**Responses to Comments on Part 2 of the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan (Development Management Policies and Implementation)**

Approved by Full Council, 6th September 2023

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 1: Introduction to Part 2 | Part 1 Ch2 & Part 2 Ch3 - Level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon. Part 2 Ch1 para 1.3 - Suggest amend to give greater emphasis to 'Environmental Sustainability'. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. No change topic covered in introduction. | No | PDSP.140.017 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 1: Introduction to Part 2 | Part 1 Ch2 & Part 2 Ch3 - Level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon. Policies ES 1-4 need more ambition. ES1 - Suggest amend to change target for new dwellings and non-residential development to achieve net zero carbon by 2025 not 2030. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. | No | PDSP.140.018 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 1: Introduction to Part 2 | The "Climate Emergency" is not settled science and the potential mitigation measures will affect adversely, every inhabitant. We have no impact assessment of these policy measures by the council. | The aim for the City to be net carbon zero by 2030 in response to the Climate Emergency 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.222.009 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 1: Introduction to Part 2 | The Plan should enforce design standards for parking, specifically and reduce unnecessary light pollution. | Add reference to permeable surfaces to policy DE4 (k). | Yes | PDSP.332.002 | Nickyleaf |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 1: Introduction to Part 2 | Concerned about practical implementation of elements of the Plan, including improved walking and cycling infrastructure, suggested route improvements, connectivity and maintenance. Concerned that there are no proposals for new stations on the Upper Don Valley rail line. The Plan does not address City Centre needs such as improved children's library facilities, indoor playspace and green space. | No change needed. Acknowledge the concern about implementation of proposals in the Plan - particularly in relation to public transport. This would largely be delivered through Sheffield's Transport Plan, supported by SYMCA. We have proposed minor amendments to reflect the status of proposals for reopening the passenger rail line in the Upper Don Valley. The IDP considers the need for infrastructure across the city, including social infrastructure within the City Centre, and where known details projects for delivering infrastructure alongside the assessment of need. | No | PDSP.406.001 | TonyJon |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | The 80% requirement should be clarified to make it clear that this is not a density policy but is concerned about controlling potential secondary uses. | Agreed - the proposed rewording of the policy to refer to gross floorspace would address this. | Yes | PDSP.021.001 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes Sheffield (Submitted by Sheppard Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | The 80% and 60% requirements in the policy should be reduced to 50%. | Disagree, as this reduction would result in the Plan failing to deliver the housing and employment land requirements. | No | PDSP.024.001 | British Land (Submitted by Quod) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | The flexibility within draft Policy AS1 is welcomed. However, the draft Plan does not allocate any ‘Office Sites’, therefore it seems that this part of the policy is not applicable. | The support for the policy is welcomed and it should be noted that there are Office site allocations, for example CW02, SV01, SV02, SV03 and HC01. | No | PDSP.035.003 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on allocated sites | Welcome flexibility when it comes to specific uses or mix of uses on allocated sites. However, the draft Plan does not allocate any ‘Office Sites’, therefore it seems that this part of the policy is not applicable. Opportunities for a variety of use should be reflected in other locations. The opportunity for instance for leisure uses or commercial developments as part of residential developments should be welcomed. | The support for the policy is welcomed and it should be noted that there are Office site allocations, for example CW02, SV01, SV02, SV03 and HC01. The second comment relates to Policy Zones. | No | PDSP.035.004 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | Support the policy wording (i.e. ‘should’ rather than ‘must’) but requests flexibility for certain sites. | Welcome the support for the policy wording. Some further clarification on the sites covered by the Sheffield Station Masterplan will be provided. | Yes | PDSP.053.001 | London and Continental Railways (LCR) (Submitted by Lichfields) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | In relation to certain City Centre sites, the policy is over restrictive as it would not allow for an appropriate mix of uses on certain sites. | The 20% allowance for other uses provides sufficient flexibility to deliver other uses and to reduce the 80% requirement when applied to housing allocations would undermine the strategic policy approach to achieve the stated housing requirement. | No | PDSP.076.005 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | It is welcomed that draft Policy AS1 introduces a certain amount of flexibility. However, the draft Plan does not allocate any ‘Office Sites’, therefore it seems that this part of the policy is not applicable. | The support for the policy is welcomed and it should be noted that there are Office site allocations, for example CW02, SV01, SV02, SV03 and HC01. | No | PDSP.086.005 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | The policy wording should be clarified to state whether the 80% requirement applies to the net or gross area. | Reword policy AS1 to clarify that the requirement applies to floorspace rather than developable area. | Yes | PDSP.112.005 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | Use for travellers should not promoted on an unspecified site. | The policy deals with the approach to all site allocations in general and does not proposed specific uses on individual sites. | No | PDSP.295.001 | Kazbar |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations | Policy AS1: Development on Allocated Sites | Travellers cause problems and there should be public consultation. | The policy is about the general approach to all site allocations and not specifically those for travellers, so no change is required. | No | PDSP.322.001 | Michelle Freeman |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations |  | Modify text to improve references to Green Network. | Propose minor amendments to supporting text relating to the Green Network. Additional wording in policy BG1 references extending blue and green infrastructure. Also propose additional text after paragraph 5.24 to explain the role of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and associated mapping of connected infrastructure. | Yes | PDSP.116.037 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations |  | Suggest the correction of some typographical and minor factual errors and issues of legibility to make the Plan as accurate and legible as possible. | We do not consider that the proposed change would add clarity. The approach to preferred and acceptable uses is different and this is accurately explained in the text. | No | PDSP.116.038 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 2 The Policy Zones, Allocated Sites and Other Designations |  | CH8 & GS5 - suggest amendment to title as it doesn't describe breadth of chapter and relocate some of opening paragraphs to GS5. | No change needed. | No | PDSP.122.004 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Policy should be specifically linked to the management of Green Spaces and the Local Nature Recovery Network (LNRN). | Support is welcomed. Further clarification is now provided via explicit links to other policies. | Yes | PDSP.002.007 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | We support the intention set out under criterion c that,  wherever possible, existing buildings are reused. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.003.023 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Support the positive aims of reducing carbon emissions by developing carbon, absorbing habitats, reuse of buildings where possible and using sustainable/ recycled materials. | Support is welcomed. | No | PDSP.011.003 | Derbyshire County Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | It is not clear what costs have been included in the viability appraisal. | The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal states (para 8.11) that the 2025 Future Homes Standard is taken to add 7% to the cost of development and is assumed in the base appraisals. The 75% carbon reduction requirement in the policy is the same as the Future Homes Standard. This percentage was derived from studies referenced in paragraphs 8.9 and 8.10 of the assessment. | No | PDSP.016.015 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Change date of introduction of policy; change requirements in policy to meet site or viability issues. | As the government have not yet confirmed the detailed timeline for introducing the Future Homes Standard, it is not considered appropriate to amend the introduction date for the 75% reduction requirement. Introduction of the requirement at this point of the plan was tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. It is acknowledged not all developments will be able to connect to (or develop new) energy networks. However, the vast majority, if not all developments should be able to deliver other means of on-site renewable energy, if necessary. It is also acknowledged that there could be site specific instances where the requirements are not technically feasible, these would be assessed on a case-by-case basis when a detailed scheme progresses to the planning application stage. | No | PDSP.021.002 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes Sheffield (Submitted by Sheppard Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Aligning the Council’s requirement for carbon neutral development with those of Government is welcomed. It is also welcomed that the policy does not require enhanced standards above those in Part F and Part L of the Building Standards. | Support is welcomed. | No | PDSP.028.001 | Churchill Retirement Living Ltd. (Submitted by Planning Issues Ltd.) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Policy is based on 2013 Building regulations and does not take account of 2022 uplift. | The Future Homes and Building Standards are still being developed and are not yet a part of Building Regulations. The Plan seeks to close this gap by introducing a policy that is very close to the emerging Future Homes and Building Standards. It is acknowledged there may be some confusion by relating this policy to the 2013 regulations, a 64% carbon reduction on 2021 building regulations would equate to the proposed 75% reduction on 2013 standards. Propose an update to the policy to reflect this. The re-use of existing buildings can still result in the delivery of new dwellings or non-residential uses/units. The policy wording can be changed to make this clearer. It is acknowledged that there could be site specific heritage instances where the requirements are not technically feasible, these would be assessed on a case by case basis when a detailed scheme progresses to the planning application stage. | Yes | PDSP.035.005 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Policy considered likely to be unviable for some schemes. | The costs of the proposed policy were assessed within the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, that was published alongside the Regulation 19 consultation. It is acknowledged that there could be site specific instances where the requirements are not technically feasible, these would be assessed on a case by case basis when a detailed scheme progresses to the planning application stage. | No | PDSP.051.004 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Decrease carbon reduction requirements, a national approach, rather than local requirements is preferred. | Whilst the Council would welcome a national requirement to further reducing carbon emissions, these requirements (Future Homes and Building Standards) are still being developed and are not yet a part of Building Regulations. The Plan seeks to close this gap by introducing a policy that is very close to the emerging Future Homes and Building Standards. By setting requirements as close as possible to these emerging standards, developers should not be overly burdened.  The costs of the proposed policy were assessed within the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, that was published alongside the Regulation 19 consultation | No | PDSP.056.004 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | It is not clear what costs have been included in the viability appraisal. | The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal states (para 8.11) that the 2025 Future Homes Standard is taken to add 7% to the cost of development and is assumed in the base appraisals. The 75% carbon reduction requirement in the policy is the same as the Future Homes Standard. This percentage was derived from studies referenced in paragraphs 8.9 and 8.10 of the assessment. | No | PDSP.071.013 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Carbon reduction targets not achievable for non-residential development. | The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal has modelled the carbon reduction requirements for non-residential developments at a 20% uplift and is assumed in the base appraisals. The requirements set in the Policy are therefore considered viable. It is acknowledged that there may be some circumstances where it may not be feasible to achieve a policy requirement. These would be considered at planning application stage and decisions made based on all material considerations. | No | PDSP.073.001 | Sheffield Forgemasters Engineering (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Carbon reduction targets not achievable for non-residential development. | The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal has modelled the carbon reduction requirements for non-residential developments at a 20% uplift and is assumed in the base appraisals. The requirements set in the Policy are therefore considered viable. It is acknowledged that there may be some circumstances where it may not be feasible to achieve a policy requirement. These would be considered at planning application stage and decisions made based on all material considerations. | No | PDSP.074.003 | Sheffield Hallam University (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | It is not clear what costs have been included in the viability appraisal. | The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal states (para 8.11) that the 2025 Future Homes Standard is taken to add 7% to the cost of development and is assumed in the base appraisals. The 75% carbon reduction requirement in the policy is the same as the Future Homes Standard. This percentage was derived from studies referenced in paragraphs 8.9 and 8.10 of the assessment. | No | PDSP.079.017 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Policy is based on 2013 Building regulations and does not take account of 2022 uplift. Creation of wetlands difficult on City Centre sites. | The Future Homes and Building Standards are still being developed and are not yet a part of Building Regulations. The Plan seeks to close this gap by introducing a policy that is very close to the emerging Future Homes and Building Standards. It is acknowledged there may be some confusion by relating this policy to the 2013 regulations, a 64% carbon reduction on 2021 building regulations would equate to the proposed 75% reduction on 2013 standards. The plan will be updated to reflect this. The re-use of existing buildings can still result in the delivery of new dwellings or non-residential uses/units. The policy wording can be changed to make this clearer. It is acknowledged that there could be site specific heritage instances where the requirements are not technically feasible, these would be assessed on a case by case basis when a detailed scheme progresses to the planning application stage.  Note the policy requires creation and restoration of wetlands ‘wherever possible’. | Yes | PDSP.086.006 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Decrease carbon reduction requirements, a national approach, rather than local requirements is preferred. | Whilst the Council would welcome a national requirement to further reducing carbon emissions, these requirements (Future Homes and Building Standards) are still being developed and are not yet a part of Building Regulations. The Plan seeks to close this gap by introducing a policy that is very close to the emerging Future Homes and Building Standards. By setting requirements as close as possible to these emerging standards, developers should not be overly burdened. Whilst the national grid will not be fully zero carbon until 2050, buildings will still be able to reach net zero before that point, through means such as installation of on-site renewables or connection to local energy networks. The power for Local Authorities to set targets beyond national standards was confirmed by the government in their response to the Future Homes Standard in January 2021 "‘The new planning reforms will clarify the longer term role of local planning authorities in determining local energy efficiency standards. To provide some certainty in the immediate term, the Government will not amend the Planning and Energy Act 2008, which means that local planning authorities will retain powers to set local energy efficiency standards for new homes." This was further confirmed through the examination of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan in 2022. B&NES requested received the following clarification of this from government: "‘Plan-makers may continue to set energy efficiency standards at the local level which go beyond national Building Regulations standards if they wish." | No | PDSP.112.006 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Add requirement for Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments on developments. Emphasise re-use of existing buildings before demolition. | Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments were assessed as part of a range of policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Part (c) of ES1 already promotes the re-use of buildings wherever possible. However, it is agreed that the proposed wording heightens the emphasis on the re-use of buildings and is welcomed.  The order of requirements in this policy do not set a hierarchy of requirements, and so it is not considered necessary to adjust the order the requirements are presented in.  The suggestion to change the policy title to better reflect the thrust of the policy is welcomed | Yes | PDSP.113.002 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Add requirement for Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments on developments. Emphasise re-use of existing buildings before demolition. | Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments were assessed as part of a range of policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Part (c) of ES1 already promotes the re-use of buildings wherever possible. However, it is agreed that the proposed wording heightens the emphasis on the re-use of buildings and is welcomed. The full proposed wording around the waste hierarchy is considered to detailed for a Local Plan policy and should instead be considered for inclusion within any future SPDs. | Yes | PDSP.116.039 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Add requirement for Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments on developments. Emphasise re-use of existing buildings before demolition. | Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments were assessed as part of a range of policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Part (c) of ES1 already promotes the re-use of buildings wherever possible. However, it is agreed that the proposed wording heightens the emphasis on the re-use of buildings and is welcomed. The full proposed wording around the waste hierarchy is considered to detailed for a Local Plan policy and should instead be considered for inclusion within any future SPDs. | Yes | PDSP.116.040 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Increase carbon reduction requirements. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. Suggested rewording to introduction is welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.140.021 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Increase sustainability requirements. | A range of carbon reduction and sustainability standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. | No | PDSP.140.022 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Increase carbon reduction requirements to near Passivhaus standards. | A range of carbon reduction standards assessments were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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.  It is considered unfeasible to apply the requirement to house extensions, due to the limited planning controls over requiring modifications to the existing property that the extension would be connected to.  It is agreed that changing the word "expected" to "required" would provide clarity and also better matches the wording in the policy title. Building Regulations (current and future standards) would apply to house extensions. | Yes | PDSP.140.023 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Increase carbon reduction requirements to near Passivhaus standards. | A range of carbon reduction standards assessments were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. | No | PDSP.159.001 | Olivia Blake MP |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Increase carbon reduction requirements to RIBA Climate Change 2030 standards. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. | No | PDSP.160.002 | Sheffield Green Party |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Add requirement for Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments on developments. Emphasise re-use of existing buildings before demolition. | Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments were assessed as part of a range of policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Part (c) of ES1 already promotes the re-use of buildings wherever possible. However, it is agreed that the proposed wording heightens the emphasis on the re-use of buildings and is welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.188.003 | Boo |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Support approach. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.201.006 | Claire |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Incorporate RSPB research into policy. | Reference to specific biodiversity net gains measures are not considered appropriate for the Plan. Reference would be better served via an SPD. | No | PDSP.271.008 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Add requirement for Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments on developments. Emphasise re-use of existing buildings before demolition. | Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments were assessed as part of a range of policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Part (c) of ES1 already promotes the re-use of buildings wherever possible. However, it is agreed that the proposed wording heightens the emphasis on the re-use of buildings and is welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.271.009 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Incorporate RSPB research into policy. | Reference to specific biodiversity net gains measures are not considered appropriate for the Plan. Reference would be better served via an SPD. | No | PDSP.285.005 | Jonathan789 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Increase sustainability requirements. | A range of carbon reduction and sustainability standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher level of requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. | No | PDSP.298.001 | Kimbo |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Support. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.341.004 | PaulMaddox1960 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Add requirement for Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments on developments. Emphasise re-use of existing buildings before demolition. | Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessments were assessed as part of a range of policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Part (c) of ES1 already promotes the re-use of buildings wherever possible. However, it is agreed that the proposed wording heightens the emphasis on the re-use of buildings and is welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.393.006 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development | Insulation may not be applicable on some existing homes. Council should plan to assist private owners/landlords. | These comments are considered beyond the scope of the Local Plan | No | PDSP.408.003 | Trantion |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Examples of low-carbon energy sources would provide clarity. | It is considered that further clarification would best be delivered via an SPD. | No | PDSP.001.006 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Support the approach to considering the impact of renewable energy schemes on heritage assets. | Support is welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.024 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Suggest additional wording to lessen impact on birds. | Support is welcomed. Clause (c) is considered to provide adequate protection. Any further detailed clarification/guidance would best be delivered via an SPD. | No | PDSP.006.008 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Low carbon energy sources not included in viability assessment. | The costs of developing residential schemes with low-carbon energy sources is included within the 7% additional development costs modelled for the Future Homes Standard. | No | PDSP.016.016 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Clarification around on-site combustion of fossil fuels needed. Opportunities for wind energy outside Greenland and Hesley Wood. | The "Definitions" section following the policy provides clarification on the scope of the requirement to avoid on-site combustion of fossil fuels. The Policy enables the delivery of smaller (35m or lower) turbines within the urban area. | No | PDSP.035.006 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Low carbon energy sources not included in viability assessment. Unclear why areas identified for wind turbines. | The costs of developing residential schemes with low-carbon energy sources is included within the 7% additional development costs modelled for the Future Homes Standard. The supporting text to the policy highlights that 2 locations for grid connected wind turbines were identified in the "Investment Potential of Renewable Energy Technologies in Sheffield" (2014) report. These sites are identified on the Policies Map. | No | PDSP.071.014 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Low carbon energy sources not included in viability assessment. | The costs of developing residential schemes with low-carbon energy sources is included within the 7% additional development costs modelled for the Future Homes Standard. | No | PDSP.079.018 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Clarification around on-site combustion of fossil fuels needed. Limiting turbines to 35m in the urban area is too restrictive. | The "Definitions" section following the policy provides clarification on the scope of the requirement to avoid on-site combustion of fossil fuels. The "Investment Potential of Renewable Energy Technologies in Sheffield" (2014) report identified 2 locations in Sheffield for larger turbines. Larger turbines within the urban area are considered unlikely to be deliverable due to the topography of the city and the high variation in wind velocities. | No | PDSP.086.007 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Duplication in respect of Government legislation to restrict gas boilers in new developments. | Although the Government legislation restricting gas boilers from 2025 is expected, it currently carries no weight in planning matters. This policy is intended to bridge that gap in legislation. | No | PDSP.112.007 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Reword policy to improve clarity. | Proposed rewording is welcomed | Yes | PDSP.116.041 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation | Welcome policy. