which is in place for 3-5 years whilst the assessment work continues. | Yes | PDSP.268.008 | Jim Bamford |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Include reference to re-opening the Sheffield to Stocksbridge railway line and supporting tram extensions. | Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line. | Yes | PDSP.316.003 | maspiers |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Concerned about the proposed cycle route from Langsett Road to Crookes. | The cycle routes included on the Policies Map are existing cycle tracks, off road routes or quiet road routes. They are not proposed routes. This will be made clear on the Policies Map. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) Active Travel Implementation Plan. | Yes | PDSP.324.001 | Mike Briercliffe |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Need city wide, joined up, segregated cycle routes. Women in particular will not cycle regularly as a means of transport unless they feel safe. | Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield transport strategy and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) active travel implementation plan. | No | PDSP.350.002 | Polly Blacker |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Expand the introduction text to illustrate the equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes. | Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. | Yes | PDSP.355.001 | rich147 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes. | Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. | Yes | PDSP.356.003 | Richard Attwood |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Support for the Plan, including sustainable transport elements. Clarify if the Plan addresses the need to improve access and public transport to the two major hospitals in the city. | Support is noted and welcomed. The transport policies in the Plan such as Policy T1 set out the priorities for an effective transport network and seek to improve connectivity at national, regional and local levels. This includes Mass Transit corridors which serve key areas of the city including the Northern General Hospital, improved rail connections and railway re-opening to enhance regional accessibility, as well as securing the future of the tram. | No | PDSP.358.001 | Richard Worth |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Include a strategy for a comprehensive network of cycle paths, including routes connecting local and district centres. | No change proposed. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Active Travel Implementation Plan. | No | PDSP.408.001 | Trantion |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel | Reduce car ownership by increasing provision of car clubs. Add a requirement to provide car club spaces in or near district and local centres, and close to denser housing areas. | Policy CO2 encourages the provision of facilities for shared mobility, including parking for car club vehicles where appropriate. No further change is proposed. | No | PDSP.408.002 | Trantion |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | The general policy aim would help to ensure that consideration will be given to the protection and enhancement of Blue and Green Infrastructure in line with the wide aims of Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy should include reference to the Sheffield & Tinsley Canal. | Agree - a reference to the Sheffield and Tinsley Canal should be added. | Yes | PDSP.001.004 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Watercourses are not clearly represented in Map 17. Reference should be made to extending the network or improving connectivity which could be done through Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). A policy identifying the use of green spaces in the city for Natural Flood Management type measures could provide an important step to improve biodiversity and public involvement in strengthening blue green infrastructure. | Agree in part – given the scale of Map 17, it would only be practical to show Main Rivers and not all water courses. However, both Main Rivers and Ordinary watercourses should be shown on the Policies Map. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Areas Safeguarded for Flood Storage are already shown on the Policies Map and are referred to in Policy GS9(f); they form part of the network of blue and green infrastructure. | Yes | PDSP.002.004 | Environment Agency |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Welcome that the scope of the policy covers not only the protection of blue and green infrastructure but also protection of heritage assets. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.020 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy is supported but reference could be made to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework. | Support noted and welcomed. A reference to Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework should be added to the Policy. | Yes | PDSP.006.007 | Natural England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Broadly supports policy BG1 and acknowledges that playing fields form a valuable part of green infrastructure. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.007.006 | Sport England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | The use of pattern legends with similar colours is difficult to  read. | Agree. Adjustments should be made to the colours on Map 17 so that the different designations and Main Rivers are clearer | Yes | PDSP.014.012 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Consider policy to be sound. | Noted. | No | PDSP.086.004 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Support sustainable outdoor recreation opportunities but would welcome recognition in the Local Plan of the potential tensions between human activity and biodiversity. | Agree that the supporting text should clarify that biodiversity should usually take precedence where there is a conflict with recreational objectives. An amendment is proposed to paragraph 5.25. | Yes | PDSP.104.003 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Dams, goits and weirs provide essential habitat, including where they are no longer fully in water, and so these heritage assets should also be protected as part of the blue and green infrastructure. Registered parks and gardens are both designated heritage assets and green infrastructure so should be recognised as part of the Green Network. | A reference to historic parks and gardens should be added to Policy BG1. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries. This would therefore be an important consideration for development proposals within the river corridor. | Yes | PDSP.116.029 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Dams, goits and weirs provide essential habitat, including where they are no longer fully in water, and so these heritage assets should also be protected as part of the blue and green infrastructure. Registered parks and gardens are both designated heritage assets and green infrastructure so should be recognised as part of the Green Network. | Agree policy should be amended to highlight the heritage significance of blue and green infrastructure. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries. | Yes | PDSP.116.030 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | The draft Local Plan does not contain adequate policies for the sustainable development of local food infrastructure. | Agree in part. The plan protects allotments (Policy GS1) and gives significant weight to the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land (Policy GS4). However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1. | Yes | PDSP.121.013 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Repeats comment PDSP.121.013 | See response to comment PDSP.121.013 | Yes | PDSP.121.014 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Registered parks and gardens are both designated heritage assets and green infrastructure so should be recognised as part of the Green Network. | Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. However, agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Agree that the Policy should be clearer about protection of designated ecological and geological sites and provide a signpost to Part 2 policy GS5. | Yes | PDSP.122.003 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Map 17 does not show Blue & Green Infrastructure. | Map 17 already shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview, but the detail is provided on the Policies Map. Policies BG1, GS1, GS2, GS5, GS7 and GS8 provide appropriate levels of protection from development. However, agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.125.008 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps but these are not publicly available. There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. A reference to active travel routes along river banks should be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.  A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | Yes | PDSP.125.009 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | This Policy requires expansion to include a recognition of the heritage significance of blue/green infrastructure and the importance of protecting these. | Agree policy should be amended to highlight the heritage significance of blue and green infrastructure. | Yes | PDSP.125.010 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Policy should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure. | Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Agree that the Policy should be clearer about protection of designated ecological and geological sites and provide a signpost to Part 2 policies GS5 and GS6. | Yes | PDSP.127.007 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | There needs to be more emphasis on nature recovery and on extending the Green Network. Rewording of policy suggested. The definition of the ‘Green Network’ refers to Map 17 however Map 17 is not a Green Network map, it is simply a map of existing green spaces and ecologically designated sites. Rewording of Map 17 title suggested. Reference should be made to the Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. A reference to Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework should be added to the Policy and supporting text. | Yes | PDSP.131.002 | Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | The first sentence of Policy BG1 should be reworded to include reference to the 'urban forest'. | Whilst trees and woodland are an important part of the character of much of the urban area of Sheffield, the term 'urban forest' could be misunderstood by many people. Policy GS7 provides an appropriate framework for protecting trees, woodlands and hedgerows and promoting new tree planting. | No | PDSP.137.001 | Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Protection, management and enhancement of the blue and green infrastructure of the city will increase biodiversity and combat climate change. | Support welcomed and noted. | No | PDSP.140.015 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Plan should also acknowledge the role of other agencies and registered charities involved in work to extend the Green Network. The Plan should also adopt and commit to deliver Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Standards for England (2023). | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. A reference to the different agencies involved in delivering projects should be added to the supporting text to Policy BG1 (see amendment to paragraph 5.24). | Yes | PDSP.151.003 | Upper Don Trail Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to riverside access should be added to the supporting text of Policy BG1. Sub-Area policies SA1-SA8 should be amended to refer to extending and enhancing active travel routes along one bank of Main Rivers wherever practicable and where it is consistent with biodiversity and heritage objectives. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.177.002 | Andy Buck |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | BG1 says that greenspaces will be protected from inappropriate built development. The word 'inappropriate' is too vague. | Disagree. This is an overarching policy and needs to be read in conjunction with policies in Part 2 of the Plan which clarify what is meant by inappropriate development. | No | PDSP.190.002 | caro999 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Wholly supports the policy of protecting Sheffield’s Blue and Green Infrastructure. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.191.005 | Carol Collins |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Urban Green Space Zones, Green Belt and geological sites should be shown on Map 17 for clarity and to make absolutely clear that these are not for development. | Map 17 already shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview, but the detail is provided on the Policies Map. Policies BG1, GS1, GS2, GS5, GS7 and GS8 provide appropriate levels of protection from development. | No | PDSP.193.004 | Caroline Quincey |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Supportive of the green space designation of Bolehill Wood. Would like to see more mention and policy targets for urban food growing and sustainable food production. | Support for Bolehill Wood Local Green Space designation noted and welcomed. A reference to local food production will be added to the first sentence of Policy BG1. Add objective on sustainable local food production to the objectives on A Green City. | Yes | PDSP.198.001 | ChloeCheeseman |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Local Nature Recovery Network should be included as a supplement to the Plan. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the width of the buffer zones adjoining rivers and streams. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a). | Yes | PDSP.201.005 | Claire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy should encourage connection of green spaces where possible to create a real green network. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. | Yes | PDSP.205.003 | ClareW |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.220.002 | DJGShef |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.229.002 | Gaffer |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.232.002 | Gill |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.245.002 | Hilary |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Concerned about potential conflict in objectives of promoting public access to blue and green infrastructure and protecting and enhancing biodiversity. | Agree that the Policy should clarify that biodiversity should usually take precedence where there is a conflict with recreational objectives – see proposed amendment to paragraph 5.25. | Yes | PDSP.260.005 | Jan Symington |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Map 17 doesn't show the blue and green infrastructure. There needs to be more emphasis on linking blue and green spaces all over the city, and on enhancing biodiversity. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. Very sensible that the Local Plan proposes protecting the Green Belt and that most of the new housing will be in the inner-city areas. Key documents such as South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Strategy produced in 2011, and Access to Nature - capacity and demand maps 2021 have not been referred to. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a). References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan. | Yes | PDSP.267.006 | Jill17 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | The industrial heritage of the water-power sites linked to water should also be protected as part of the blue and green infrastructure. | Agree policy should be amended to highlight the heritage significance of blue and green infrastructure. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries. | Yes | PDSP.270.002 | Jim McNeil |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Local Nature Recovery Network should be included as a supplement to the Plan. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the width of the buffer zones adjoining rivers and streams. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a). | Yes | PDSP.271.005 | JimC |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Policy should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.271.006 | JimC |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Policy should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.271.007 | JimC |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.281.002 | John59 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document | Yes | PDSP.284.002 | JoM |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Suggests that new areas for green spaces and blue and green infrastructure improvements should be identified as currently the Local Plan priorities are not explicitly strong regarding this. Also requires policy to identify/ differentiate between how much value each open space is worth. | No changed required. The Plan identifies a number of locations where new green space will be created in the Central Area and as part of allocated sites in other areas. Policy GS1 provides an appropriate policy framework for assessing the value of green spaces, if and when development proposals arise. | No | PDSP.285.003 | Jonathan789 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Suggests that new areas for green spaces and blue and green infrastructure improvements should be identified as currently the Local Plan priorities are not explicitly strong regarding this. Also requires policy to identify/differentiate between how much value each open space is worth. Would also like to see blue infrastructure such as rivers being utilised to their full extend, being de-culverted and opened up for more access. Suggests adding Local Plan ambition to meet the accessible green space standards provided by Natural England. | The standards set out in Part 2, Table 4, were recommended by the Sheffield Open Space Assessment and reflect the availability of accessible natural greenspace in Sheffield. References to active travel routes along river banks should however, also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Policy GS9 already includes an expectation that rivers will be deculverted wherever practicable. | Yes | PDSP.285.004 | Jonathan789 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.306.002 | LisaG |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.329.002 | nahtalix |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | There is not enough future provision or protection for the existing green and blue infrastructure/ local nature network. Would like to see more provision as well as strengthening of Local Plan priorities to provide more green spaces. | Disagree - the plan provides a robust framework for considering planning applications that affect greenspace and the local nature network – see Policies GS1, GS2 and GS5-GS7 in particular.  However, agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats – see proposed amendment to Policy BG1. | Yes | PDSP.333.004 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Local Nature Recovery Network should be included as a supplement to the Plan. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the width of the buffer zones adjoining rivers and streams. | Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Policy GS9 already specifies buffer zones for development next to rivers. | Yes | PDSP.341.003 | PaulMaddox1960 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Map 17 doesn't show the blue and green infrastructure. There needs to be more emphasis on linking blue and green spaces all over the city, and on enhancing biodiversity. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.343.002 | penny71 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.346.002 | PeterB |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | The Upper Don Trail should be named in the Local Plan with a commitment to its development and completion, including the improved cycle route north past Wardsend Cemetery and through the Millenium Park in Oughtibridge to link further north. | References to active travel routes along river banks should be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. | Yes | PDSP.350.003 | Polly Blacker |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Welcomes building in the inner city to avoid building on the Green Belt. Plan should be much more visionary regarding expansion of the Green-and Blue Network to include the inner city and other deprived areas. | Note support for protection of Green Belt. Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree policy BG1 should be strengthened to emphasise the potential for improving the *connectivity* of the Green Network and supporting nature recovery (as part of the Local Nature Recovery Network). | Yes | PDSP.354.001 | rcb |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Policy should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure. | Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.393.003 | Sue22 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the specified width of the buffer zones alongside rivers and streams. Specific objectives should be included to make green spaces that are primarily for sport and recreation better for wildlife alongside retaining and enhancing their wider recreational value. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around *connecting* greenspaces and wildlife habitats -see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a). Management of existing sport and recreation areas is not development and is therefore not an issue that should be covered in the Local Plan. However, development for new sports or recreation space would need to comply with Policies GS5 and GS6. | Yes | PDSP.393.004 | Sue22 |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure | Policy needs to show more ambition regarding expansion of the Green Network (not just protection and enhancement of what already exists). Sections of the Porter Trail, Upper Don Trail and River Sheaf Trail required by current planning conditions, and in some cases currently under construction, should be shown on the Policies Map. Existing or proposed river trails should be mentioned by name in the Policy. | Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. The importance of the watercourse should be highlighted in the supporting text of Policy BG1 and references to active travel routes along river banks will be added to relevant Sub-Area policies. However, it would be overly detailed to show all the riverside trails on the Policies Map. | Yes | PDSP.393.005 | Sue22 |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Welcome the reference to main river corridors and the canal. | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.001.005 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | We welcome the recognition given to the role Sheffield’s | We welcome the recognition given to the role Sheffield’s heritage assets play as an integral element of the character of many areas of the city, and that conserving them alongside new development will result in wide ranging benefits for the city. | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.003.021 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | We support this policy which should help to ensure that development within Sheffield is of a high standard that is appropriate to its context. | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.003.022 | Historic England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy D1 duplicates bullet points. Remove bullets i-m and separate bullet h. | Accept suggested policy amendment. | Yes | PDSP.014.013 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Object to terminology used in Policy D1 e.g. beautiful, high quality, in that it can be interpreted differently by different decision makers. | Policy D1 sets out the design requirements for new development in the city and reflects the theme of terminology used in the National Design Guide on 'Well Designed' and 'Attractive', while also reflecting the 'Living With Beauty' report produced by the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission, which is an independent body set up to advise government on how to promote and increase the use of high-quality design for new build homes and neighbourhoods. The report explains that Local Planning Authorities should not be afraid to ask for 'beauty' and should refuse poor quality development. | No | PDSP.020.011 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Repeat of comment PDSP.020.011 | See response to comment PDSP.020.011. | No | PDSP.020.012 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy D1: Need to make greater emphasis on the quality of design across all development. | No change needed. Draft policy already covers themes raised. |  | PDSP.099.005 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Plan needs to consider Loxley Valley & Peak Park as a whole with integrated protection, and LV as 'gateway' to the Peaks. Consider designating 'Areas of Special Character' as Conservation Areas. Lack of information on LNRS/NRN. Suggest Loxley Valley & LWS are considered as part of the future LNRS/NRN. Given Biodiversity Emergency suggest Biodiversity should hold sway over recreational opportunities.  GS5 - Include actual minimum distances for habitat buffer strips. Suggest buffer strips for Main Rivers is 20m and 10m for Ordinary Watercourses.  Suggest continued Green Belt Designation of sites including Lidl, Forge Valley school & former college, & sites off Chapman Close & Greaves Lane to protect against further intensive development. | Agree in part. The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process, albeit linked to the local plan, will progress outside of the local plan process as a distinct piece of work. Work on theLocal Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed so will be included when complete in an SPD and/or in the plan at next review stage.  