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.140.024 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes | Viability of connection to energy networks has not been thoroughly tested. | The policy provides flexibility in connecting to /developing new energy networks by acknowledging this may not be feasible in all circumstances. Modification to clause (c) proposed to make this clearer. The viability of the proposed policies has been tested sufficiently through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and has made best use of all available data in identifying costs. | Yes | PDSP.016.017 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes | Viability of connection to energy networks has not been thoroughly tested. | The viability of the proposed policies has been tested sufficiently through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and has made best use of all available data in identifying costs. The policy provides flexibility in connecting to /developing new energy networks by acknowledging this may not be feasible in all circumstances. Modification to clause (c) proposed to make this clearer. | Yes | PDSP.071.015 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes | Viability of connection to energy networks has not been thoroughly tested. | The policy provides flexibility in connecting to /developing new energy networks by acknowledging this may not be feasible in all circumstances. Modification to clause (c) proposed to make this clearer. The viability of the proposed policies has been tested sufficiently through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and has made best use of all available data in identifying costs. | Yes | PDSP.079.019 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes | Connection to available energy networks should not be mandatory. | The policy seeks to require connection to renewable and low carbon energy networks where it is feasible. The specifics of feasibility of connection would need to be tested on a site-by-site basis at the planning application stage. Heat networks are acknowledge by the Government as being capable of providing "the lowest cost low carbon heat to the end-consumer" (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/heat-networks-zoning-pilot> ).  The Governments Heat and Building Strategy (2021, <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1044598/6.7408_BEIS_Clean_Heat_Heat___Buildings_Strategy_Stage_2_v5_WEB.pdf> ) further acknowledges that "Heat networks are particularly cost-effective low-carbon heating solutions in dense urban environments." (p80) | No | PDSP.086.008 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes | Connection to available energy networks should not be mandatory. | The policy seeks to require connection to renewable and low carbon energy networks. Heat networks are acknowledge by the Government as being capable of providing "the lowest cost low carbon heat to the end-consumer" (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/heat-networks-zoning-pilot>).  The Governments Heat and Building Strategy (2021, <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1044598/6.7408_BEIS_Clean_Heat_Heat___Buildings_Strategy_Stage_2_v5_WEB.pdf> ) further acknowledges that "Heat networks are particularly cost-effective low-carbon heating solutions in dense urban environments." (p80) | No | PDSP.112.008 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes | Plan requires stronger climate change policies, to deliver on the Council’s net-zero by 2030 ambition. Add in specific reference to mine water heat networks. | A variety of policy options were assessed as part of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. All types of renewable and shared energy schemes (including mine water heat recovery) are supported within ES3. Highlighting of one particular type of network is not considered necessary. | No | PDSP.140.025 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Definitions of some wording is not clear enough. Whole policy does not appear to have been considered in the Viability Assessment. | Additional details on policy implementation are intended to be included within an SPD. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has taken full consideration of all the policies within the plan, and has identified additional build costs, where applicable. | No | PDSP.016.018 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Policy repeats other policies. 80% requirement for Green/Blue rooves is too high a threshold. | Although repetition is aimed to be minimised, there will naturally be some cross-over between the objectives of some policies. The requirement for green/blue roofs includes caveats to take account of design issues such as those listed in the representation. | No | PDSP.035.007 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Definitions of some wording is not clear enough. Whole policy does not appear to have been considered in the Viability Assessment. | Additional details on policy implementation are intended to be included within an SPD. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has taken full consideration of all the policies within the plan, and has identified additional build costs, where applicable. | No | PDSP.071.016 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Definitions of some wording is not clear enough. Whole policy does not appear to have been considered in the Viability Assessment. | Additional details on policy implementation are intended to be included within an SPD. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has taken full consideration of all the policies within the plan, and has identified additional build costs, where applicable. | No | PDSP.079.020 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Policy repeats other policies. 80% requirement for Green/Blue rooves is to high a threshold. | Although repetition is aimed to be minimised, there will naturally be some cross-over between the objectives of some policies. The requirement for green/blue roofs includes caveats to take account of design issues such as those listed in the representation. | No | PDSP.086.009 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Support the policy approach. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.088.005 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Insufficient evidence to apply enhanced water usage standards. | Research from bodies including the Environment Agency, along with forecasts from water companies have warned that nationally and locally there will be water shortages in the near future, where water demand from the country’s rising population outstrips supply as a result of climate change, unless mitigation measures are implemented to address it, including those aimed at reducing water usage. | No | PDSP.112.009 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Reduce water usage requirements below building regulations standards. | A range of standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. | No | PDSP.127.008 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings | Welcome policy ES4. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.140.026 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES5: Managing Air Quality | National Highways supports the emphasis on modal shift away from the private car. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.005.002 | National Highways |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES5: Managing Air Quality | Policy does not recognise the impacts of aerial emissions on the natural environment and biodiversity. Further evidence needs to be collected and the Habitats Regulation Assessment should assess potential air quality impacts. | Revise introductory wording to the policy to recognise the impacts of aerial emissions on the natural environment and biodiversity. | Yes | PDSP.006.009 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES5: Managing Air Quality | Doubtful an environmental buffer can mitigate air pollution effectively. | There have been a variety of academic research papers that indicate buffers can be effective in mitigating air pollution impacts. EG: <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-009-5502-8_21> | No | PDSP.086.010 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES5: Managing Air Quality | Ban wood burning stoves. | The majority of Sheffield is designated a Smoke Control Area.  Further control of wood burners is considered beyond the powers available to the Local Planning Authority. | No | PDSP.102.011 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES6: Contaminated and Unstable Land | Include reference to National Quality Mark Scheme and Environment Agency advice within supporting text. | Suggested additions are welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.002.008 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES6: Contaminated and Unstable Land | Support the policy approach. | Support is welcomed. | No | PDSP.008.001 | The Coal Authority |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES6: Contaminated and Unstable Land | Require site investigation instead of "appropriate assessment". | Planning Practice Guidance (Land Stability) recommends that developers "should seek appropriate technical and environmental expert advice to assess the likely consequences of proposed developments on sites…". It is not considered that site investigation will always be required, but will be a decision based on the potential risk/impact of the development. Requirements for an "appropriate assessment" do not preclude site investigations, where it is considered necessary. | No | PDSP.086.011 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES7: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources and the Exploration, Appraisal and Production of Fossil Fuels | Support policy approach. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.003.025 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES7: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources and the Exploration, Appraisal and Production of Fossil Fuels | Policy should not apply to Site Allocations. | Site Allocations relate to the future uses of the site. There is no justifiable reason as to why sections of Policy ES7 should not apply to them. | No | PDSP.025.004 | Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES7: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources and the Exploration, Appraisal and Production of Fossil Fuels | Any exploration of fossil fuels should demonstrate that the proposed scheme will have a net zero impact on climate change. | Suggested additions to policy wording are welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.140.027 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES8: Use and Production of Secondary and Recycled Aggregates | Policy should encourage reuse of materials before becoming secondary aggregates. | Suggestions are welcomed. Amended policy wording recommended to ES4 (Sustainable Design of Buildings) to highlight re-use. | Yes | PDSP.116.042 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency | Policy ES8: Use and Production of Secondary and Recycled Aggregates | Policy should encourage reuse of materials before becoming secondary aggregates. | Suggestions are welcomed. Amended policy wording recommended to ES4 (Sustainable Design of Buildings) to highlight re-use. | Yes | PDSP.116.043 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Recommend inclusion of policy addressing risks of drought and water resources to help prepare for water shortages and weather extremes. Would encourage policies that reduce climate change impacts through measures e.g. carbon technology and also one that minimises environmental impacts of dewatering. Recommend a policy is included to protect groundwater from oil/gas/mineral extraction and development of Petrol Filling Stations. Highlighted Cross Connection Drainages issues, as causes pollution problems to watercourses e.g. foul to surface sewers. Significant issue in Sheffield. Recommend amends to Plan in relation to Regulated Sites and mitigation requirements for developers. Also suitability of site allocations needs to be checked against Regulated Sites and any mitigation requirements clearly set out in site conditions. | Policy amendment added regarding drought and water resources. Groundwater protection policies are already included within the Plan. Cross connection drainage issues are considered beyond the Local Plan remit. Regulated sites have been considered as part of the site allocation process and a site condition attached where applicable for assessment to be considered as part of any planning application. | Yes | PDSP.002.006 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Support objectives. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.025.003 | Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Wind turbine plans are insufficient and need extending. Ground source and air heat pumps should be encouraged in policy. | The "Investment Potential of Renewable Energy Technologies in Sheffield" (2014) report identified 2 locations in Sheffield for larger turbines. Larger turbines within the urban area are considered unlikely to be deliverable due to the topography of the city and the high variation in wind velocities. Policies ES1 & ES2 support use of low carbon heating sources. Description of specific technologies is considered too detailed for the Plan and is best served in a separate SPD. | No | PDSP.099.006 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Encourage local businesses to manufacture Swift and Bat Bricks. | This is beyond the scope of the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.124.001 | S11Swifts |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Increase carbon reduction requirements. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. Suggested rewording to introduction is welcomed | Yes | PDSP.140.019 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Increase carbon reduction requirements. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. | No | PDSP.140.020 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Fossil fuel usage should be prevented in homes by 2025. Plan should allow for coal mine heat storage and connection to energy networks. | A range of carbon reduction and sustainability standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Policy ES2 restricts the use of onsite combustion of fossil fuels where feasible. Policy ES3 provides support for renewable energy network and shared energy schemes. This would include networks that where heated via mine water. Both policies would be applicable upon adoption of the Plan. | No | PDSP.183.001 | Ann-Marie |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Remove all policy references and decision-making protocols relating to 'Climate Emergency' and 'Net Zero'. | Climate mitigation and adaptation are central principles of plan-making and are legally required via the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), Planning Act (2008) and Climate Change Act (2008). | No | PDSP.222.010 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | Increase sustainability requirements. | A range of carbon reduction and sustainability standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). 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. | No | PDSP.336.002 | Patricia Dawson-Butterworth |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 3: An Environmentally Sustainable City - Responding to the Climate Emergency |  | There needs to be a plan to retro-fit the whole city with insulation during the time period of the plan. | This is beyond the remit of the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.350.004 | Polly Blacker |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC1: Principles Guiding the Development of Strategic Housing Sites | Part 1: Appendix 1 and Annex A, should clearly  distinguish which allocations are classed a  as ‘strategic sites. | Accept the proposed change. Agree that it would be helpful to make a change to identify strategic sites in Annex 1. | Yes | PDSP.003.026 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC1: Principles Guiding the Development of Strategic Housing Sites | Supports the policy approach. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.007.009 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC1: Principles Guiding the Development of Strategic Housing Sites | The policy does not reflect the fact that not all older people's or specialist housing has the same land requirement. The policy does not give guidance on the percentage of older people's housing to be delivered on strategic sites and will not be effective. | No change needed. The policy does not explicitly require all types of homes to be delivered on all strategic sites, so no percentage requirement is made - rather an appropriate range is required. | No | PDSP.038.004 | Gladman Retirement Living Ltd |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC1: Principles Guiding the Development of Strategic Housing Sites | Cumulative impact of development in a wider area will be difficult to take into account. NC1 repeats design and environmental requirements. | No change needed. Whilst policy NC1 reflects the requirements of a range of policies in the Plan, it does not duplicate those requirements but rather draws together the range of factors that would need to be considered through the masterplanning of a Strategic Housing Site. The policy text refers to production of an appropriate masterplan, and therefore consideration of the cumulative effects of development within the local area would need to be judged on a site-by-site basis to ensure that the masterplan is fit for purpose, acknowledging that development will be at different stages. | No | PDSP.086.012 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC1: Principles Guiding the Development of Strategic Housing Sites | Amend policy to reflect neighbourhoods' capitalising on historic environment to increase sense of belonging. | No change needed. Acknowledge the comment being made and note that the historic environment is important in place-shaping. However, this does not need a specific reference within policy NC1. | No | PDSP.116.044 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC1: Principles Guiding the Development of Strategic Housing Sites | Amend policy to reflect neighbourhoods' capitalising on historic environment to increase sense of belonging. | No change needed. Acknowledge the comment being made and note that the historic environment is important in place-shaping. However, this does not need a specific reference within policy NC1. | No | PDSP.116.045 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC2: Development in the Residential Zones | Land to be removed from the Green Belt at Lightwood, but not allocated for development, should make reference to sensitive location in relation to Green Belt and adjoining conservation area. | No change needed. The land proposed for release from the Green Belt at Lightwood, adjoining Site Allocation SS17, does not need referencing within policy text as it is needed to ensure a robust Green Belt boundary in that location, and to ensure the Green Belt is adjusted to reflect existing built development on the ground. Once removed from the Green Belt the land would be within the Residential Policy Zone. Although policy NC2 does not reference the importance of protecting adjacent areas, other policies offer protection for sensitive areas alongside NC2, including GS3 Landscape Character. | No | PDSP.013.006 | North East Derbyshire District Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC2: Development in the Residential Zones | Purpose Built Student Accommodation should be classed as an acceptable use within Residential Zones. | No change needed. Purpose Built Student Accommodation is not acceptable in all residential areas. | No | PDSP.085.002 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC2: Development in the Residential Zones | Note that Policy NC2 includes use classes C4, E and F1. | No change needed. Observation noted. | No | PDSP.086.013 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC2: Development in the Residential Zones | Add “In Residential Zones traditional manufacturing by small businesses in buildings historically occupied by such businesses will be an acceptable use.” | If the manufacturing process is compatible with residential uses, then it will be a use within Class E(g)(iii), so would be judged on its merits. However, a B2 manufacturing use could cause nuisance issues to sensitive residential uses, so would be inappropriate. The policy applies only to new uses, so does not impact on existing manufacturing uses. A change to the policy is not therefore necessary. | No | PDSP.116.046 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC2: Development in the Residential Zones | Add “In Residential Zones traditional manufacturing by small businesses in buildings historically occupied by such businesses will be an acceptable use.” | If the manufacturing process is compatible with residential uses, then it will be a use within Class E(g)(iii), so would be judged on its merits. However, a B2 manufacturing use could cause nuisance issues to sensitive residential uses, so would be inappropriate. The policy applies only to new uses, so does not impact on existing manufacturing uses. A change to the policy is not therefore necessary. | No | PDSP.116.047 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | Housing requirement should be uplifted. Concerned the levels of affordable housing needed won’t be delivered. States policy is contrary to the NPPF. | The housing requirement proposed in the Plan aligns with the city's jobs growth targets in the City Region Strategic Economic Plan. Setting a higher requirement runs the risk that either there would be insufficient demand for the homes (from people who could afford to buy on the open market) or demand would be diverted from other districts thereby undermining delivery on those areas. Simply setting a higher housing requirement does not mean that more affordable homes will be delivered. There is limited scope to increase the % requirements for delivery through planning obligations (S106) as set out in the WPVA, therefore other methods need to be maximised. The Council are already looking beyond S106 delivery at ways to support and facilitate other delivery mechanisms e.g. Registered Providers, the Council. | No | PDSP.016.019 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | More housing site allocations in the most viable Housing Market Areas to meet the housing requirement. | There is limited scope to increase the % requirements for delivery through planning obligations (S106) as set out in the WPVA, therefore other methods need to be maximised. The Council are already looking beyond S106 delivery at ways to support and facilitate other delivery mechanisms e.g. Registered Providers, the Council. | No | PDSP.020.013 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | Considers affordable housing requirement to hinder viability. States housing requirement should be uplifted to meet affordable housing requirements. | The housing requirement proposed in the Plan aligns with the city's jobs growth targets in the City Region Strategic Economic Plan. Setting a higher requirement runs the risk that either there would be insufficient demand for the homes (from people who could afford to buy on the open market) or demand would be diverted from other districts thereby undermining delivery on those areas. Simply setting a higher housing requirement does not mean that more affordable homes will be delivered. There is limited scope to increase the % requirements for delivery through planning obligations (S106) as set out in the WPVA, therefore other methods need to be maximised. The Council are already looking beyond S106 delivery at ways to support and facilitate other delivery mechanisms e.g. Registered Providers, the Council. | No | PDSP.020.014 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | Criteria b) should be amended to be a starting point rather than a requirement with reference to the SHMA. The policy should permit open market tenders for Registered Providers operating in Sheffield and should avoid prescribed transfer values. | Part b) is based on SHMA evidence and is a requirement in the NPPF (paragraph 62) to be reflected in policy. In addition, the policy requirement and transfer values have been applied through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.021.003 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes Sheffield (Submitted by Sheppard Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | The second bullet point in the first paragraph of policy NC3 should be removed, and the effect of smaller sites when combined should not be a consideration or subject to an affordable housing requirement. | At the time of an application the Council would need to be informed if there will be an opportunity to be part of a bigger development. This will reduce the likelihood of co-located sites coming forward piecemeal without contributing to affordable housing delivery. | No | PDSP.025.005 | Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that specialist older people’s housing will be considered at the development management stage. It is therefore not considered necessary to develop a specific policy for Extra Care Housing. It would be more appropriate to set a nil affordable housing target for sheltered and extra care development, at the very least in urban areas. | In respect of specialist accommodation the Council recognise the challenges of affordability in both meeting the need and delivering this type of accommodation. To balance this the policy (and Government Guidance Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-2019050) allows for flexibility and testing through financial appraisal. | No | PDSP.028.002 | Churchill Retirement Living Ltd. (Submitted by Planning Issues Ltd.) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that sufficient supply of affordable housing won't be delivered due to a lower housing requirement. Sites will become unviable if they try and deliver affordable housing and therefore developers will seek to negotiate a reduction in affordable housing undermining a key aim of the Plan. | The housing requirement proposed in the Plan aligns with the city's jobs growth targets in the City Region Strategic Economic Plan. Setting a higher requirement runs the risk that either there would be insufficient demand for the homes (from people who could afford to buy on the open market), or demand would be diverted from other districts thereby undermining delivery on those areas. Simply setting a higher housing requirement does not mean that more affordable homes will be delivered. There is limited scope to increase the % requirements for delivery through planning obligations (S106) as set out in the WPVA, therefore other methods need to be maximised. The Council are already looking beyond S106 delivery at ways to support and facilitate other delivery mechanisms e.g. Registered Providers, the Council. | No | PDSP.034.010 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that affordable housing requirement is not justified as it impacts on delivery and viability of sites. | On balance, the Council consider that the recommendations in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment alongside the Council priority to delivery affordable housing, and public interventions in the market (e.g. the Central Area Strategy work) the policies are deliverable. | No | PDSP.035.008 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | Considers affordable housing requirement to be inconsistent with the NPPF. The requirement is too high. | Policy requirements have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The 10% NPPF affordable home ownership requirement will be met through First Homes tenure requirement (scenarios are in the First Homes Position Statement). | No | PDSP.037.003 | Gladman Developments Ltd |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that it is not justified that any development of specialist housing for older people, regardless of Use Class, with the exception of care or nursing homes, would be required to provide affordable housing. States that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment has failed to run an assessment on the full range of accommodation where a contribution is being sought (sheltered and extra care) and the Council has gone against the WPVA recommendation to not seek a contribution. | Recognise the challenges of affordability in both meeting the need and delivering this type of accommodation. To balance this the policy (and Government Guidance Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509) allows for flexibility and testing through financial appraisal. | No | PDSP.038.005 | Gladman Retirement Living Ltd |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that the levels of 10% and 30% affordable housing requirement are not supported by evidence, and that the evidence is that for older persons accommodation these should be 0%. Does not support the approach of providing affordable housing and believes the required levels won’t be delivered due to viability. | The policy reflects the Councils priority to deliver affordable housing and part c) allows for flexibility where the full policy contribution is not provided. In respect of specialist accommodation the Council recognise the challenges of affordability in both meeting the need and delivering this type of accommodation. To balance this the policy (and Government Guidance Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509) allows for flexibility and testing through financial appraisal. | No | PDSP.042.040 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that the level of affordable housing required to be delivered through the plan period is not viable and achievable. States that the housing requirement should be adjusted to help meet need. | The policy requirements have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The housing requirement proposed in the Plan aligns with the city's jobs growth targets in the City Region Strategic Economic Plan. Setting a higher requirement runs the risk that either there would be insufficient demand for the homes (from people who could afford to buy on the open market) or demand would be diverted from other districts thereby undermining delivery on those areas. Simply setting a higher housing requirement does not mean that more affordable homes will be delivered. | No | PDSP.054.005 | Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that schemes delivering housing for older people should be exempt from delivering affordable housing. | In respect of specialist accommodation, the Council recognise the challenges of affordability in both meeting the need and delivering this type of accommodation. To balance this the policy (and Government Guidance Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-2019050) allows for flexibility and testing through financial appraisal. | No | PDSP.056.005 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that the level of affordable housing to be delivered is too high and won't be achieved. States that this would only happen if there was an uplift in the housing requirement. | The policy requirements have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The housing requirement proposed in the Plan aligns with the city's jobs growth targets in the City Region Strategic Economic Plan. Setting a higher requirement runs the risk that either there would be insufficient demand for the homes (from people who could afford to buy on the open market) or demand would be diverted from other districts thereby undermining delivery on those areas. Simply setting a higher housing requirement does not mean that more affordable homes will be delivered. | No | PDSP.067.006 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that the requirements of the policy are not consistent with national policy and so is unsound. The respondent’s promoted site should be allocated and more flexibility added into the policy. | The housing requirement proposed in the Plan aligns with the city's jobs growth targets in the City Region Strategic Economic Plan. Setting a higher requirement runs the risk that either there would be insufficient demand for the homes (from people who could afford to buy on the open market) or demand would be diverted from other districts thereby undermining delivery on those areas. Simply setting a higher housing requirement does not mean that more affordable homes will be delivered. There is limited scope to increase the % requirements for delivery through planning obligations (S106) as set out in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, therefore other methods need to be maximised. The Council are already looking beyond S106 delivery at ways to support and facilitate other delivery mechanisms e.g. Registered Providers, the Council. | No | PDSP.079.021 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | Affordable housing contributions should be based on amount of units rather than floorspace. The requirement for some sites to deliver affordable housing with adjoining site is contradictory to the NPPF. | The Council will continue to calculate the affordable housing requirement as a proportion of the gross internal floor area. | No | PDSP.086.014 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | Policy NC3 to be adapted to recognise Build to Rent as set out in the NPPF. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2018 found that this was a new -sub-market in the private rented sector and found very little evidence of need to inform a policy. Policy CA3 (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George, University of Sheffield) supports Build to Rent accommodation in these locations. Build to Rent schemes will be required to be policy compliant with affordable housing percentages set out in Policy NC3 and the Council will use the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance as a material consideration. | No | PDSP.091.002 | Watkin Jones Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | The requirement to provide affordable housing will be limited by viability and not be enough. The Council should review affordable housing requirements regularly. Comment calls on Government support to deliver more affordable homes. | The affordable housing requirements can be reviewed as part of the Local Plan review every 5 years. The Council are working with Homes England to look at ways to deliver more affordable housing in the city. | No | PDSP.099.007 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing | States that the baseline aspiration of a policy or combination of policies is set too high as this will jeopardise future housing delivery. States that affordable housing requirement may be too difficult. States concern that the NPPF requirement in para 65 (where 10% of the overall number of homes to be for affordable home ownership) will not be met. Concern NC3 may not deliver this requirement and asks the Council to provide evidence. | On balance, the Council consider that the recommendations in the WPVA alongside Council priority to delivery affordable housing, and public interventions in the market (e.g. the Central Area Strategy work) the policies are deliverable. The 10% NPPF affordable home ownership requirement will be met through First Homes tenure requirement (scenarios are in the First Homes Position Statement). | No | PDSP.112.010 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Questions the evidence to underpin requiring 98% M4(2) and 2% M4(3) (as per the criteria in Government Guidance on housing: optional technical standards). Policy requirement % should be reduced to allow for more viable developments. | A topic paper will give more detail on the justification for the additional Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(3). M4(2) and M4(3) requirements in Policy NC4 have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment . | No | PDSP.021.004 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes Sheffield (Submitted by Sheppard Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Questions the evidence to underpin requiring 98% M4(2) and 2% M4(3) (as per the criteria in Government Guidance on housing: optional technical standards). Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(2) and M4(3) will make a number of housing sites unviable. | A background paper will give more detail on the justification for the additional Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(3). M4(2) and M4(3) requirements in Policy NC4 have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.025.006 | Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Questions the evidence for the enhanced requirement of 100% M4(3) for specialist accommodation and reference appeal decision. Amend policy wording and requirement: The removal of the requirement imposing a 100% M4(3) requirement for all specialist older persons’ housing. | The policy is worded with 'should be' to allow for flexibility in the provision of 100% M4(3) standards for all specialist accommodation. The policy (and Government Guidance Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509) allows for flexibility and testing through financial appraisal. | No | PDSP.028.003 | Churchill Retirement Living Ltd. (Submitted by Planning Issues Ltd.) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Optional Technical Standards 98% M4(2) and 2% M4(3) policy requirement is too high a threshold. Viability will be an issue for SME and self-build developers. | A background paper will give more detail on the justification for the additional Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(3). Policy requirement in part (a) and (b) have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. | No | PDSP.035.009 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | The Plan fails to explain how it intends to meet the needs of older people over the plan period or what the level of need is. It fails to properly distinguish between the different typologies of elderly people’s housing to provide for choice, and the policy is not effective because it has no mechanism to ensure all typologies are met over the plan period. The policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective. Part (d) Amend wording in policy to reflect definition (error) policy states 'close the essential services' but definition box states 'close to local facilities'. Part (d) Local facilities - policy too restrictive and will limit number of sites to be developed for specialist accommodation. Part (d) requirement to be 400m to local services doesn’t take account of the type of specialist accommodation e.g. why be near shops if it is a nursing or care home. The policy does not set out an indicative figure or range of units needed as per PPG Housing for Older People. | Agree to amend wording of part (d) to read 'close to local facilities' to reflect the policy definition wording. Agree to remove part c) as this doesn't take account of the type of specialist accommodation (level of care/ size) and doesn't therefore directly link to local health facility capacity. The rest of the paragraph allows for each scheme to be assessed depending on the level of care offered as part of the specialist accommodation. | Yes | PDSP.038.006 | Gladman Retirement Living Ltd |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Evidence - policy does not set out an overall level of need for older persons housing, identify the areas of need, or distinguish the types and tenures needed to provide better choice, leading to a generic policy. The WPVA must assess the different typologies of specialist housing recognising the different costs associated with them in distinction to C3 development and ensure not subject to affordable housing requirement. Allocate specific sites, anywhere in Sheffield, which are not subject to planning obligations like affordable housing. This would deliver the critical need for different types and tenures of older persons accommodation across the city (not just in areas of need). Amend part c) too restrictive by only allowing specialist accommodation in areas with health service capacity, and doesn’t take account of how different types of provision can reduce the impact on local health services. | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has assessed models of specialist housing sheltered and extra care models. Specific sites have not been allocated for specialist accommodation, but it is an acceptable use on all allocated Housing Sites. The policy is flexible and enables development across the city through planning applications. Agree to remove part c) as this doesn't take account of the type of specialist accommodation (level of care/ size) and doesn't therefore directly link to local health facility capacity. The rest of the paragraph allows for each scheme to be assessed depending on the level of care offered as part of the specialist accommodation. | Yes | PDSP.042.041 | Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Allocate respondent’s promoted site (HELAA ref S04637) in the Green Belt for older persons housing (subject to planning application). | Site is subject to planning application and outside the scope of the Sheffield Plan. The site is in the Green Belt and allocation would not be consistent with the spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.048.002 | Inspired Villages (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Question the evidence for the enhanced requirement for 100% M4(3) for specialist accommodation. Specialist housing should be supported anywhere not just in areas of need and should. Amend wording so not to repeat national Building regs policy (100% M4(2). Remove part(c) of policy. | The policy is worded with 'should be' to allow for flexibility in the provision of 100% M4(3) standards for all specialist accommodation. The policy (and Government Guidance Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509) allows for flexibility and testing through financial appraisal. The policy wording 'promotes' specialist accommodation in areas of need, which doesn't stop developments in other areas of the city. Paragraph 4.19 states why the policy confirms the Government's requirement for all new homes to be 'adaptable and accessible'. Agree to remove part c) as this doesn't take account of the type of specialist accommodation (level of care/ size) and doesn't therefore directly link to local health facility capacity. The rest of the paragraph allows for each scheme to be assessed depending on the level of care offered as part of the specialist accommodation. | Yes | PDSP.056.006 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | The requirement for Optional Technical Standards 98% M4(2) and 2% M4(3) is too high. Concerned about viability particularly for SME developers. Concerned about the policy requirement for 'wheelchair adaptable homes should be located on the flattest part of a site' due to Sheffield’s topography. Part (d) requirement to be 400m from local services doesn’t take account of the type of specialist accommodation e.g. why be near shops if it is a nursing or care home. Supported accommodation to be wheelchair adaptable should not be required throughout the development. | Policy requirement in part (a) and (b) have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The policy wording allows for flexibility ('where feasible' and 'should be') for locating wheelchair adaptable homes on the flattest part of the site. Agree to remove part c) as this doesn't take account of the type of specialist accommodation (level of care/ size) and doesn't therefore directly link to local health facility capacity. The rest of the paragraph allows for each scheme to be assessed depending on the level of care offered as part of the specialist accommodation. | Yes | PDSP.086.015 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Question the evidence to underpin the 98% M4(2) and 2% M4(3) Optional Technical Standards policy requirement. Policy wording to directly reference M4(2) and M4(3). Policy wording should include transitional period to implement M4(2) (3) due to viability. Policy wording should make clear general needs housing excludes Purpose Built Student Accommodation. | A topic paper will give more detail on the justification for the additional Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(3). The 98% requirement for M4(2) and 2% requirement for M4(3) optional technical standards are referenced in the definitions part of the policy wording. We will follow any Government Guidance for the transitional period to implement higher standards. See Policy NC6 (part d) for requirements for Purpose Built Student Accommodation. | No | PDSP.088.006 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Ensure design of specialist housing for older or disabled people includes internal and external communal space. | Comment welcomed and noted. No change proposed. | No | PDSP.093.001 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Object to the gradient exemption for wheelchair adaptable homes in policy NC4. Insufficient overall allowance to meet the needs. In relation to Optional Technical Standards M4(2) - increase scope to include wet rooms which is currently a requirement in M4(3) dwellings only. Policy should require that all developments have a minimum of 5% M4(3) requirements. | Policy requirement in part (a) and (b) have been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and any changes in the optional technical standards would not be viable. | No | PDSP.093.002 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living | Question the evidence behind requirement for higher optional technical standards. Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(2) and M4(3) only apply using criteria in PPG. Policy wording should include a transitional period to implement M4(2) (3) due to viability. | A topic paper will give more detail on the justification for the additional Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(3). We will follow any Government Guidance for the transitional period to implement higher standards. Paragraph 4.19 states why the policy confirms the Government's requirement for all new homes to be 'adaptable and accessible'. | No | PDSP.112.011 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Development of HMOs in flood risk areas should not result in ground-floor or basement level self-contained rooms. | Proposed rewording is welcomed, and has been added to Policy GS9. | Yes | PDSP.002.009 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Insufficient evidence that planned densities can be achieved with housing mix. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified a need for a mix of housing sizes across the city, including the need for larger (2 bedroom +) units in the City Centre. One of the objectives of the Sheffield Plan is to create neighbourhoods that work for everyone. The City Centre Strategic Vision envisages a broader mix of housing in the City Centre. Providing a better mix of homes will support the wider City Centre economy. The proposed policy is considered flexible enough and provides the opportunity for a range of housing types to be delivered across a development | No | PDSP.016.020 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Insufficient evidence that planned densities can be achieved with housing mix. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified a need for a mix of housing sizes across the city, including the need for larger (2 bedroom +) units in the City Centre. One of the objectives of the Sheffield Plan is to create neighbourhoods that work for everyone. The City Centre Strategic Vision envisages a broader mix of housing in the City Centre. Providing a better mix of homes will support the wider City Centre economy. The proposed policy is considered flexible enough and provides the opportunity for a range of housing types to be delivered across a development. | No | PDSP.020.015 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Insufficient evidence that planned densities can be achieved with housing mix. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified a need for a mix of housing sizes across the city, including the need for larger (2 bedroom +) units in the City Centre. One of the objectives of the Sheffield Plan is to create neighbourhoods that work for everyone. The City Centre Strategic Vision envisages a broader mix of housing in the City Centre. Providing a better mix of homes will support the wider City Centre economy. The proposed policy is considered flexible enough and provides the opportunity for a range of housing types to be delivered across a development | No | PDSP.020.016 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Planning policy should not plan for homes for people on different incomes. Requirement for unit mix of schemes over 30 units is challenging. Requiring a mix of units impacts deliverability. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified a need for a mix of housing sizes across the city, including the need for larger (2 bedroom +) units in the City Centre. One of the objectives of the Sheffield Plan is to create neighbourhoods that work for everyone. The City Centre Strategic Vision envisages a broader mix of housing in the City Centre. Providing a better mix of homes will support the wider City Centre economy. | No | PDSP.035.010 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Insufficient evidence that planned densities can be achieved with housing mix. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified a need for a mix of housing sizes across the city, including the need for larger (2 bedroom +) units in the City Centre. One of the objectives of the Sheffield Plan is to create neighbourhoods that work for everyone. The City Centre Strategic Vision envisages a broader mix of housing in the City Centre. Providing a better mix of homes will support the wider City Centre economy. The proposed policy is considered flexible enough and provides the opportunity for a range of housing types to be delivered across a development | No | PDSP.040.005 | Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Insufficient evidence that planned densities can be achieved with housing mix. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified a need for a mix of housing sizes across the city, including the need for larger (2 bedroom +) units in the City Centre. One of the objectives of the Sheffield Plan is to create neighbourhoods that work for everyone. The City Centre Strategic Vision envisages a broader mix of housing in the City Centre. Providing a better mix of homes will support the wider City Centre economy. The proposed policy is considered flexible enough and provides the opportunity for a range of housing types to be delivered across a development. | No | PDSP.079.022 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Make it clear that policy does not relate to Purpose Built Student Accommodation. | The Policy is worded to explicitly apply to "Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), hostels and shared housing". Rewording of the policy is not considered necessary. | No | PDSP.085.003 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Planning policy should not plan for homes for people on different incomes. Requirement for unit mix of schemes over 30 units is challenging. | No change needed. Planning a range of housing types and tenures helps meet the main aims and objectives of the Plan. Housing mix has been tested within the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA) and is considered viable. | No | PDSP.086.016 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Unit mix should not apply to PBSA schemes. | The Purpose-Built Student Accommodation Market Study identified that there is currently an oversupply of PBSA studios in the city. The study recommended that a presumption against all studio developments is adopted. This policy as worded will prevent all-studio developments. Mix for Purpose Built Student Accommodation schemes is also encouraged through Policy NC6. | No | PDSP.088.007 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Variety in wheelchair adapted homes. | Requirements for provisions of accessible and adaptable housing across the whole City are included within a number of other proposed policies within the plan, most notably NC4 (Housing for independent and supported living). | No | PDSP.093.003 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Take a more flexible approach to housing mix in the City Centre. | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified a need for a mix of housing sizes across the city, including the need for larger (2 bedroom +) units in the City Centre. One of the objectives of the Sheffield Plan is to create neighbourhoods that work for everyone. The City Centre Strategic Vision envisages a broader mix of housing in the City Centre. Providing a better mix of homes will support the wider City Centre economy. The proposed policy is considered flexible enough and provides the opportunity for a range of housing types to be delivered across a development | No | PDSP.112.012 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | Reword policy to improve clarity. | Proposed rewording is welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.116.048 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities | In policy NC5 (c): replace “will be not be” with “will not be”. | Proposed rewording is welcomed. | Yes | PDSP.116.049 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation | Development of Purpose-Built Student Accommodation in flood risk areas should not result in ground-floor or basement level self-contained rooms. | Proposed rewording is welcomed and has been added to Policy GS9. | Yes | PDSP.002.010 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation | Support policy approach. | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.074.004 | Sheffield Hallam University (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation | Identification of areas suitable for Purpose Built Student Accommodation should be removed from the policy. | The Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) Market Study highlighted that schemes (or future schemes) may be at risk where they are more than a 10-minute walk from university campuses. This is due to the high number of bedspaces that already exist with that radius. The City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Framework further identifies some Central Area Neighbourhoods as areas where new PBSA should not be encouraged. This will help achieve a greater mix of housing types for a variety of end users across the Central Area and help achieve the overarching spatial strategy of the Plan. The student to bed ratio approach to PBSA enables new PBSA to be delivered where there are sufficient changes in student numbers or available bedspaces in the city. | No | PDSP.085.004 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation | Remove student-bedspace ratio limits on Purpose Built Student Accommodation. | The Purpose Built Student Accommodation Market Study identified a student to bed ratio in the City of 1.5:1, an unhealthy level in national terms. Analysis from the study recommended a ratio of between 1.8:1 to 2:1 should be achieved. The policy sets a requirement of 1.8:1 which is considered appropriate and would provide a high-end number of beds without achieving unhealthy levels. The policy allows the universities to support specific schemes outside of this range where they feel it would bring a significant benefit. This process would operate independently of any universities current nomination processes. | No | PDSP.086.017 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation | West Bar should be included within the area suitable for Purpose Built Student Accommodation. | The Purpose Built Student Accommodation Market Study highlighted that schemes (or future schemes) may be at risk where they are more than a 10-minute walk from university campuses. This is due to the high number of bedspaces that already exist with that radius. The City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Framework identifies the West Bar Central Area Neighbourhood as an area where new Purpose Built Student Accommodation should not be encouraged. Expansion of the area to the West Bar site is therefore not considered as appropriate. | No | PDSP.088.008 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation |  | Support is welcomed | No | PDSP.091.004 | Watkin Jones Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation | Increase number of accessible units. | A range of accessibility standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall Plan viability. Inclusion of a higher requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. | No | PDSP.093.004 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites | Suggests adding in a new criterion that any new sites or extensions in flood zones 2 and 3 would be subject to local and national flood risk policy. | No change. Any development would be subject to local and national flood risk policies based on the vulnerability of the use and the flood zone. | No | PDSP.002.011 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites | Comment supports policy criteria and approach. | Comment noted. | No | PDSP.086.018 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites | Objects to traveller site allocation. | Site SES03 is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required with respect to matters such as air quality. However, an additional/updated condition on development is proposed that will ensure an environmental buffer strip is provided between the development and neighbouring housing. Other adjustments to the conditions on development have been proposed for the purpose of clarity, or in response to relevant points raised.  The main issues raised in the representations with respect to site SES03 are addressed further in the [Strategy & Resources Committee Report (2nd August)](https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=641&MId=8902&Ver=4). Please refer to this report for detailed responses. | No | PDSP.218.001 | Dennis100 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites | Comment states that the current criteria used to allocate Gypsy and Traveller sites does not consider several factors including pollution, overhead cables, loss of open space, wildlife habitat and impact on traffic. Remove Gypsy and Traveller site allocation. | Site SES03 is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required with respect to matters such as air quality. However, an additional/updated condition on development is proposed that will ensure an environmental buffer strip is provided between the development and neighbouring housing. Other adjustments to the conditions on development have been proposed for the purpose of clarity, or in response to relevant points raised.  The main issues raised in the representations with respect to site SES03 are addressed further in the [Strategy & Resources Committee Report (2nd August)](https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=641&MId=8902&Ver=4). Please refer to this report for detailed responses. | No | PDSP.231.001 | Georgia Milliard |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites | Objects to Traveller site allocation. Site allocation will cause financial deprivation in the area. | Site SES03 is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required with respect to matters such as air quality. However, an additional/updated condition on development is proposed that will ensure an environmental buffer strip is provided between the development and neighbouring housing. Other adjustments to the conditions on development have been proposed for the purpose of clarity, or in response to relevant points raised.  The main issues raised in the representations with respect to site SES03 are addressed further in the [Strategy & Resources Committee Report (2nd August)](https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=641&MId=8902&Ver=4). Please refer to this report for detailed responses. | No | PDSP.252.001 | J |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites | Objects to Traveller site allocation. | Site SES03 is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required with respect to matters such as air quality. However, an additional/updated condition on development is proposed that will ensure an environmental buffer strip is provided between the development and neighbouring housing. Other adjustments to the conditions on development have been proposed for the purpose of clarity, or in response to relevant points raised.  The main issues raised in the representations with respect to site SES03 are addressed further in the [Strategy & Resources Committee Report (2nd August)](https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=641&MId=8902&Ver=4). Please refer to this report for detailed responses. | No | PDSP.376.001 | Sharon Griffiths |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites | The criteria used to allocate Gypsy and Traveller sites do not consider factors such as pollution, overhead cables, loss of open space, wildlife habitat and impact on traffic. Remove Gypsy and Traveller site allocation. | Site SES03 is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required with respect to matters such as air quality. However, an additional/updated condition on development is proposed that will ensure an environmental buffer strip is provided between the development and neighbouring housing. Other adjustments to the conditions on development have been proposed for the purpose of clarity, or in response to relevant points raised.  The main issues raised in the representations with respect to site SES03 are addressed further in the [Strategy & Resources Committee Report (2nd August)](https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=641&MId=8902&Ver=4). Please refer to this report for detailed responses. | No | PDSP.399.001 | TedRayner |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Oppose introduction of space standards. Needs properly evidenced to demonstrate need. Greater flexibility should be given to compliance. | No change. | No | PDSP.016.021 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Concerned that policy will impact on meeting density requirements. Greater flexibility should be given to compliance. | No change needed. Nationally Described Space Standards were included in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. | No | PDSP.020.017 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Concerned that policy will impact on meeting density requirements. Greater flexibility should be given to compliance. | No change needed. Nationally Described Space Standards were included in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. | No | PDSP.020.018 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Oppose introduction of space standards. Should be given flexibility around compliance as could impact on meeting densities. | No change. | No | PDSP.021.005 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes Sheffield (Submitted by Sheppard Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Parts b and c are overly prescriptive and should be deleted. | No change. | No | PDSP.035.011 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Concerned that policy will impact on meeting density requirements. Greater flexibility should be given to compliance. Concerned that policy will impact on viability. | No change needed. Nationally Described Space Standards were included in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. | No | PDSP.039.005 | Gleeson Homes |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Opposed to introduction of space standards. Needs to be properly evidenced to demonstrate need. Greater flexibility should be given to compliance. | No change. | No | PDSP.079.023 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Suggest amendments to parts a and b, with Purpose Built Student Accommodation only complying with part b. | No change. | No | PDSP.085.005 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Parts b and c are overly prescriptive and should be deleted. | No change. | No | PDSP.086.019 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Support Nationally Described Space Standards but there should be a transition period. Requires clarification as to application on Student Accommodation schemes. | No change. Part (b) requires adequate living space for student accommodation. | No | PDSP.088.009 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Suggest amendments to ensure amenity space is accessible with level thresholds and to ensure private/communal space is provided to allow assistance dogs to relieve themselves. | No change needed regarding level thresholds as covered under policy D1. Required in relation to assistance dogs as this is covered under policy NC8 through provision of appropriate private amenity/garden space. | Yes | PDSP.093.005 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards | Oppose introduction of space standards. Needs to be properly evidenced to demonstrate need. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.112.013 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | The historic environment should be a consideration in determining appropriate densities. Lower densities should be allowed where necessary to safeguard the character of a historic area or protect a heritage asset. | Accept the suggested amendment to reflect the sensitives of the historic environment in relation to density ranges. | Yes | PDSP.003.027 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | The policy requires flexibility to take account of other policies in the Plan. Propose Green Belt release for housing allocation. | No change needed. Green Belt release for proposed housing allocation would be inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy. | No | PDSP.016.022 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | Densities are higher than other nearby authorities and do not reflect the character of areas. NC5 and NC9 are in conflict as a mix of size and types of homes cannot be delivered above 50 dwellings per hectare. | No change needed. Policy reflects existing practice and is reflective of different locations within the urban area. Quality design can ensure a mix of typologies above 50 dwellings per hectare. | No | PDSP.020.019 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | Densities are higher than other nearby authorities and do not reflect the character of areas. NC5 and NC9 are in conflict as a mix of size and types of homes cannot be delivered above 50 dwellings per hectare. | No change needed. Policy reflects existing practice and is reflective of different locations within the urban area. Quality design can ensure a mix of typologies above 50 dwellings per hectare. | No | PDSP.020.020 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | Clarify whether Local Plan capacity evidence base reflects the ranges in NC9. | No change needed. Capacity takes account of appropriate density ranges as described in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. | No | PDSP.035.012 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | The policy requires flexibility to take account of other policies in the Plan. Propose Green Belt release for housing allocation. | No change needed. Green Belt release for proposed housing allocation would be inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy. | No | PDSP.079.024 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | Density policy should not have an upper threshold and instead be considered on a site by site basis based on characteristics. | No change needed. The City Centre has no upper density threshold and therefore does not constrain the density of accommodation in this area. Acknowledge that purpose built student accommodation is often delivered at high density and the policy allows for this in appropriate locations. | No | PDSP.085.006 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | Clarify whether Local Plan capacity evidence base reflects the ranges in NC9. | No change needed. Capacity takes account of appropriate density ranges as described in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. | No | PDSP.086.020 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | Support the policy approach. | No change needed. Support noted. | No | PDSP.088.010 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC9: Housing Density | Density policy should allow flexibility in relation to site specific conditions, market aspirations, deliverability, viability and accessibility. | No change needed. The density ranges are broad, and allow for a variety of typologies to be delivered which would respond to these issues. | No | PDSP.112.014 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC10: Development in District and Local Centres | The District Centre Boundary for Crystal Peaks has not been determined in a manner which meets the tests of soundness within the NPPF. | The objection refers to a specific Policy Zone designation rather than the wording of the policy itself. It is considered that the boundary for the Crystal Peaks District Centre is appropriate. The Sheffield Retail and Leisure Study in paragraph 9.15 states "The large majority of Sheffield’s district centres are vital and viable and have vacancy rates that are below that national average rate of 14.1% (in respect of the proportion of units that are vacant). The only district centres that have vacancy rates in excess of this figure are Crystal Peaks, London Road and Woodseats, which are among the largest district centres by size or total number of units in the authority area. This demonstrates that smaller centres – which tend to have a focus around convenience goods retail and services which meet day-to-day local needs – are performing most strongly." Table 9.3 shows that Crystal Peaks is the second largest District Centre in Sheffield in terms of total retail floorspace. We consider that the centre is large enough to meet the needs of its catchment as shown and that to increase its size could lead to increased vacancy rates in a Centre that already has relatively high rates. This could undermine the vitality and viability of the Centre as designated. The area to the north is Drakehouse Retail Park that has a different and wider than local retail function. | No | PDSP.017.001 | Albany Courtyard Investments (Submitted by Tetra Tech) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC10: Development in District and Local Centres | As offices (Class E(g)(i)) at street level do not fall within the preferred use, it is unclear if they are allowed in district and local centres at all. Clarification is needed. | Paragraph 2.11 in Part 2 explains that the omission of offices from the policy means that they have an 'amber light' status, where other considerations will need to be taken into account before deciding whether they are acceptable in principle. | No | PDSP.086.021 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC10: Development in District and Local Centres | The Plan should specify the development of exhibition spaces among its 'Preferred' uses and include indoor or outdoor affordable exhibition spaces and artists' studio spaces among the 'local community uses'. Also include Art, Culture and Heritage Trails, which add interest, vibrancy and character to an area, and help to enhance, protect and conserve the cultural and heritage interest of neighbourhoods. | Agree that such uses would be appropriate, but they are already included as Acceptable in Use Class F1. Trails are not a specific land use for buildings so are not appropriate to be specifically listed. | No | PDSP.138.001 | Sheffield Visual Arts Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC11: Access to Key Local Services and Community Facilities in New Residential Developments | Support for the minimum service frequency standard but need to ensure this can be sustained by developers in the long term. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.005.003 | National Highways |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC11: Access to Key Local Services and Community Facilities in New Residential Developments | Policy approach reflects Plan objectives for fair, inclusive healthy city. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.014.015 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC11: Access to Key Local Services and Community Facilities in New Residential Developments | Many sites will not meet the policy requirements as the bar is too high. | No change needed. Site allocations were tested against the policy requirements to ensure that they could be reasonably met. | No | PDSP.086.022 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC12: Hot Food Takeaways | Policy NC12's policy principles are supported but it fails to provide an evidence based way of achieving its objectives. It is too restrictive and therefore unsound. The 800m exclusion zone is inconsistent with national planning policy. The policy is inconsistent, discriminatory and disproportionate. Examination of other plans has found similar policy approaches to be unsound. There is no justification for the ban on expansion. There needs to be further exploration into policies that are more positive, have a reputable evidence base and that comply with the Framework. | In line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 92c and 93b, the policy takes into account the need to support Sheffield’s Food and Wellbeing Strategy 2018 and its 'Whole Systems' approach to making good food the easy choice for everyone. The policy's 800 metre catchment (or, 10 minute walk), is based on the concept of the '20 minute neighbourhood', where most peoples needs are met within a 10 minute walk or cycle ride. In considering restrictions in locations close to schools, the proposed guidance will particularly seek to influence improved health in children and young people.  A minor amendment to the policy is proposed that would further limit the impact of the Policy on *existing* hot-food takeaways in District Centres where hot food takeaways already make up 25% of the units in the Centre. This amendment would allow existing business that are more than 800 metres from a secondary school to extend their opening hours and also their premises to provide, say, better kitchen facilities. However, extensions into adjoining shop units in such District Centres would be restricted. | Yes | PDSP.057.001 | McDonald’s Restaurants LTD (Submitted by Planware Ltd) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC12: Hot Food Takeaways | Disagrees with the 800m exclusion zone around secondary schools. Suggest removal due to lack of effectiveness; no justification; and inconsistency with National Policy | In line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 92c and 93b, the policy takes into account the need to support Sheffield’s Food and Wellbeing Strategy 2018 and its 'Whole Systems' approach to making good food the easy choice for everyone. The policy's 800 metre catchment (or, 10 minute walk), is based on the concept of the '20 minute neighbourhood', where most peoples needs are met within a 10 minute walk or cycle ride. In considering restrictions in locations close to schools, the proposed guidance will particularly seek to influence improved health in children and young people.  A minor amendment to the policy is proposed that would further limit the impact of the Policy on *existing* hot-food takeaways in District Centres where hot food takeaways already make up 25% of the units in the Centre. This amendment would allow existing business that are more than 800 metres from a secondary school to extend their opening hours and also their premises to provide, say, better kitchen facilities. However, extensions into adjoining shop units in such District Centres would be restricted. | Yes | PDSP.086.023 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC12: Hot Food Takeaways | Disagrees with the 800m exclusion zone around secondary schools (policy NC12 part (a)). Seeks its removal from the policy, on grounds of: Lack of effectiveness; Lack of justification; and Lack of consistency with National Policy. | In line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 92c and 93b, the policy takes into account the need to support Sheffield’s Food and Wellbeing Strategy 2018 and its 'Whole Systems' approach to making good food the easy choice for everyone. The policy's 800 metre catchment (or, 10 minute walk), is based on the concept of the '20 minute neighbourhood', where most peoples needs are met within a 10 minute walk or cycle ride. In considering restrictions in locations close to schools, the proposed guidance will particularly seek to influence improved health in children and young people.  A minor amendment to the policy is proposed that would further limit the impact of the Policy on *existing* hot-food takeaways in District Centres where hot food takeaways already make up 25% of the units in the Centre. This amendment would allow existing business that are more than 800 metres from a secondary school to extend their opening hours and also their premises to provide, say, better kitchen facilities. However, extensions into adjoining shop units in such District Centres would be restricted. | Yes | PDSP.154.001 | Councillor Joe Otten |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC13: Safeguarding Local Services and Community Facilities | The draft policy needs clarification with regards to Assets of Community Value. It is unclear if they are entirely captured by the ‘valued community facilities’. If this clarity cannot be provided the policy should be deleted. | No change needed. The supporting text for the policy clearly references Assets of Community Value as being considered community facilities and their status will be used as an indication of the value of that facility. | No | PDSP.086.024 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC13: Safeguarding Local Services and Community Facilities | Add the following text to allow loss of a valued community facility to be permitted where “the loss or change of use of existing facilities is part of a wider public service estate reorganisation." | Whilst the benefits of a wider review of the provision of community facilities is recognised, the policy as worded would provide a valuable additional check that the facilities being lost and provided would meet the needs of local communities. | No | PDSP.119.002 | NHS Property Services |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC13: Safeguarding Local Services and Community Facilities | The text is very weak. Suggest adding a model policy developed by CAMRA. | The policy as worded provides a robust method for assessing whether a community facility is valued and should be protected. | No | PDSP.126.001 | Sheffield and District CAMRA Committee |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC13: Safeguarding Local Services and Community Facilities | Suggest adding a model policy developed by CAMRA. | The policy as worded provides a robust method for assessing whether a community facility is valued and should be protected. | No | PDSP.126.002 | Sheffield and District CAMRA Committee |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC14: Safeguarding Sensitive Uses from Noise, Odours and other Nuisance | The draft policy needs to be in accordance with the Framework, especially paragraph 185 which emphasises that new development needs to be appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. | The policy is in accordance with the NPPF, particularly paragraphs 177 and 188. | No | PDSP.086.025 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Natural England would like to see the incorporation of GI information provided in the Annex to their submission to be included within policies BG1, NC15 and GS1 in order to strengthen these policies. They do not suggest how this might be done. | Policy BG1 has been strengthened with further reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and Urban Green Space Zones, which will help in delivery of Green & Blue Infrastructure requirements set out in Annex A. |  | PDSP.006.010 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Additional sports pitches and playing fields should be informed by the Sheffield Playing Pitch Strategy and not by a standards-based approach. | No change required. The supporting text to policy NC15 states that the Council published a citywide Playing Pitch Strategy in 2022 which will be used to inform decisions on planning applications affecting playing pitches. | No | PDSP.007.010 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Note the limited number of open space allocations (only 3 sites in the Central Area) and the quality of some of the Urban Green Space zones that include infrastructure verges (along tramline, trainline or roads) and the Parkway roundabout. Such linear green infrastructure routes and spaces are not publicly accessible, and their value in meeting other green infrastructure purposes, such as biodiversity and urban cooling, is not quantified but is presumed. | Open Space allocations are put forward as appropriate; further open spaces will be proposed and implemented as part of future masterplanning exercises and ongoing programmes such as Grey to Green. Current Urban Greenspace Zone designations are considered to be justified and appropriate. | No | PDSP.014.016 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Due to high densities and small site areas, delivering open space will be very difficult on a number of sites, therefore adding further pressure to existing areas of open space. | The potential for high densities and small site areas is recognised and policy NC15 therefore takes into account the fact that there will be cases where it would be more appropriate to provide or enhance open space off-site within the local area. | No | PDSP.020.021 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Due to high densities and small site areas, delivering open space will be very difficult on a number of sites, therefore adding further pressure to existing areas of open space. | The potential for high densities and small site areas is recognised and policy NC15 therefore takes into account the fact that there will be cases where it would be more appropriate to provide or enhance open space off-site within the local area. | No | PDSP.020.022 | Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | This policy is unclear. Does it only apply to residential developments with a capacity for 100 or more dwellings or does it include residential institutions or Purpose Built Student Accommodation as listed in Table 2? | The "Definitions" stated below the policy include "residential development" which is in the Glossary. The definition of residential development in the Glossary states that it includes residential institutions and purpose-built student accommodation. | No | PDSP.086.026 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | This section should require all developments to identify and design a space for assistance animals to use to relieve themselves. This would need to be a mandatory requirement and include suitable facilities to partition off from other communal amenity space. This will ensure that large developments are an inclusive option for all including those needing assistance dogs. | No change needed. It is not practical for every new home to have dog toilet space – especially in apartments.  