Policy GS5 includes a requirement to provide appropriate buffer strips to designated sites and habitats. The Environment Agency set outs the following habitat buffer distances required for watercourses: (a) at least 10 metres for rivers and streams & (b) a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is) – however, this is too detailed for inclusion in the Local Plan and is better dealt with in a supplementary planning document.  The land referred to no longer performs the purposes of Green Belt. Heritage water assets are already covered by policy. The Policies map is based on the best available Ordnance Survey base mapping that was available to the Council in digital format. The base map could be changed if other mapping becomes available. | Yes | PDSP.104.004 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Recommend that measures to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse emissions should be delivered through nationally recognised standards. | The Council declared a Climate Emergency in 2019, with a target of becoming net zero by 2030. The Plan proposes introduction of the Future Homes and Future Buildings Standards from 2025 which is in line with the Government proposals. From 2030 development will be expected to be net zero carbon for consistency with the Council target. | No | PDSP.112.004 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Create a HES allied to Local Plan and supported by policies detailing how historic environment can bring public benefits. Increase list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield. | Agree in part. An encompassing term to be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets. The plan already creates a policy 'hook' for further guidance/strategies. | Yes | PDSP.113.001 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | D1 (a & b) items a & b repeated p.105-106. | Accept suggested policy rewording. | Yes | PDSP.116.031 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Increase list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield. Plan states aim for high standard of design. NPPF states that development which is not well designed should be refused, which the Plan should say the same. Policy would benefit from additional supporting text on the importance and benefits of heritage. | Agree in part. An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets. It is not necessary to duplicate the NPPF. | Yes | PDSP.116.032 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Repeat of comment PDSP.116.032 | See response to comment PDSP.116.032. | Yes | PDSP.116.033 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Increase list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield. | An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets. | Yes | PDSP.116.034 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Repeat of comment PDSP.116.031 | See response to comment PDSP.116.031. | Yes | PDSP.116.035 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Repeat of comment PDSP.116.034 | See response to comment PDSP.116.034 | Yes | PDSP.116.036 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | NHS would welcome further engagement on identifying health requirements of new and existing development. | This will be covered as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | No | PDSP.119.001 | NHS Property Services |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policies don't contain adequate provision to cover sustainable local food growing infrastructure. | A reference to local food production should be included in Policy BG1. | Yes | PDSP.121.015 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Repeat of comment PDSP.121.015 | See response to comment PDSP.121.015 | Yes | PDSP.121.016 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. | An encompassing term to be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets | Yes | PDSP.137.002 | Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | We applaud the wording of D1 a). | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.140.016 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | No requirement for Rainwater Recycling and Water Run-off, which will increase water demand, flood risk and impact on drainage system capacity. | Policy ES4 includes the Building Regulations Optional Requirement for new dwellings to limit wholesome water consumption to 110 litres per person per day. ES4 also requires green/brown/blue roofs where viable and compatible with other design features, which will contribute towards reducing flood risk. GS9 & 11 focus on measures to manage flood risk including use of Sustainable Drainage Systems where feasible. These measures have been incorporated into the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Any further measures would therefore render the Plan unviable unless other policies were amended to compensate. | No | PDSP.185.001 | Ascreenname |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy D1 doesn't mention biodiversity or design features to encourage biodiversity in new development e.g. swift bricks | Although Policy D1 doesn't mention biodiversity or design features to encourage biodiversity, these are covered in Policy GS5 Development & Biodiversity – an amendment is proposed to include specific requirements for swift bricks. | No | PDSP.191.006 | Carol Collins |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Embed Loxley Valley Design Statement in the Plan. Embed Heritage Strategy in the Plan. Embed Waterways Strategy in the Plan. | Agree in part. An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets**.**  Strategies should flow from policy not dictate it. | Yes | PDSP.260.006 | Jan Symington |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities | Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Increase list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield. | Agree in part. An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets**.** | Yes | PDSP.381.001 | Simon\_Surveys |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | The policy states that development should not increase flood risk across the city – we would suggest re-wording to make clear that flooding isn’t increased elsewhere (including out of the city). | Agree. The policy should be amended to make this clear. | Yes | PDSP.002.005 | Environment Agency |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | The cumulative traffic impact of the site allocations is being considered, and where there is a significant traffic impact at the Strategic Road Network. SCC will need to ensure that this is mitigated appropriately. Early engagement and involvement in these sites (as they move through the planning process) is welcomed by National Highways. SCC will need to give consideration to public transport services around site allocations in meeting the criteria set out for the minimum service frequency standard within Policy NC11. | The comments are noted and the support for the policy approach is welcomed. The aim is to agree a Statement of Common Ground with National Highways once the transport modelling has been completed and in advance to the public hearings. | No | PDSP.005.001 | National Highways |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Broadly support Policy IN1, particularly the provision of sufficient sports facilities to meet the forecast demand. It also needs to meet the needs of respective sports that are played in the City and be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy so there should be additional text in the policy and supporting text to reference the Sheffield Playing Pitch Strategy September 2022. | The supporting text makes reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as a means of identifying requirements. The IDP references the Playing Pitch Strategy so the Strategy will be used to inform infrastructure needs and there is no need to replicate the reference in the Plan. | No | PDSP.007.007 | Sport England |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Transport’ should be in bold. | Agree. | Yes | PDSP.014.014 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Suggest the tram network is included in the policy section on Transport. | Agree – an amendment has been proposed | Yes | PDSP.015.010 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Support the Policy but have concerns over the deliverability due to the restrictive nature of developments, viability and thus the funds raised by CIL. The majority of proposed development is on brownfield land in the central areas of which there are known viability issues. There should be a reliance on sites which are already in accessible locations with capacity on the road network, such as Orgreave Park, which is not reliant on public money. | The support for the policy is welcomed. However, the comment is about a specific site rather than the policy itself. In any case, the site is greenfield land within the Green Belt so its inclusion as a site allocation would not align with the Spatial Strategy. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.  This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. | No | PDSP.068.006 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Add “All new build developments will be required to have physical infrastructure to support gigabit-capable full fibre connections. Policy CO3 in Part 2 of the Plan provides further details of this requirement." | There is no need to repeat the wording of policy CO3 here. | No | PDSP.102.009 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Contributions to community food growing should be included in the policy. | Food production is not generally considered to be an infrastructure item, but the policy does not exclude it if it is considered relevant. There is therefore no need to amend the policy. The definition of infrastructure in the Glossary sets out what is included, but not what is excluded. However, a reference to local food production will be included in Policy BG1. | No | PDSP.121.017 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Repeat of comment PDSP.121.017. | See response to comment PDFSP.121.017. | No | PDSP.121.018 | Regather |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Add to infrastructure priorities adding to, joining up and developing connected and continuous green spaces throughout industrial, commercial and residential areas for public health and wellbeing, wildlife and biodiversity and the attractiveness of the city for investors, employers, workers and visitors. | Other policies in the Plan such as BG1 and those in Chapter 8 of Part 2 cover this issue. | No | PDSP.137.003 | Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Chapter 5: Topic Policies | Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision | Strongly support the policy, in particular improving active travel, the passenger rail network, the rail freight network, the bus network and the strategic highway network. The Council should collaborate with statutory providers to increase service frequency and quality, improve connectivity and reliability, and promote sustainable transport patterns to help decarbonise the system, boost productivity, and encourage healthier and more active travel. | No change needed. Support for the policy welcomed.  The South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) is currently undertaking a formal assessment of bus franchising and until the outcome of that work is known it is not appropriate to reference this in the Local Plan. However, Policy T1 specifically refers to supporting the objectives of the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership which is in place for 3-5 years whilst the assessment work continues. | No | PDSP.268.009 | Jim Bamford |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Appendix 1: List of Site Allocations | Land between 68 and 69 Loxley New Road should be included as a Site Allocation. | Using the density assumptions set out within the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment, the estimated capacity for this site is 2 units. This site is considered too small for allocation with the Plan. Development of the site could still come forward via the planning application process | No | PDSP.061.001 | Mr and Mrs Shaw (Submitted by Spring Planning) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Appendix 1: List of Site Allocations | Object to the exclusion of land at Hillfoot Road and Penny Lane, Totley as a site allocation (Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment site reference S03070). | No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. | No | PDSP.062.002 | Mr Charles Rhodes and Star Pubs (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations | Appendix 1: List of Site Allocations | Housing figures are incorrect in Annex A. | It is acknowledged that there is an error in the housing figures of some sites within Annex A. These will be presented in a revised Table for the Inspector which will also take account of dwelling completions in 2022/23. | Yes | PDSP.102.010 | Dore Village Society |