Provision of appropriate private amenity/garden space is covered under policy NC8. | No | PDSP.093.006 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.095.002 | Baitulmukarram Ja'me Masjid |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.095.003 | Baitulmukarram Ja'me Masjid |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.096.001 | Bodmin Street Mosque |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.096.002 | Bodmin Street Mosque |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.096.003 | Bodmin Street Mosque |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.108.002 | Guzar-E-Habib Education Centre |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.108.003 | Guzar-E-Habib Education Centre |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.115.001 | Jamia Masjid Ghausia |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.115.002 | Jamia Masjid Ghausia |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.115.003 | Jamia Masjid Ghausia |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.117.001 | Makki Mosque |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.118.001 | Muslim Burial Forum of Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.118.002 | Muslim Burial Forum of Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.118.003 | Muslim Burial Forum of Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Propose addition to the policy. Any new open space that is provided should be assessed for community food growing opportunities, in recognition of the mental wellbeing benefits that come from working together in an outdoor environment and the positive health outcomes afforded by easier access to fruit and vegetables. Add Community garden and Urban Farm to table 2 open space definitions. | The types of open space set out in Table 2 are consistent with those used in the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022; no change is required. Agree to include additional wording relating to food growing in policy GS1 part c. | Yes | PDSP.121.023 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | The Plan has not drawn on local expertise in relation to working towards a future sustainable food system. | Agree to include additional wording relating to food growing in policy GS1 part c. | Yes | PDSP.121.024 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.132.001 | Sheffield Islamic Centre |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.132.002 | Sheffield Islamic Centre |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.149.001 | Tinsley Hanfia Mosque |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.149.002 | Tinsley Hanfia Mosque |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.149.003 | Tinsley Hanfia Mosque |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.150.001 | Trustees of Jamiat Tabligh ul Islam |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.150.002 | Trustees of Jamiat Tabligh ul Islam |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.150.003 | Trustees of Jamiat Tabligh ul Islam |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.165.001 | Adnan Hussain |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.165.002 | Adnan Hussain |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.165.003 | Adnan Hussain |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Those types of open space which offer most benefit to both people and wildlife over the lifetime of the space should be specified in supporting text. | No change required. The type of open space that most benefits people and wildlife can be best determined taking account of the location and particular site characteristics in conjunction with the overall quantity and quality of different types of open space in the local area. | No | PDSP.188.004 | Boo |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.250.001 | Imran Ali |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.250.002 | Imran Ali |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.250.003 | Imran Ali |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.325.001 | Mohammed Fiaz Anjum |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.325.002 | Mohammed Fiaz Anjum |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | Green spaces and trees must be required as part of any new city centre development. | The Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022 states that, for the City Centre, there is a quantitative shortfall in the provision of all types of open space. The need to protect existing facilities and maximise opportunities for securing new open space is extremely important in this area and "considering the levels of proposed development, the need to provide these types of open space on-site in new development is a priority for the area (or where this is insufficient space for new provision, the priority will be to enhance existing provision)". | No | PDSP.336.003 | Patricia Dawson-Butterworth |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments | There is a need to clarify that not all green spaces are of equal value and to specify those which are of the greatest benefit to both people and wildlife. | No change needed. Open space delivered as part of new developments will be dependent on the location, site characteristics and needs of that particular area. | No | PDSP.375.006 | Sean\_Ashton |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC16: Development in Flexible Use Zones | B2 and B8 uses should be acceptable in Flexible Use Zones to allow greater flexibility. | Disagree that B2 and B8 uses should be acceptable in Flexible Use Zones as this would discourage acceptable sensitive uses such as residential. | No | PDSP.084.003 | Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC16: Development in Flexible Use Zones | We believe this specific policy is sound. It is welcomed that draft Policy NC16 accommodates a wide range of different uses which gives flexibility for future development. | Welcome the support for the policy. | No | PDSP.086.027 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC17: Development in the Hospital Zones | Use Class E would need to be a preferred or acceptable use as there is no means of controlling movement of uses within Class E as this does not constitute development and therefore planning permission would not be required and the Development Plan would not be applied to such undertakings. | The policy would allow for Conditions to be placed on any Class E uses to restrict the change within the Use Class. | No | PDSP.086.028 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC17: Development in the Hospital Zones | Sheffield’s hospital sites incorporate heritage assets. It needs to be clear that while hospital provision should not be impeded, developments are expected to conserve and re-use heritage assets and give proper consideration to alternatives to loss. This could be achieved through a reminder that the strong support remains subject to other policies in the Plan. Append to 4.57 “Developments will still be expected to comply with other policies within the Plan.” | There is no need to state that other policies in the Plan will apply. Policy DE9 ‘Development and Heritage Assets’ will apply. | No | PDSP.116.050 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | Policy NC17: Development in the Hospital Zones | Sheffield’s hospital sites incorporate heritage assets. It needs to be clear that while hospital provision should not be impeded, developments are expected to conserve and re-use heritage assets and give proper consideration to alternatives to loss. This could be achieved through a reminder that the strong support remains subject to other policies in the Plan. Append to 4.57 “Developments will still be expected to comply with other policies within the Plan.” | There is no need to state that other policies in the Plan will apply. Policy DE9 ‘Development and Heritage Assets’ will apply. | No | PDSP.116.051 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | The approach to provision of sports facilities is not in line with Playing Pitch Strategy. | No change needed. An additional policy is not required to guide provision of new sports provision as the suite of policies in the Draft Plan supports appropriate provision based on evidence from the Playing Pitch Strategy and the Sheffield Open Spaces Assessment 2022. | No | PDSP.007.008 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Support policy approach to accessible and adaptable housing. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.011.005 | Derbyshire County Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | The proposal to re-open existing freight rail line to passengers is now on the DfT Restoring Your Railways scheme long list and is therefore more than an ambition. | 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. | Yes | PDSP.015.011 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | The Council needs to objectively assess the need for Build to Rent and plan for this tenure through a new policy promoting BTR to make the plan sound. | The SHMA 2018 found that this was a new sub-market in the private rented sector and found very little evidence of need to inform a policy. Policy CA3 (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George, University of Sheffield) supports Build to Rent accommodation in these locations. Build to Rent schemes will be required to be policy compliant with affordable housing percentages set out in Policy NC3 and the Council will use the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance as a material consideration. | No | PDSP.091.001 | Watkin Jones Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | The Council needs to include a new policy on co-living. It is recognised as a tenure in Part 1 (policy CA3) but no policy in Part 2 to guide the determination of planning applications of this tenure. | Co-living schemes would be determined under policies relating to residential developments. Suggest minor amendment to policy NC8 (b) to clarify that adequate space standards would be required in co-living schemes. | Yes | PDSP.091.003 | Watkin Jones Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Supports more independent living schemes and wants to see Dementia friendly concepts as part of all new developments and services. Need improved co-ordination of services across different organisations planning areas. | Co-ordination of care service areas is outside of the scope of the Local Plan. See policy NC4 and DE3 for supporting independent living and dementia friendly design in developments and open spaces. | No | PDSP.094.002 | Age UK Sheffield/Sheffield 50+ |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Improved public transport needed for older people. Use CIL to improve transport links. | No change needed. Public transport routes and timings are outside the scope of the Local Plan. | No | PDSP.094.003 | Age UK Sheffield/Sheffield 50+ |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Sheffield has some larger community centres which are currently underused, and could be used by existing communities more, and by other communities, particularly where there has been new developments. | The Plan includes a policy, NC13, that protects existing community facilities where they are valued. However, it is difficult to promote increased use of existing facilities within the planning system. | No | PDSP.094.004 | Age UK Sheffield/Sheffield 50+ |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Plan lacks adequate policy on sustainable development and local food infrastructure and doesn't utilise NPPF guidance or local expertise on this. | Agree to include additional wording relating to food growing in policy GS1 part c. | No | PDSP.121.019 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Plan lacks adequate policy on sustainable development and local food infrastructure, and doesn't utilise NPPF guidance or local expertise on this. | Agree to include additional wording relating to food growing in policy GS1 part c. | No | PDSP.121.020 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Plan lacks adequate policy on sustainable development and local food infrastructure, and doesn't utilise NPPF guidance or local expertise on this. | Agree to include additional wording relating to food growing in policy GS1 part c. | No | PDSP.121.021 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Plan lacks adequate policy on sustainable development and local food infrastructure, and doesn't utilise NPPF guidance or local expertise on this. | Agree to include additional wording relating to food growing in policy GS1 part c. | No | PDSP.121.022 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon. Suggest amending 4.16 to reflect where increased development viability allows for more affordable housing, this should also signal requirement for higher environmental standards in development. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Increased requirements would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. No change. |  | PDSP.140.028 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Vitality of centres relies on securing business and community uses which the Plan cannot address. | No change needed. Comment acknowledged. | No | PDSP.140.029 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Definition of highly accessible locations does not take account of hilly topography. Refer to walking distances as in Policy NC11. | No change needed. The approach to distances in relation to accessibility is consistent across the two policies referred to. In policy NC11 the text describes a 10 minute walk as 800m and a 5 minute walk as 400m, which are the same distances used in the definitions for highly accessible locations given in NC5. | No | PDSP.140.030 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.143.001 | South Yorkshire Muslim Community Forum |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.143.002 | South Yorkshire Muslim Community Forum |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | In relation to paragraph 4.50 about the broader environmental benefits of integrating open space in new developments, there is a need to clarify that not all green spaces are of equal value and to specify those which are of the greatest benefit to both people and wildlife. | No change needed. Open space delivered as part of new developments will be dependent on the location, site characteristics and needs of that particular area. | No | PDSP.201.007 | Claire |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Remove references to 20 minute neighbourhoods. | No change needed. The 20 minute neighbourhood concept does not require people to remain within their neighbourhoods rather to ensure a good range of facilities nearby. | No | PDSP.222.011 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Lack of recognition that some green spaces are of higher importance than others. Those which are of greater value need emphasising. | No change needed. Open space delivered as part of new developments will be dependent on the location, site characteristics and needs of that particular area. | No | PDSP.271.010 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | There is a need to clarify that not all green spaces are of equal value and to specify those which are of the greatest benefit to both people and wildlife. | No change needed. Open space delivered as part of new developments will be dependent on the location, site characteristics and needs of that particular area. | No | PDSP.285.006 | Jonathan789 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | In relation to paragraph 4.50 about the broader environmental benefits of integrating open space in new developments, there is a need to clarify that not all green spaces are of equal value and to specify those which are of the greatest benefit to both people and wildlife. | No change needed. Open space delivered as part of new developments will be dependent on the location, site characteristics and needs of that particular area. | No | PDSP.341.005 | PaulMaddox1960 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 4: Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities |  | Remove reference to 20 minute neighbourhoods. | No change needed. The 20 minute neighbourhood concept does not require people to remain within their neighbourhoods rather to ensure a good range of facilities nearby. | No | PDSP.365.001 | Ruth Coulthard |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) | Add text to paragraph 5.11: "Improving access to the emerging economic opportunities will also involve connecting to local communities and neighbourhoods. The AMID will act as a catalyst for place-based regeneration including improving local amenities, creation of attractive public spaces and improved engagement with existing blue and green infrastructure to encourage interaction and the creation of a significant number of new homes within the AMID and its surrounding communities within the plan period - creating sustainable neighbourhoods for the next generation." | This policy focuses on preferred uses within the Innovation District. The suggested change would be more appropriate for the Sub Area policy SA4 in Part 1 that covers the East of Sheffield and has a significant amount of supporting text relating to Innovation District. We note that a similar comment has been made by the respondent against policy SA4. | No | PDSP.001.007 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) | The policy is highly restrictive so should be amended to promote all preferred uses. | Disagree. The proposed rewording would effectively remove the key element of the policy to promote Innovation District-related activities. If the policy was reworded as suggested it would not be sound as it would not add anything to other existing policies. The policy is promotional rather than restrictive. | No | PDSP.024.008 | British Land (Submitted by Quod) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) | Include Orgreave Park in the Advanced Manufacturing and Innovation District. | The support for the policy is welcomed. However, the comment is about a specific site rather than the policy itself. The site proposed is greenfield land within the Green Belt so its inclusion within the Innovation District would not align with the Spatial Strategy. | No | PDSP.068.007 | Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) | The Council should set out and justify the “innovation-focussed economic development objectives” that it expects new development to reflect. | No change is needed. This policy focuses on preferred uses within the Innovation District. “Innovation-focussed economic development objectives” are stated as the delivery of advanced manufacturing, health and wellbeing and net-zero processes. | No | PDSP.073.002 | Sheffield Forgemasters Engineering (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) | EC1 should acknowledge the Sheffield Innovation Spine (SIS) and specifically identify it as a location in which a range of innovation and technology-focused development opportunities are encouraged. | There is currently no approved basis for the SIS, however the Innovation District connects to the City Centre. Reference will be made to SIS in the relevant Sub Area policies for the Central Area and SA1. | No | PDSP.074.005 | Sheffield Hallam University (Submitted by Urbana) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) | Policy EC1 should acknowledge the location of the Sheffield Innovation Spine (SIS) and confirm its ability to support the growth of the AMID. | There is currently no approved basis for the SIS, however the Innovation District connects to the City Centre. Reference will be made to SIS in the relevant Sub Area policies for the Central Area and SA1. | No | PDSP.076.006 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) | This policy is neither justified or effective. Whilst a specifically identified AMID Policy is welcomed, this approach lacks ambition and clear objectives. It does not include land which is important to AMID outside of the Local Authority boundary. | The support for the policy is welcomed. The Sheffield Plan cannot identify land outside the local planning authority area in which to implement Local Plan policies. | No | PDSP.086.029 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC2: Development in the City Centre Office Zones | Victoria Quays is designated as a City Centre Office Zone. If demand for offices reduces this could result in a future proliferation of empty or underutilised premises. The policy should allow for a change of use away from offices in circumstances where office use is not the dominant use and where demand for office occupants does not exist. | The approach is considered appropriate for the Office Zones in general and the concern is related specifically to one specific zone. The policy allows for 40% of an area to be non-office uses so contains flexibility. | No | PDSP.001.008 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC2: Development in the City Centre Office Zones | Policy EC2 should acknowledge the potential of the Sheffield Innovation Spine to contribute to the creation of new employment space within the City Centre. The Office Zones are insufficient to meet the need identified in the Employment Land Review. | The Sheffield Innovation Spine will be referenced in the relevant Sub Area policies. The comment relates to the extent of the Office Zones and the need for additional land, rather than the approach to the Policy Zones themselves. Therefore no change is needed. | No | PDSP.076.007 | Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC2: Development in the City Centre Office Zones | The draft policy is broadly acceptable, however, there is no reference made with regards to on street level frontages. New office buildings should be required to provide complementary uses including café/restaurants, corner shops, publicly accessible lobby, etc. | Given the extent of the Zones it may not be appropriate for all ground floor frontages to be in such 'active' uses. It is better to allow flexibility within the areas and not impose more restrictions. Where appropriate, certain sites within the Zones could be more suited to active ground floor uses but the policy for the Zones cannot identify specific locations. | No | PDSP.086.030 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC2: Development in the City Centre Office Zones | The West Bar site should not be included as an Office Zone and the policy is too restrictive. | Note that the respondent has referred to 'Policy EC3' in their submission - we assume this should be 'Policy EC2'. 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.088.011 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones | The boundary for the Crystal Peaks District Centre has not been correctly drawn. | The policy for the General Employment Zones is not relevant to the Crystal Peaks District Centre boundary. In in that location, the boundary for the District Centre has been soundly determined as set out in the Retail and Leisure Study. See the response to comment number PDSP.017.001 | No | PDSP.017.002 | Albany Courtyard Investments (Submitted by Tetra Tech) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones | Welcome the flexibility in the policy but consider it is overly restrictive. Specifically, the policy should allow for residential uses in order to deliver the strategic aim of achieving sufficient residential development on brownfield sites. Some sites are suited for residential use. | While some sites in General Employment Zones may be suitable for residential, the policy promotes employment uses that may in future come forward and create unsuitable residential locations. | No | PDSP.023.001 | Bolsterstone Group (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones | Greater flexibility should be included, and the policy should not expressly prohibit residential development, rather should include a mechanism for alternative uses (such as residential) to come forward in circumstances where an employment use becomes unviable and where any technical, amenity or other impacts can be adequately mitigated. | While some sites in General Employment Zones may be suitable for residential, the policy promotes employment uses that may in future come forward and create unsuitable residential locations. | No | PDSP.050.002 | Laver Regeneration (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones | Meadowhall should be accepted as a centre in its own right to permit associated hotel and trade retail uses which can capitalise on existing travel journeys and public transport links. | Hotels are an acceptable use in General Employment Zones and trade retail where classed as sui generis uses, or retail would be considered on their individual merits so there is no need to amend the policy. Meadowhall has not been identified as a shopping area in the Plan or the Retail and Leisure Study. | No | PDSP.058.001 | Meadowhall South Ltd (Submitted by Jigsaw Planning and Development Ltd) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones | Meadowhall should be accepted as a centre in its own right to permit associated hotel and trade retail uses which can capitalise on existing travel journeys and public transport links. | Hotels are an acceptable use in General Employment Zones and trade retail where classed as sui generis uses, or retail would be considered on their individual merits so there is no need to amend the policy. Meadowhall has not been identified as a shopping area in the Plan or the Retail and Leisure Study. | No | PDSP.058.002 | Meadowhall South Ltd (Submitted by Jigsaw Planning and Development Ltd) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones | The Neepsend General Employment Zone should be removed and replaced with a Central Area Flexible Use Zone. | The general approach in policy EC3 is appropriate and the comments relate to specific locations and sites within the Zone. It is therefore not appropriate to amend the policy wording as a result of these concerns. | No | PDSP.060.002 | Mr A Spurr (Submitted by Spring Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones | This draft policy is broadly acceptable. | The support for the policy is welcomed. | No | PDSP.086.031 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC4: Development in Industrial Zones | Hotels (class C1) should not be an ‘acceptable’ use. Existing industrial businesses would be limited in their operations if new hotel developments were to be built next door. | No change needed. Hotels can be a complementary use to support businesses and Policy EC6 can be applied to ensure that the development of sensitive uses does not restrict existing businesses. | No | PDSP.086.032 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC5: Assessment of Proposals for Commercial, Business and Service Uses, Retail Warehouse Clubs and Leisure Development outside Centres | Policy EC5 is inconsistent with the NPPF so should replicate the advice of the NPPF or cross-refer to it. Specifically, the distances and floorspace thresholds identified at criteria e and h are unjustified and should be deleted. | The Retail and Leisure Study provides clear evidence for these thresholds and this approach is in line with the NPPF, which encourages local thresholds to be set where locally appropriate. | No | PDSP.031.002 | Derwent Development Management Ltd (DDML) (Submitted by Aylward Town Planning Ltd) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC5: Assessment of Proposals for Commercial, Business and Service Uses, Retail Warehouse Clubs and Leisure Development outside Centres | Amend the policy to ensure it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Delete criteria (c) and (f) and amend (h), to require impact assessments as specified in the NPPF. | The Retail and Leisure Study provides clear evidence for the policy wording and this approach is in line with the NPPF, which encourages local thresholds to be set where locally appropriate. | No | PDSP.051.005 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC5: Assessment of Proposals for Commercial, Business and Service Uses, Retail Warehouse Clubs and Leisure Development outside Centres | The thresholds for a retail impact assessment seem to be very low, given Sheffield is a city and the Framework’s threshold for this is 2,500 sq. metres. Where is the evidence for this divergence from the Framework. | The Retail and Leisure Study provides clear evidence for the policy wording and this approach is in line with the NPPF, that encourages local thresholds to be set where locally appropriate. | No | PDSP.086.033 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC6: Economic Development and Sensitive Uses | The draft policy refers to growth aspirations of nearby businesses and in Industrial Zones and General Employment Zones. Clarification is needed to confirm if this policy is targeted on the City Centre or Industrial Zones and General Employment Zones or both? | The Definitions section clearly states that the policy applies to both Policy Zones. No amendment is necessary. | No | PDSP.086.034 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC7: Promoting Local Employment in Development | How can this policy be managed / monitored and applied? This is not a development management policy, nor is it a land use policy. It cannot be reasonably monitored or enforced. | The policy is clearly a development management policy, and the Council will be closely involved in its delivery (see the Implementation section in Part 2). The spatial strategy requires jobs to be created for Sheffield residents in order reduce commuting and ensure new housing and economic development is sustainable. | No | PDSP.086.035 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC7: Promoting Local Employment in Development | It would be easy and cheap to skill-up local small builders on sustainability issues such as SUDS, biodiversity (e.g. swift bricks), light pollution, hedges, not fences and verge protection. | The objection is not relevant to this policy and will be covered either by other policies in the Plan or other regulations. | No | PDSP.332.003 | Nickyleaf |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy | Policy EC8: Development in University/College Zones | Support the policy and consider it sound. However, it is not possible to control uses that are within Class E. | The support for the policy is welcomed, and the Council consider that the uses can be controlled by the use of Conditions on planning permissions. | No | PDSP.086.036 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy |  | It is noted that Sheffield City Council support the proposed Apleyhead logistics site in the submitted Bassetlaw Local Plan in meeting the needs within the wider sub-region. This site is not supported by Rotherham Council. | We acknowledge the concerns of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council regarding the Bassetlaw Plan in relation to transport (A57) and carbon, but note that this has no direct impact on the policy approach to logistics in the Sheffield Plan. The Apleyhead site would be included within the ‘wider economic market area’ for logistics need and further discussion will continue through the Duty to Cooperate. The Examiner of the Bassetlaw Plan has concluded that the site should remain in the Plan as a logistics site. | No | PDSP.014.017 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy |  | Agree with the key aims to ensure that there is a strong economy. However, it is also important to secure successful commercial markets for a wide range of sectors and the size and locations of these requirements need to take full account of relevant market and economic signals and so a more positive approach to this objective is required. See our objections to draft Policies SP1 and SP2 in Part 1. | The comment is noted and is dealt with in the responses to policies SP1 and SP2. | No | PDSP.034.011 | Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy |  | Agree with the key aims but it is also important to secure successful commercial markets for a wide range of sectors. These issues are explored in more detail in our objections to draft Policies SP1 and SP2 in Part 1 of the Local Plan. | The comment is noted and is dealt with in the responses to policies SP1 and SP2. | No | PDSP.078.004 | St Pauls Developments plc and Smithywood Business Parks Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy |  | Agree with the key aims to ensure that there is a strong economy across the city with strong transport connectivity between communities and commercial areas. However, it is also important to secure successful commercial markets for a wide range of sectors and the size and locations of these requirements need to take full account of relevant market and economic signals - see our objections to draft Policies SP1 and SP2 in Part 1. | The comment is noted and is dealt with in the responses to policies SP1 and SP2. | No | PDSP.084.004 | Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 5: A Strong and Growing Economy |  | The wording of paragraph 5.10 is helpful in setting out sub-sectors where the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District has a distinctive advantage. Many of these are developing or using processes which do not rely on fossil fuels. | Welcome support for the wording of the supporting text. | No | PDSP.140.031 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC1: Commercial, Business and Service Uses and Leisure Developments in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area | Add Build to Rent, Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Sui Generis) and Co Living (Sui Generis) to the list of Acceptable Uses. Add Learning and non-residential institutions for the provision of education and non-education (Class F1) to the list of Acceptable Uses. | Purpose Built Student Accommodation is only suitable in certain parts of the Primary Shopping Area therefore it is most appropriate not to list it and consider it on its merits. Build to Rent would be generally classed as C3 use so is already covered by the policy. Co-living is a newly developing market and doesn't have a proper definition so it would not be appropriate to list it in the policy. F1 uses are generally more appropriate elsewhere so should be judged on their merits. | Yes | PDSP.055.002 | Marks and Spencer (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC1: Commercial, Business and Service Uses and Leisure Developments in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area | It is welcomed that the draft policy includes a wide range of acceptable uses but excludes certain of those uses on ground floor street frontages. Purpose Built Student Accommodation should be added as an acceptable use. The draft policy does not reference Map 5: Shopping, Leisure and Culture Development where the Primary Shopping Area is shown or the relevant policy map. The City Centre Primary Shopping Area is interrupted at Charter Row by a City Centre Office Zone. For the vitality and proper functioning of the Primary Shopping Area the link between Fargate / High Street and the Moor area should be strengthened. | Purpose Built Student Accommodation is only suitable in certain parts of the Primary Shopping Area therefore it is most appropriate not to list it and consider it on its merits. There is no need to cross reference Map 5 that appears after the policy, nor the Policy Zones to which many of the policies in Part 2 apply. The comment on the Office Zone relates to the Policies Map rather than the policy wording itself. However, the Office Zone does not break up the Primary Shopping Area and, in any case, the uses promoted are complementary to the Primary Shopping Area. | Yes | PDSP.086.037 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC1: Commercial, Business and Service Uses and Leisure Developments in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area | Policy VC1 should include preference given to indoor or outdoor affordable exhibition spaces and artists' studio spaces and Art, Culture and Heritage Trails. These add interest, vibrancy and character to an area, and help to enhance, protect and conserve the cultural and heritage interest of neighbourhoods. | Agree that such uses would be appropriate so will be added to the list of Acceptable Uses under Use Class F1.  Trails are not a specific land use for buildings so are not appropriate to be specifically listed. | Yes | PDSP.138.002 | Sheffield Visual Arts Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC2: Development in the Cultural Zones | Policy VC2 deems Use Classes C3 and C4 unacceptable. Justification required for this and also on how policy efficiency would be monitored. Justification required for dominance being at least 70% of the ground floor area. There is no reference to what this proportion currently is or why  residential accommodation above ground floor level could not be appropriate. | No change needed. The Cultural Zone reflects the location of existing key City Centre institutions and the policy is designed to support their continued vitality. | No | PDSP.086.038 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC3: Development in the Central Area Flexible Use Zones | If there is a permitted Class E use on a site, a future proposal for that same permitted use should be considered acceptable ‘in principle’ in the Central Area. Amend the to 5th bullet point include “where they accord with a permitted Class E use of the site”. | 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.051.006 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC3: Development in the Central Area Flexible Use Zones | Purpose Built Student Accommodation should be added as an acceptable use within Central Area Flexible Zone. | No change needed. Purpose Built Student Accommodation is not acceptable in all residential areas. | No | PDSP.085.007 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC3: Development in the Central Area Flexible Use Zones | Clarity is needed on why residential institutions (class C2) is included as an acceptable use within draft Policy NC16 but not in draft Policy VC3. Clarity needed on whether Purpose Built Student Accommodation is suitable as a use within Central Area Flexible Zone. | NC16 applies to Flexible Use Zones outside the Central Sub-Area where there are different expectations around the types of accommodation that would be suitable. Purpose Built Student Accommodation is only suitable in certain parts of the Central Area Flexible Use Zone and therefore it is most appropriate not to list it and consider it on its merits. | No | PDSP.086.039 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC3: Development in the Central Area Flexible Use Zones | Lack of promotion for the development of exhibition spaces among preferred developments. Lack of imaginative 'showcasing' of cultural and heritage sites. Consider adding planning for Art, Culture and Heritage Trails in future planning. | Policies DE8 and DE9 adopts a positive approach towards the showcasing of Sheffield’s culture and heritage. Exhibition spaces would be considered on their merits.  Trails are not a specific land use for buildings so are not appropriate to be specifically listed. | No | PDSP.138.003 | Sheffield Visual Arts Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre | Policy VC3: Development in the Central Area Flexible Use Zones | Objects to the Central Area Flexible Use Zone as it would be harmful to the continued operation of the existing business (B2 use) | 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.045.001 | HD Sports (Submitted by Avison Young) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre |  | In paragraph 6.8 Replace “The Cultural Zones” with “The central Cultural Zone”. | Propose alternative amendment to ensure sentence reads correctly. | Yes | PDSP.116.052 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre |  | There should be a new strategic policy addressing culture within the Local Plan. | Comment noted. The emerging Sheffield Design Guide will provide further details alongside the emerging Culture Strategy. It is considered that the Plan (policies NC11 and NC13) seeks to make sufficient provision for and protection of community facilities including cultural infrastructure. | No | PDSP.116.053 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre |  | On page 84 Replace “The Cultural Zones” with “The central Cultural Zone”. | No change needed. | No | PDSP.116.054 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 6: A Vibrant City Centre |  | Requirement to correct typo from Houses on Multiple Occupation to 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' in VC1. | For consistency and clarity throughout the plan the term used is ‘Houses in Multiple Occupation’. Policy text amended to reflect this. | Yes | PDSP.140.032 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Support for the policy as it could ensure prioritising walking and cycling over car based transport in new development. The policy should also enable off site active travel improvements to be secured. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.001.009 | Canal & River Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Spatial strategy should support a reduction in the need to travel by private car and focus on locations that are or can be made sustainable. | The spatial strategy focuses significant new development in the city centre and other accessible locations including the Lower Don Valley. We will continue to work with National Highways to establish the impacts of, and identify any mitigations which may be required to enable this quantum of development. | No | PDSP.005.005 | National Highways |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Broad support for policy approach in Policy CO1. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.007.011 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Table 3 relates to “significant trip generating development”. It should be confirmed that where a development proposal represents a change of use (and perhaps the net change in traffic does not reach the thresholds set out in Table 3), the thresholds in Table 3 are still relevant. Confirm whether criteria a) to e) is a priority list / hierarchy or would an applicant need to fulfil all of them regardless their order. | Developers will be required to fulfil each criteria a) to e), as indicated by the policy wording 'and' at the end of each criteria point. Whilst not in priority order, the policy requires the package of measures to be proportionate to the impact, location and type of development. A footnote will be added to the Table 3 heading on page 78 to clarify that where a development proposal represents a change of use the thresholds in Table 3 are still relevant. | Yes | PDSP.086.040 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Strengthen policy wording to require improvements. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.130.004 | Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Additional policy requirements to include protection for existing active travel infrastructure and new infrastructure to be designed to latest standards. Add reference to E-bikes. | A reference to e-bikes has been added for clarity. 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.130.005 | Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Support for the policy wording which will help to reduce trips, reduce car use and maximise sustainable travel. Include definition of minimum service frequency and how improvements will be secured long term. | Support noted and welcomed. The definition of 'minimum service frequency' is in the Glossary. | No | PDSP.140.034 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Strengthen policy wording to require improvements. Add specific reference to E-bikes. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.355.002 | rich147 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation | Strengthen policy wording to require cycling improvements. Add reference to E-bikes. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.356.006 | Richard Attwood |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | Clarify CO2 policy wording relating to residential parking in the central area as this contradicts parking guidelines. | The policy wording is incorrect. It should mirror the Parking Guidelines which say 1 space per 10 dwellings for the Central Area. | Yes | PDSP.005.006 | National Highways |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | Supports the approach to secure parking provision. | Support noted and welcomed | No | PDSP.007.012 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | Parking standard for retail class E(a) in the central area should include more than operational only parking. | It is not agreed that additional parking (except for operational and disabled parking provision) is appropriate for food retail developments in the city centre. The Plan provides policies which support a car free, sustainable approach for city centre living, whereby everyday needs can be met locally, by active modes or public transport. The parking guidelines have been developed to respond to the need to reduce reliance on the private car and increase sustainable trips, and support a car free or low car city centre, as well as responding to the Council’s declaration of a Climate Emergency and net zero ambitions. | No | PDSP.051.007 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | Support for car free Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA), but note that PBSA should be sui generis not C2. Standards may result in over provision of cycle parking for PBSA. Extend the use of innovative alternatives referred to in the guidelines to PBSA as well as dwellings. | Support for car free development is noted and welcomed. It is agreed that the Use Class 'C2' in the Parking Guidelines will be removed in relation to Purpose Built Student Accommodation. The policies in the Plan support an increase in active travel and sustainable modes which is required to implement the Plan sustainably. An ambitious approach to cycle parking is required to ensure sufficient provision is made to support future modal shift. However it is agreed that the wording relating to innovative solutions should be amended to clarify that this relates to all residential development, including Purpose Built Student Accommodation, to allow developers to propose alternative solutions to meet the requirements. | Yes | PDSP.085.008 | Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | It is acknowledged that the Council intends to reduce car use and provides parking guidelines which define standards for all use classes as maxima. The parking guidelines also distinguish between the Central Area and the remaining urban area. | Comment noted. | No | PDSP.086.041 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | Car free requirements present an issue for category 3 wheelchair adaptable/accessible properties which are likely to have different parking requirements. The policy must include provision for accessibility specific active travel mobility devices including non-standard cycles. | Policy CO2 (c) requires the provision of accessible parking. It is agreed however that it should be clarified in Annex B Parking Guidelines that in relation to car free housing development provision will be required for disabled parking. An amendment is proposed to ensure all category 3 dwellings include a car parking space, and in addition accessible spaces are provided for 5% of the total dwellings. There are no proposed changes in relation to EV charge points. The Parking Guidelines make provision for 50% of accessible spaces to include EV charge points, which is higher than the requirements for standard parking spaces, reflecting the potential higher demand. The Plan makes provision for consideration of non-standard cycle parking spaces through its policies (CO2 and Annex B: Parking Guidelines). | Yes | PDSP.093.007 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | Support for the use of 'must' in the policy to ensure the provision of secure cycle parking. The policy should also require charging points for E-bikes. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.130.006 | Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO2: Parking Provision in New Development | Access, off street parking, and provision for deliveries should be planned into any new development to reduce need for on street parking. | The Parking Guidelines set out parking requirements which are deemed to be appropriate for each Use Class. Servicing and deliveries associated with new development is referenced in relation to 'operational' parking in Annex B Parking Guidelines. Specific access arrangements for a development will be considered as part of the Planning Application process. | No | PDSP.336.004 | Patricia Dawson-Butterworth |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO3: Broadband and Telecommunications | With regard to the part of the policy stating that development involving the construction of new buildings or other structures should not cause interference to broadcast or telecommunication services, it is not clear how this is to be implemented. | Agree to delete the final sentence of policy CO3; this is a repetition of NPPF policy. | Yes | PDSP.086.042 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO3: Broadband and Telecommunications | Want to see inclusion of traditional landline infrastructure equipment in developments and for infrastructure on footways to contrast in the short and long term with paving surfaces and should be orientated to not cause an obstruction. | Traditional copper-based landlines are in the process of being phased out and replaced with IP based services which is part of the Public Telephone Switch Network (PSTN) switch off which will be completed by 2025. Telecare providers are aware of this and working towards replacing the equipment. The replacement solutions will need to be resilient to power cuts and it would be down to those sourcing the replacements to factor that into any procurements. More information on the PSTN switch off can be found on the Openreach website. There is therefore no change required to the Plan. | No | PDSP.093.008 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO3: Broadband and Telecommunications | Amend CO3(b) to read “the equipment is appropriately located, designed, coloured and landscaped to take account of its setting and there is no adverse impact on visual amenity or the significance of heritage assets". | Agree to much of the suggested change. | Yes | PDSP.116.055 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City | Policy CO3: Broadband and Telecommunications | Amend CO3(b) to read “the equipment is appropriately located, designed, coloured and landscaped to take account of its setting and there is no adverse impact on visual amenity or the significance of heritage assets". | Agree to much of the suggested change. | Yes | PDSP.116.056 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Strengthen the policy wording to require provision of sustainable and active travel improvements associated with new development. Additional policy requirements to include protection for existing active travel infrastructure. The Plan should include requirements for charging infrastructure for electric bikes, including where policies support provision for electric cars. There should be equal or greater emphasis given to provision for electric bikes as electric cars. Policy DE4 should require that streets, routes and spaces should adhere to the latest national guidelines on walking and cycling infrastructure. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. Add reference to adherence to national guidance to Policy DE4. 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.100.002 | Cycle Sheffield (Submitted by Sheffield CTC ) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Strengthen the wording in para 7.6 to require provision of sustainable and active travel improvements associated with new development. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.130.002 | Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Strengthen the wording in para 7.6 to require provision of sustainable and active travel improvements associated with new development. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.130.003 | Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Supports the focus on encouraging active travel and reducing car dependency. Provide clarity on the overlap of T1 in Part 1 with the Development Management policies. There is no reference to requirements for tram or train in the Development Management policies. Encouraging a shift to tram and train as well as to active travel is key to reducing carbon emissions and traffic congestion. | Support is noted and welcomed. Reference to the Part 1 Policy T1 will be added to paragraph 7.1 of Part 2 to clarify the link between the strategic policy and Development Management policies.  At a strategic level, support for the future of the tram is included in policy T1. Where the Development management policies (CO1 and CO2) refer to public transport this includes bus, tram and rail and the measures required at Planning Application stage will depend very much on where the development is in relation to the public transport network. | Yes | PDSP.140.033 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Remove all references to 5G telecommunications infrastructure pending further robust fully independent studies proving its safety. | No change required. NPPF paragraph 116 states the local planning authorities must determine planning applications on planning grounds only. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for an electronic communications system, or set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure. | No | PDSP.222.012 | Dystopia247 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Strengthen the policy wording to require sustainable and active travel improvements. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.356.004 | Richard Attwood |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Strengthen the policy wording to require active travel improvements and improve the chances of facilitating a modal shift toward active travel. | The comment is welcomed and the wording of policy CO1 has been amended to strengthen the principle of provision, and our ability to secure cycling and walking improvements and infrastructure. It is not proposed to change the wording of the guidance in Annex B as this sets out how this should be provided appropriately to the development, within the principle that has now been strengthened in the policy. The cycle parking standards are minimums, there is an omission in the table heading which will be amended to clarify this. A reference to e-bikes has also been added for clarity. | Yes | PDSP.356.005 | Richard Attwood |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | National Highways would welcome early engagement and involvement in the future planning application process for development at any of the allocation sites to ensure consistency with circular 01/2022. National Highways expect that developments will only be promoted at locations that are or can be made sustainable. National Highways will expect the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to identify the location and likely scale of the necessary mitigations, and funding. | The Spatial Strategy focuses significant new development in the city centre and other accessible locations including the Lower Don Valley. We will continue to work with National Highways to establish the impacts and identify any mitigations which may be required to enable this quantum of development. | No | PDSP.005.004 | National Highways |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 7: A Connected City |  | Commend the Broadband and Telecommunications section in Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation. It is positive to see the importance of good connectivity highlighted along with encouraging more than one network operator to ensure residents have choice and promoting competition amongst suppliers to ensure the best value for residents and businesses. | Note and welcome the support and also note the additional information provided. | No | PDSP.144.001 | Superfast South Yorkshire |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1 Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Very unclear how the Standards for Assessing the Quantity of and Access to Informal Greenspace and Outdoor Sports Areas (Table 4) have been derived. Sheffield does not meet the Natural England Accessible Greenspace Standards (ANGST) e.g. see Section 7.3.2 and Figures 12-14 in the Open Space Assessment. Instead of taking steps to address these gaps in provision in the allocation map or policies, a lower standard of 15-minute walk time to an accessible natural greenspace has been suggested in the Assessment. | The standards are derived from the Sheffield Open Spaces Assessment 2022, Natural England Accessible Greenspace Standards (ANGST) and the 15 minute walking distance to accessible natural greenspace is the standard recommended by the study. The study recommends that this access standard is used to identify key gaps in access to all accessible natural green spaces above 0.15ha in size. | No | PDSP.131.003 | Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Support the identification of Urban Greenspace Zones in the plan and the recognition that greenspace often contributes to the significance of designated heritage assets and to the character and enjoyment of the historic environment more generally. We particularly welcome the inclusion of criteria c, e and f which seek to protect greenspaces of high amenity value, safeguard spaces that act as environmental buffers and maintain important views or vistas across Urban Greenspace Zones respectively. | Note and welcome the support for policy GS1. | No | PDSP.003.028 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Welcome the reference to Natural England Accessible Greenspace Standards (ANGST) and a minimum size requirement for the provision of green infrastructure in new development. Policy and supporting text should set minimum accessibility, quantitative and quality requirements for new green infrastructure. The Plan should also reference the following green infrastructure policy standards: Green Flag Award scheme; The Sensory Trust ‘By All reasonable Means’ good practice guidance; The Forestry Commission guidelines for Tree canopy cover; The Woodland Trust woodland access standards.  Welcome the inclusion of a specific GI Policy BG1 and Policy NC15: Creating Open, Space in Residential Developments, Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones. The information, in annex A, on GI will be helpful to incorporate into these policies and to help strengthen them and then ultimately help in the deliverability when the plan is ultimately adopted. | **Green Flag Award & The Sensory Trust** - No change. The Green Flag awards lie outside of the Local Plan process as the Council and other organisations may submit parks, woodland and other greenspaces to be assessed against criteria, managed by Keep Britain Tidy. In relation to accessibility the draft policies propose to adopt Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework principles and standards including the ‘Accessible Greenspace Standards’.  **20% Tree Canopy** – Reference will be made in Policy GS7 regarding setting a target of 20% tree canopy cover across the city. Will retain proposed tree planting requirements as set out in policy GS7, that will help contribute towards meeting the overall 20% canopy cover target.  **Woodland access standards** – Not feasible to adopt the standard due to the nature of the city’s proposed growth strategy focusing 20,000 new homes in the city centre of which a large part would lie outside of the Forestry Commission’s minimum distance of 500m to 2ha of woodland. | Yes | PDSP.006.011 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Policy GS1 should be reworded to make clear that playing fields and sports pitches should be provided in accordance with the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy and not using a standards-based approach. | Agree to add the following wording in "Further Information" to policy GS1: "The Council's Playing Pitch Strategy, approved in September 2022, should be referred to for evidence relating to recommendations for playing pitch requirements and their provision". | Yes | PDSP.007.013 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | The supporting text only refers to ‘recreation’, but the policy refers to sports and recreational provision. The eight different criteria make this policy very restrictive. No reference is made to any evidence base document from which such an assessment can  be undertaken. Would the Council be able to provide a background document to inform those  zones?. | The policy relates to sport and recreation provision. The criteria in the policy are intended to protect open space and recreation sites whilst allowing some flexibility in certain circumstances. The Sheffield Open Spaces Assessment 2022, published as part of the Draft Plan public consultation, provides an evidence base. | No | PDSP.086.043 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Support the designation of the land at Owlthorpe as Local Green Space. Request that similar protection be given to land at Hollin Busk and Wood Royd Lane. | No change needed - Support for the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe is welcomed. It is not appropriate to add additional Local Green Spaces to the Plan at this stage in the process because the landowners and other third parties have not been given the opportunity to comment on them. Notwithstanding this point, the sites are designated as Urban Green Space Zones in the Draft Plan. | No | PDSP.099.008 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Given the problem with some areas being described as “Urban Zones” and also “Residential Areas” in different maps, the policy should just refer to "Green Spaces". | The term "Urban Green Space Zones" is a specific land use designation proposed for the Plan and is considered appropriate to refer to greenspaces in the city. | No | PDSP.102.012 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Support the Green Belt status of the land to the west of Crimicar Lane in Fulwood, enclosed by the gardens of houses on Peterborough Road to the north and Crimicar Avenue to the south. Request that the land at Crimicar Lane Sports Ground be designated a Local Green Space. | Acknowledge the request for this land to be designated as a Local Green Space. It is not appropriate to add additional Local Green Space designations to the Plan at this stage in the process because the landowners and other third parties have not been given the opportunity to comment on them. Notwithstanding this point, the site lies within the existing Green Belt. | No | PDSP.109.002 | Hallam Cricket Club |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | In policy GS1 all items are negative linked by “or” except (c) and (f) which are positive, which is open to an interpretation different to the one intended. For an unambiguous reading: - Use “or” after (a)(i) and (a)(ii); then  - Either omit “or” in every other case;  - Or replace “or” with “and” in every other case, and “and” between (a)(iii) and (b). | Agree to change wording: insert "and" after a) (iii) and also after b), c), d), e) and f). | Yes | PDSP.116.057 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | In policy GS1 all items are negative linked by “or” except (c) and (f) which are positive, which is open to an  interpretation different to the one intended. | Agree to change wording: insert "and" after a) (iii) and also after b), c), d), e) and f). | Yes | PDSP.116.058 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | The draft Local Plan does not contain adequate policies for the sustainable development of local food infrastructure. | Agree to suggested change. Amend part c) of the policy to include safeguarding of greenspace with food growing value. | Yes | PDSP.121.030 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Suggest rewording of policy GS1 part b. There is no clear blue and green infrastructure network  in either map or strategy form. The reasoning behind Table 4 is not transparent and needs to be made clear that it stems from the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022. | Agree that reference should be included to the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022 in a footnote to Table 4. It is considered that the wording of part b is clear and appropriate. | Yes | PDSP.125.011 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Support policy GS1 but state that the Access to Nature maps and the Natural England GI Framework should be used to identify GI gaps and opportunities as a GI layer on the interactive spatial maps. | Amendment added to policy BG1 to include adoption of Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework, to help develop Blue and Green infrastructure network in the city. |  | PDSP.127.010 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Support policy GS1 but would welcome more emphasis on the value of allotments. | Note and welcome the support for policy GS1. Reference is proposed to be added to supporting local food protection within the Part 1 policy on Blue and Green Infrastructure, BG1. | No | PDSP.140.035 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Part (ii) of the policy needs to guard against the loss of open spaces for sporting activities that have been sanctioned in the past, when alternative facilities the council said would replace them are only to be found across the city. This policy does not fit with the concept of sustainable neighbourhoods. | Policy GS1 (ii) is consistent with national planning policy in the NPPF which states that open space may be lost if it is replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality "in a suitable location". Should such circumstances arise, the location of new open space will be determined in conjunction with the relevant Council departments and external stakeholders at that time. | No | PDSP.260.008 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | The reasoning behind Table 4 is not transparent and needs to be made clear that it stems from the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022. | Agree that reference should be included to the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022 in a footnote to Table 4 and also that a footnote should be added setting out the Natural England Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGST). The Sheffield Open Space Assessment states that accessibility to natural green space will be assessed through a combination of ANGST Standardsand 15 minutes' walk time, including consideration of access to smaller greenspaces below 2 hectares in size. | Yes | PDSP.271.013 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Suggest rewording of policy GS1 part b. There is no clear blue and green infrastructure network  in either map or strategy form. The reasoning behind Table 4 is not transparent and needs to be made clear that it stems from the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022. | Agree that reference should be included to the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022 in a footnote to Table 4. It is considered that the wording of part b is clear and appropriate. | Yes | PDSP.333.005 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | The Access to Nature maps and the Natural England GI Framework should be used to identify GI gaps and opportunities as a GI layer on the interactive spatial maps. The reasoning behind Table 4 is not transparent and needs to be made clear that it stems from the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022. | Agree that reference should be included to the Sheffield Open Space Assessment 2022 in a footnote to Table 4. | Yes | PDSP.333.006 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Specific reference should be made 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. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.352.001 | Rafiq |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Ensure that policies are responsive to the creation of new burial spaces across the city, including provision on Green Belt, both on publicly and privately owned sites. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.352.002 | Rafiq |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS1: Development in Urban Green Space Zones | Site Allocations should recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities. | The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised. 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.352.003 | Rafiq |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Support for policy approach. | No change required. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.003.029 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Propose Green Belt site for allocation for development. | No change needed. The proposed allocation is in the Green Belt and would be contrary to spatial strategy. | No | PDSP.062.003 | Mr Charles Rhodes and Star Pubs (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Repetition of national policy should be removed. Clarification required as to whether part (d) will exclude infilling in other locations not listed. | No change needed. Repetition of national policy is kept to a minimum and included where it adds value to the local context. | No | PDSP.086.044 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Inconsistent approach to relationship between sub-area policies and policy GS2. Norton Aerodrome should be referenced in GS2 as a Green Belt development. Suggestions for improving the wording of part (d). | Accept proposed minor amendment to clarify part (d). No further change needed as policy G2 applies to land that will remain in the Green Belt once Norton Aerodrome is released. | Yes | PDSP.102.013 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Suggest that land where development has taken place should continue to be protected by Green Belt designation. | No change needed. Where development has taken place some areas of land no longer perform the purposes of Green Belt. | No | PDSP.104.005 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Suggests incorporating text from the NPPF into the policy in order to be easier to use and to strengthen the approach. | No change needed. Local Plan policy should not repeat National Policy. | No | PDSP.122.006 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Support for policy approach. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.140.036 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Green Belt protection should be strengthened as in the UDP. | No change needed. The Policy approach reflects the NPPF and takes forward those elements of the UDP policies that are still appropriate. | No | PDSP.260.009 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS2: Development in the Green Belt | Green Belt protection should be strengthened as in the UDP. | No change needed. The Policy approach reflects the NPPF and takes forward those elements of the UDP policies that are still appropriate. | No | PDSP.260.010 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Support the policy approach. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.003.030 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Proposals that affect the setting off the National Park should require Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Include reference to the Peak District National Park Management Plan. Include requirement to consult Peak District National Park Authority on relevant applications. Refer to major development exceptional circumstances text within National Parks. | No change needed. We acknowledge the importance of the valued landscapes within the Peak District National Park. Policy GS3 requires development to reflect the characteristics of different landscape typologies, including in the areas bordering the National Park within its fringe landscape. The policy also requires consideration of views into and out of different character areas. Paragraph 8.13 makes it clear that development within Sheffield but impacting the National Park is covered by the policy. Requirements for planning proposals to be subject to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) are dependent on scale and context and it is not appropriate to make a blanket requirement within the policy. Similarly there is no need to specify that the Peak District National Park Authority are consulted on all proposals likely to impact on its special qualities as this is dependent on scale and context and the PDNPA would be consulted as appropriate. | No | PDSP.006.012 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Querying policy approach to residential extensions in the Green Belt. | No change proposed. | Yes | PDSP.086.045 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Reword the policy to reference National Landscape Character Areas. | No change needed. The policy refers to areas defined in the Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment. | No | PDSP.102.014 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Suggest references to additional heritage features. | Accept suggestion. | Yes | PDSP.116.059 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Suggest references to additional heritage features. | Accept suggestion. | Yes | PDSP.116.060 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Define the landscape character areas referred to in the policy. | Acknowledge that clarification is required to ensure the policy can be implemented correctly with reference to distinct landscape character sub-areas. The sub area characteristics are set out in the 2011 Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment in three main groupings of upland, valley and lowland character areas as well as highly maintained landscapes. PDF maps showing the detail of the areas covered by each of the 15 character sub-areas will be made available alongside the Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment in order to implement the policy. | Yes | PDSP.122.007 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Policy should include heritage significance of blue/green infrastructure. | No change needed. The policy refers to landscape character typologies which themselves refer where appropriate to blue/green infrastructure. | No | PDSP.125.012 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | The policy should give higher level protection to Loxley Valley adjacent to the National Park as per previous Areas of High Landscape Value. | No change needed. Land in the areas to which this policy applies are already protected by Green Belt designation and where appropriate would be required to take account of the impact on the National Park. | No | PDSP.260.011 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS3: Landscape Character | Define the landscape character areas referred to in the policy. | Acknowledge that clarification is required to ensure the policy can be implemented correctly with reference to distinct landscape character sub-areas. The sub area characteristics are set out in the 2011 Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment in three main groupings of upland, valley and lowland character areas as well as highly maintained landscapes. PDF maps showing the detail of the areas covered by each of the 15 character sub-areas will be made available alongside the Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment in order to implement the policy. | Yes | PDSP.393.007 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | Support the policy but recommend specific approaches for Local Plan policies in relation to soils. | No change needed. Support welcome. | No | PDSP.006.013 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | Questions how the Plan will resolve the tension between agriculture and the potential for Biodiversity Net Gain investments and requires clarification. | No change needed. National guidance around implementation of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) regulations will steer appropriate locations for investment. In Sheffield the priority will be for BNG to be delivered onsite, or as locally as possible where it is offsite. | No | PDSP.086.046 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | The Plan does not contain adequate policies for sustainable development of local food infrastructure. Should protect high quality soils for agroecological horticulture. | No change needed. The Plan is not required to specifically make provision for sustainable food infrastructure. However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1. The spatial strategy guides development away from agricultural land that could be utilised for food production. Policy GS4 sets out the limited circumstances in which the best and most versatile agricultural land could be developed. The majority of agricultural land in Sheffield is not within the highest categories. Furthermore it is largely within rural areas designated as Green Belt and therefore strongly protected in terms of built development opportunities. | No | PDSP.121.031 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | The Plan does not contain adequate policies for sustainable development of local food infrastructure. Protect high quality soils for agroecological horticulture. | No change needed. The Plan is not required to specifically make provision for sustainable food infrastructure. However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1. The spatial strategy guides development away from agricultural land that could be utilised for food production. Policy GS4 sets out the limited circumstances in which the best and most versatile agricultural land could be developed. The majority of agricultural land in Sheffield is not within the highest categories. Furthermore it is largely within rural areas designated as Green Belt and therefore strongly protected in terms of built development opportunities. | No | PDSP.121.032 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | Supports the policy approach which would allow for modest solar farms. | No change needed. Support noted. | No | PDSP.140.037 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | Support protection of agricultural land in the context of food insecurity. | No change needed. Support noted. | No | PDSP.260.012 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land | Support protection of agricultural land in the context of food insecurity. | No change needed. Support noted. | No | PDSP.260.013 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5 | The policy should require swift bricks in all new developments. The policy should refer to the South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Sheffield Nature Emergency Action Plan. | Swift bricks are one of a number of measures that may be required as part of Biodiversity Net Gain. Amend the policy to require universal swift bricks and / or bat roosting features in new developments. | No | PDSP.131.004 | Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Include actual minimum distances for habitat buffer strips. Suggest buffer strips for rivers and streams is 10m and greater than 10m for some other river types. Suggest policy specifically states that barriers along watercourses will be removed to aid the migration of fish and other aquatic wildlife. | No change needed. Further detail on buffer strips will be covered by a future SPD. No change required to reference to removal of barriers as this is already covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.002.012 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Policy needs to include Ramsar site reference on designated site list. Needs to refer to ensuring development follows mitigation hierarchy, and if not, proposals will be refused.  Need to provide further clarification on when harm to a local site is acceptable. | Accept suggested policy amendments in relation to Ramsar sites and where harm is acceptable. No change proposed in relation to the mitigation hierarchy as this is covered under policy GS6. | Yes | PDSP.006.014 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Lengthy policy and requirements. Not clear in which cases these requirements need to be addressed. | Policy sets out requirements for development to help address the Biodiversity Emergency the Council recently announced. Further detail will be provided in an SPD to support the policy. | No | PDSP.086.047 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Lack of information on Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)/ Nature Recovery Network (NRN). Suggest Loxley Valley and Local Wildlife Site are considered as part of the future LNRS/NRN. Suggest Loxley Valley Local Wildlife Site status is increased to designated given biodiversity importance as highlighted at Hepworth Enquiry. Suggest Local Wildlife Site 108 boundary is drawn more tightly round factory buildings as enquiry showed nature is reclaiming the site. Suggest status of river corridor Local Wildlife Site is increased to designated to provide greater protection. | Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed to incorporate in the draft Plan. Aim to include it when complete in an SPD and/or in the Plan at next review stage. Local Wildlife Sites designation and management sits outside of the Local Plan process, although any boundary changes would be reflected on future Policies Maps. | No | PDSP.104.006 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Lack of information on Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)/ Nature Recovery Network (NRN). Suggest Loxley Valley and Local Wildlife Site are considered as part of the future LNRS/NRN. Suggest Loxley Valley Local Wildlife Site status is increased to designated given biodiversity importance as highlighted at Hepworth Enquiry. Suggest Local Wildlife Site 108 boundary is drawn more tightly round factory buildings as enquiry showed nature is reclaiming the site. Suggest status of river corridor Local Wildlife Site is increased to designated to provide greater protection. | Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed to incorporate in the draft Plan. Aim to include it when complete in an SPD and/or in the Plan at next review stage. Local Wildlife Sites designation and management sits outside of the Local Plan process, although any boundary changes would be reflected on future Policies Maps. | No | PDSP.104.007 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Measures to increase biodiversity could harm/destroy heritage assets e.g. historic weirs. | No change, covered by policy. | No | PDSP.116.062 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Measures to increase biodiversity could harm/destroy heritage assets e.g. historic weirs. | No change, covered by policy. | No | PDSP.116.063 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Prevent loss of' to 'Must include', then list features set out in suggested response modification. GS5 (l) - Suggest amending policy item to list design features set out in suggested response modification. | No change proposed. The definitions provide some examples of design features but is not an exhaustive list. | No | PDSP.120.008 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Example of swift bricks in design features definition is not sufficient. These should be a mandatory requirement. Suggest amendment to part (a) to recognise biodiversity value of buildings e.g. nesting sites. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments. No change proposed to part (a) as this is covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.124.002 | S11Swifts |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | No explanation provided about which species this applies to. Examples would at the very least highlight some of the key species of concern (e.g. Swifts).  No clear expectation of the extent to which biodiversity design features will be required.  Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Should' to 'Must', and include suggested amendments set out in response modification. | No change proposed to specify species - more detail to be provided in future SPD.  Propose addition to the policy to require universal swift bricks and / or bat roosting features in new development. | No | PDSP.127.011 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Suggest amendment to list of biodiversity design features in the definitions. Refer to Response Modification. | No change. The definitions are not comprehensive. They provide some examples, while acknowledging there are more. | No | PDSP.135.002 | Sheffield Street Tree Partnership (SSTP) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Example of swift bricks in design features definition is not sufficient. These should be a mandatory requirement. Suggest amendment to part (a) to recognise biodiversity value of buildings e.g. nesting sites.  Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Should' to 'Must include..', then listing features suggested.  Parts (a & j) suggest inclusion of South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Sheffield Nature Emergency Action Plan.  GS5 needs inclusion of an item on lighting including direction. Policies GS5/6 - Suggest inclusion of text to prevent devaluing of site before BNG baseline assessment.  Suggest amendment to GS5 (Definition) to list of biodiversity design features. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments. No change proposed to part (a) as this is covered by policy.  No change proposed to the policy language.  Further detail will be provided in SPD.  Site clearance/degradation will be covered in more detail in a future SPD.  No change proposed to the definitions. The definitions are not comprehensive they provide some examples, while acknowledging there are more. | Yes | PDSP.136.001 | Sheffield Swift Network |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | No reference or link in policy definitions to what are listed on Local & National Vulnerable Species.  Priority Habitats need to be covered in first three bullet points.  Questions whether sufficient weight been given to Sites of Special Scientific Interest as in accordance with Wildlife & Countryside Act S28G in terms of conserve and enhance?.  Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Prevent loss of' to 'Must include..', then list features.  Include actual minimum distances for habitat buffer strips. Suggest buffer strips for Main Rivers is 20m and 10m for Ordinary Watercourses.  Need inclusion of item on lighting including direction.  Suggest including requirements for biodiversity design features to be mandatory e.g. % of swift bricks, bat boxes on new development. | Further detail to be provided in a future SPD. Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments.  No further changes proposed in response as issues are covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.139.003 | South Yorkshire Bat Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity |  | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.140.038 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Example of swift bricks not sufficient. These should be a mandatory requirement. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments. | Yes | PDSP.145.001 | Swifts Local Network |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Suggest amendment to policy to recognise biodiversity value of buildings e.g. nesting sites. | No change, covered by policy. | No | PDSP.145.002 | Swifts Local Network |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Why doesn't the policy apply to all development and not just those affecting protected species/habitats and designated sites?. | No change proposed, the second part of the policy applies to all development where relevant. | No | PDSP.191.007 | Carol Collins |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Example of swift bricks not sufficient. These should be a mandatory requirement.  Sites should not be cleared before a baseline Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is measured.  Trees should not be removed from a site prior to planning permission, but if they have, this should be taken into account with the assessment for baseline BNG.  There should be no development in high flood risk areas.  There should be a 10m buffer zone between watercourses and development. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments.  Guidance relating to implantation of BNG requirements will be covered by interim guidance/SPD.  The NPPF sets out what development is permitted in flood zones.  The Environment Agency set outs the following habitat buffer distances required for watercourses: 1. at least 10 metres for rivers and streams & 2. a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is) | Yes | PDSP.193.005 | Caroline Quincey |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Suggest amending parts (a) and (j) to include reference to South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (SYLNRS) and Sheffield Emergency Nature Action Plan. Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Prevent loss of' to 'Must include..', then list features.  GS5 (l) - Suggest amending policy item to list design features. | No change proposed. References to SYLNRS covered under item (b) and Nature Emergency in opening chapter text. No further change proposed. The definitions are not comprehensive they provide some examples, while acknowledging there are more. | No | PDSP.197.001 | Charlie |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Loxley Valley needs greater statutory protection than a Local Wildlife Site.  Policy not strong enough. Development inevitably damages habitats along with continued human disturbance. Historic Waterway infrastructure needs greater protection from potential risk of biodiversity measures being implemented. | The Wildlife Site designation process sits outside of the Local Plan process, although any change would be included on a future Local Plan policy map.  No change proposed, protection for heritage assets is set out in DE9. | No | PDSP.260.014 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | No clear expectation of the extent to which biodiversity design features will be required.  Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Should' to 'Must include..', then list features.  Also Items (a & j) suggest inclusion of South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (SYLNRS)/Sheffield Nature Emergency Action Plan.  Suggest amendment to list of biodiversity design features in the definitions. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments.  References to SYLNRS covered under item (b) and Nature Emergency in opening chapter text. No further changes proposed to policy language or definitions. The definitions are not comprehensive they provide some examples, while acknowledging there are more. | Yes | PDSP.271.014 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Site in Mosborough between Station Road, School Street and High Street should be fully designated a Local Wildlife Site and not partly a development site. | No change needed. Designation of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) sit outside of the Local Plan process, although any changes to a LWS boundary would be included on any future updated Local Plan policies map. | No | PDSP.278.001 | John Mellor |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Policy lacks awareness of particular species reliant on buildings. Suggest requirement for swift bricks in policy (can be used by other species too). | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments. | Yes | PDSP.332.004 | Nickyleaf |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | No explanation provided about which species this applies to. Examples would at the very least highlight some of the key species of concern (e.g. Swifts).  No clear expectation of the extent to which biodiversity design features will be required.  Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Should' to 'Must include..', then list features.  Also Items (a & j) suggest inclusion of South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (SYLNRS)/Sheffield Nature Emergency Action Plan.  Suggest amendment to list of biodiversity design features in definition. Include actual minimum distances for habitat buffer strips. Suggest buffer strips for Main Rivers is 20m and 10m for Ordinary Watercourses. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments.  References to SYLNRS covered under item (b) and Nature Emergency in opening chapter text. No further changes proposed to policy language or definitions. The definitions are not comprehensive they provide some examples, while acknowledging there are more.  The Environment Agency set outs the following habitat buffer distances required for watercourses: 1. at least 10 metres for rivers and streams & 2. a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is) | Yes | PDSP.333.007 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | Historic Waterway infrastructure needs greater protection. Policies GS5,6, 9, 10 & 11 could have serious impact if not amended. | No change, protection of heritage assets is covered by policy DE9. | No | PDSP.393.008 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity | No clear expectation of the extent to which biodiversity design features will be required.  Suggest strengthening policy language from 'Should' to 'Must include..', then list features.  Also Items (a & j) suggest inclusion of South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (SYLNRS)/Sheffield Nature Emergency Action Plan.  Suggest amendment to list of biodiversity design features in definition. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments.  References to SYLNRS covered under item (b) and Nature Emergency in opening chapter text. No further changes proposed to policy language or definitions. The definitions are not comprehensive they provide some examples, while acknowledging there are more | Yes | PDSP.393.009 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Recommend policy is updated to clarify the requirement for a minimum 10% net gain to be demonstrated separately for all types of biodiversity unit (Area Habitats, Linear Hedgerow Habitat and Linear Rivers & Stream Habitat) if present in a site.  Need to link to GS9 and state where a development boundary lies in/or partly within the riparian zone then the rivers/streams part of the metric needs to be applied. | Accept suggested policy amendments needed. Riparian habitats will be covered in more detail in a future SPD. | Yes | PDSP.002.013 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Recommend further clarification is made on use of Small Sites Metric i.e. off site habitat enhancement.  Recommend wording strengthened to clarify that 10% BNG must be achieved in all types of biodiversity units (habitat, river & hedgerow).  Policy needs greater reference to riverine habitats, metric & link to GS9 Managing Flood Risk.  Need to reference habitats of strategic importance as a higher biodiversity unit score is applied to these in local area.  Policy needs to refer to 30th Jan 2020 date regarding habitat degradation pre–Biodiversity Net Gain assessment.  Recommend a clear approach for sites of low/nil biodiversity value is set out e.g. small target improvement of biodiversity units rather than %.  Recommend a BNG SPD is developed to provide further detail.  High biodiversity value locations have not been mapped on Site Allocations. The plan should clearly set out these areas to be protected on sites. Recommend extending monitoring to include indicators demonstrating amount & type of BNG provided by development. | Accept some suggested policy amendments**.**  Rivers and habitat degradation will be covered in more detail in a future SPD.  Aiming to adopt Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework Principles and Standards, of which the Urban Greening Factor standard will help achieve BNG on sites of low/nil biodiversity value.  A future BNG SPD will be produced providing further detail in support of the policy.  Propose amendments to the conditions of relevant allocated sites to make it clear that where a site contains a designated ecological site, that part of the site should not be developed, and the ecological interest must be protected. It also offers potential to deliver on-site BNG. | Yes | PDSP.006.015 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Oppose requirement for excess of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain in certain situations. This is in excess to the NPPF. Will affect viability of brownfield sites. Should be left to developers if they want to exceed 10%. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.016.023 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Oppose requirement for excess of 10% BNG in certain situations. Needs to be reviewed in context of secondary legislation coming into force. Will affect viability of brownfield sites. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.025.007 | Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Oppose requirement for excess of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain in certain situations. This is in excess of the NPPF and Environment Act. Will affect viability of brownfield sites.  Part (b) refers to Local Nature Recovery Strategy document; however this is not available, so can't be assessed as to impact on sites or offsite delivery. In part (c) the requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) in addition to mitigation measures not justified in the context of how the BNG metric applies. | No change proposed in relation to requirement in excess of 10%.  Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed to incorporate in the draft Plan. Aim to include it when complete in an SPD and/or in the Plan at next review stage.  No change proposed to part (c). | Yes | PDSP.051.008 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Oppose requirement for excess of 10% Biodiversty Net Gain in certain situations. This is in excess to the Environment Act. Will affect viability of brownfield sites. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.056.007 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Oppose requirement for excess of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain in certain situations. This is in excess to the NPPF. Will affect viability of brownfield sites. Should be left to developers if they want to exceed 10%. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.071.017 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Oppose requirement for excess of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain in certain situations. This is in excess to the NPPF. Will affect viability of brownfield sites. Should be left to developers if they want to exceed 10%. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.079.025 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Biodiversity Net Gain calculations can be problematic on certain habitats e.g. Open Mosaic Habitat, which is considered very valuable; however this conflicts with the redevelopment of brownfield sites.  Requirements in excess of 10% can add uncertainty. Departing from the minimum 10% lacks specificity and could obstruct development. | No change proposed. Open Mosaic Habitat included in the latest Biodiversity Metric. Where applicable this will calculate Biodiversity Net Gain units to be delivered by development onsite and/or offsite if required.  No change proposed to the requirement for more than 10% BNG in specific circumstances. | No | PDSP.086.048 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | BNG requirements are unclear. Achieving 10% for new development will not achieve 10% for the city as a whole. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.099.009 | CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Oppose requirement for excess of 10% BNG in certain situations as this is not consistent with NPPF. Should leave it to developers if they want to deliver in excess of 10%. | No change proposed. A minimum 10% requirement for BNG, and higher percentage under certain circumstances, was assessed as policy option in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). | No | PDSP.112.015 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Historic Waterway infrastructure needs greater protection from potential risk of biodiversity measures being implemented. | No change proposed, covered by other policies. | No | PDSP.113.003 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Historic Waterway infrastructure needs greater protection from potential risk of biodiversity measures being implemented. | No change proposed, covered by other policies. | No | PDSP.116.064 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Historic Waterway infrastructure needs greater protection from potential risk of biodiversity measures being implemented. | No change proposed, covered by other policies. | No | PDSP.116.065 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | The minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement is unambitious.  There is no clear expectation of the extent to which biodiversity design features will be required in GS5.  Suggest amendment to support BG1, where buffer zones are created next to key Blue and Green Infrastructure that become strategic locations where developers’ compensation requires 15% Biodiversity Net Gain units.  Policy needs to make clear whether it is applicable to householder applications.  An SPD should be provided to support this policy with more detail. Clarification needed on how off-site delivery will be achieved. Sheffield City Council must take a lead to facilitate this. Further detail needed in an SPD. | The minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement was assessed as part of the policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher percentage requirement, outside of those circumstances already identified in the policy would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  A future Biodiversity Net Gain SPD will be produced providing further detail in support of the policy. The 'Definitions' also provide further detail on when either the Biodiversity or Small Sites Metric are applied. | Yes | PDSP.124.003 | S11Swifts |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Policy needs to make clear what development Biodiversity Net Gain applies too, and any exemptions. Amendment to Policy is needed to avoid risks of sites being cleared before baseline Biodiversity Net Gain assessment is carried out.  Given the nature emergency, should encourage higher best practice target of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain, with 10% as absolute minimum.  Urban Green Factor tool would help achieve a net gain where existing sites have nil or very little biodiversity value. | A future Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) SPD will be produced providing further detail in support of the policy. The 'Definitions' also provide further detail on when either the Biodiversity or Small Sites Metric are applied. Reference to the degradation date will be included in a future informal guidance/SPD. The minimum 10% BNG requirement was assessed as part of the policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher percentage requirement, outside of those circumstances already identified in the policy would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Aim to incorporate Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' principles and standards. | Yes | PDSP.127.012 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Comment on policy GS5 (a) Suggest amendment to policy to recognise biodiversity value of buildings e.g. nesting sites.  Example of swift bricks not sufficient. These should be a mandatory requirement. No clear expectation of the extent to which biodiversity design features will be required.  In relation to GS6 the minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement is unambitious. Policy needs to make clear whether it is applicable to householder applications. | For comments on GS5 see response to comment PDSP.124.002.  In relation to GS6 the minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement was assessed as part of the policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher percentage requirement, outside of those circumstances already identified in the policy would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  A future BNG SPD will be produced providing further detail in support of the policy. The 'Definitions' also provide further detail on when either the Biodiversity or Small Sites Metric are applied | Yes | PDSP.136.002 | Sheffield Swift Network |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Suggest amendment to support BG1, where buffer zones are created next to key Blue Green Infrastructure that become strategic locations where developers compensation requires 15% BNG units.  Policy needs to make clear whether it is applicable to householder applications.  An SPD should be provided to support this policy with more detail. Clarification needed on how off-site delivery will be achieved. Sheffield City Council must take a lead to facilitate this. Further detail needed in an SPD. | No change proposed. A future Biodiversity Net Gain SPD will be produced providing further detail in support of the policy. The 'Definitions' also provide further detail on when either the Biodiversity or Small Sites Metric are applied. | No | PDSP.139.004 | South Yorkshire Bat Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain |  | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.140.039 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Comment relates to policy GS5a. Suggest amendment to policy to recognise biodiversity value of buildings e.g. nesting sites. Example of swift bricks not sufficient. These should be a mandatory requirement. | Propose amendment to require universal swift bricks or bat roosting features in new developments. No change proposed to part (a) as this is covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.191.008 | Carol Collins |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Given the nature emergency the minimum 10% BNG is not enough and should be as ahigh as possible. In relation to part (f) how can we rely on management being carried out for 30 years by developers, when in cases conditions on applications aren't even complied with. | A minimum 10% requirement for BNG, and higher percentage under certain circumstances, was assessed as policy option in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Increased requirements would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  BNG provision will be monitored over the minimum 30 years to ensure it is being delivered and will be covered by legislation. | No | PDSP.260.015 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | Policies GS5 and GS6 need to ensure all intrusive biodiversity measures on water infrastructure are not allowed until all unintrusive measures explored first. If allowed to heritage assets should allow for archaeological surveys. | No change, protection of heritage assets and archaeological surveys covered by other policies. | No | PDSP.270.003 | Jim McNeil |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain | An amendment is needed to avoid risks of sites being cleared before baseline Biodiversity Net Gain assessment is carried out.  Given the nature emergency, should encourage higher best practice target of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain, with 10% as absolute minimum.  Urban Green Factor tool would help achieve a net gain where existing sites have nil or very little biodiversity value. | Site clearance will be covered in more detail in a future SPD.  The minimum 10% BNG requirement was assessed as part of the policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher percentage requirement, outside of those circumstances already identified in the policy would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' principles and standards will be incorporated into BG1. | Yes | PDSP.333.008 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Need to refer to planning applications conforming with Natural England and Forestry Commissions guidance on protecting Ancient Trees and Woodland and Veteran Trees (AWTVT) from development.  Suggest using Forestry Commissions guidelines for Tree Canopy Cover which sets 20% as a good aspiration. Recommend using Woodland Trust's 'Woodland Access Standard'. 2ha of woodland within 500m & 20ha within 4km. | Accept proposed change to reference the AWTVT guidance in supporting text.  No change proposed to tree planting requirements (including street trees), but a reference in policy introduction will be added that tree planting will help contribute towards achieving a city-wide canopy cover target of 20%.  No change proposed to incorporate the woodland access standard as not all city centre sites will be within proximity of woodland. | Yes | PDSP.006.016 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Concerned the policy is requiring significant tree planting requirements that will impact on deliverability of sites and housing numbers. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.016.024 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | In relation to parts (d) & (e) - Will the tree planting % requirements be applied to city centre sites, and what about terraced housing streets?.  Could clarification be provided on what 'exceptional circumstances' means in part (b). | No change proposed. Policy GS7 (d & e) allows flexibility, where tree planting would not be feasible e.g. city centre locations, where the whole development plot is often maximised by the building footprint. Street trees are only required on major residential applications where new streets are provided, leaving minor residential applications exempt as plots can often be infill sites using existing highway making the inclusion of street trees difficult to accommodate. | No | PDSP.035.013 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Concerned replacement of trees on ratio greater than 1 for 1 and minimum size to be extra heavy standard may not be appropriate on every site. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.051.009 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Concerned policy is requiring significant tree planting requirements that will impact on deliverability of employment sites. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.071.018 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Concerned policy is requiring significant tree planting requirements that will impact on deliverability of tightly constrained urban sites. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.079.026 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | In relation to parts (d) & (e) - Will the tree planting % requirements be applied to city centre sites, and what about terraced housing streets?.  Could clarification be provided on what 'exceptional circumstances' means in part (b). | No change proposed. Policy GS7 (d & e) allows flexibility, where tree planting would not be feasible e.g. city centre locations, where the whole development plot is often maximised by the building footprint. Street trees are only required on major residential applications where new streets are provided, leaving minor residential applications exempt as plots can often be infill sites using existing highway making the inclusion of street trees difficult to accommodate. | No | PDSP.086.049 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Part (e) states 'where new streets are provided' suggesting low density rather than high density housing. This should be clearly stated if this is the case. | No change proposed. Policy GS7 (d & e) allows flexibility, where tree planting would not be feasible e.g. city centre locations, where the whole development plot is often maximised by the building footprint. Street trees are only required on major residential applications where new streets are provided, leaving minor residential applications exempt as plots can often be infill sites using existing highway making the inclusion of street trees difficult to accommodate. | No | PDSP.088.012 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Concerns policy for tree planting %'s would impact on land take, density, viability, highway provision & maintenance. | Policy acknowledges not all sites will be able to provide tree planting, so this will need to be demonstrated where applicable, and contributions made instead. The requirement for street trees is in response to the NPPF and Government targets to increase street tree planting. | No | PDSP.112.016 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to opening line to also recognise trees as heritage assets. | Encompassing term to be added to policy covering additional heritage assets. | Yes | PDSP.116.066 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to opening line of supporting text to also recognise trees as heritage assets. | Encompassing term proposed to be added to policy D1 recognising that the list of distinctive heritage assets is not exhaustive. | Yes | PDSP.116.067 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to part (b) include 'Ancient Trees'. | Accept suggested policy amendment. | Yes | PDSP.120.009 | Owlthorpe Fields Action Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to supporting text to include additional benefits of trees and woodlands.  Suggest amendment to include additional supporting paragraph to refer to tree planting strategies.  Suggest amendment to part (b) to identify consequences if tree removal is carried out prior to BNG baseline assessment/planning application.  Suggest amendment to definitions regarding Tree Quality & Condition.  Suggest amendment to part (f) on species selection.  Suggest amendment to part (i) on management and maintenance to prevent failures. | No change proposed to text relating to benefits. Accept suggested amendment to add support text relating to tree planting.  Site clearance/tree removal will be covered in more detail in a future SPD.  Propose to add text to the policy on species selection.  No change in relation to management, maintenance and failures as this is already covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.127.013 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to supporting text to include additional benefits of trees and woodlands.  Suggest amendment to include additional supporting paragraph to refer to tree planting strategies.  Suggest amendment to part (b) to identify consequences if tree removal is carried out prior to BNG baseline assessment/planning application.  Suggest amendment to definitions regarding Tree Quality & Condition.  Suggest amendment to part (f) on species selection.  Suggest amendment to part (i) on management and maintenance to prevent failures. | No change proposed to text relating to benefits. Accept suggested amendment to add support text relating to tree planting.  Site clearance/tree removal will be covered in more detail in a future SPD.  Propose to add text to the policy on species selection.  No change in relation to management, maintenance and failures as this is already covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.135.003 | Sheffield Street Tree Partnership (SSTP) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to part (a) re. tree removal and need for Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) Valuation to ascertain number of replacement trees. Suggest amendment to part (b) to include street trees in list.  Suggest amendment to part (c) replacing 'should' with 'must'. Suggest amendments to part (d) requiring a fully resourced 30 year management plan as part of compensation & part (e) additional measurement formula for requiring new trees. Suggest amendment to part (f) to include additional criteria for tree species selection. Suggest amendment to part (g) to provide additional points on integration & part (h) replace 'should' with 'must'.  Suggest amendments to part (i) on maintenance and liabilities for failures. | Propose including reference to CAVAT. | Yes | PDSP.137.004 | Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Support this policy, in particular the protection of and, where necessary, replacement of the amazing street trees of Sheffield. | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.191.009 | Carol Collins |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | In relation to part (a) Trees/vegetation should not be allowed to be felled before pre-application.  Part (c) Trees should not be damaged to maximise development or located close to trees resulting in damage/root protection.  In relation to part (d) any felled trees should be replaced like for like or with native trees good for wildlife. In relation to part (h) any trees which fail after planting should be replaced. Sensitive maintenance of woodland & habitats in the Loxley Valley needs reassessing to protect and aid their recovery in the future. | Site clearance/tree removal will be covered in more detail in a future SPD. Proposed amendments to provide additional guidance on appropriate trees. No change in relation to management and failures as this is already covered by the policy. Maintenance of existing woodland is beyond the scope of the Local Plan. | Yes | PDSP.260.016 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to part (f) to avoid any negative impacts on designated & non-designated assets from woodland works. | No change, covered by policy. | No | PDSP.270.004 | Jim McNeil |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to supporting text to include additional benefits of trees.  Suggest amendment to include additional supporting paragraph to refer to tree planting strategies. | No change proposed. Benefits covered in chapter and policy introduction. Propose additional policy text to guide tree planting strategies. | Yes | PDSP.271.015 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to part (b) to identify consequences if tree removal carried out prior to Biodiversity Net Gain baseline assessment/planning application.  Suggest amendment to definitions regarding Tree Quality & Condition.  Suggest amendments to part (f) on tree/shrub selection & new item on street tree selection to be in accordance with Sheffield Street Tree Partnership guidance.  Suggest amendments to part (i) on maintenance and liabilities for failures. | Site clearance/tree removal will be covered in more detail in a future SPD.  Propose amendments to guide tree quality and condition and selection in line with guidance from the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership.  No change proposed in relation to management, maintenance and failures as this is already covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.271.016 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Suggest amendment to part (b) to identify consequences if tree removal carried out prior to Biodiversity Net Gain baseline assessment/planning application.  Suggest amendment to definitions regarding Tree Quality & Condition.  Suggest amendments to part (f) on tree/shrub selection & new item on street tree selection to be in accordance with Sheffield Street Tree Partnership guidance.  Suggest amendments to part (i) on maintenance and liabilities for failures. | Site clearance/tree removal will be covered in more detail in a future SPD.  Propose amendments to guide tree quality and condition and selection in line with guidance from the Sheffield Street Tree Partnership.  No change proposed in relation to management, maintenance and failures as this is already covered by policy. | Yes | PDSP.333.009 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Need to ensure the city's Public Open Space continues to be protected and maintained.  Need to ensure Green Belt continues to be protected. | No change. Covered by other policies in the Plan. | No | PDSP.336.005 | Patricia Dawson-Butterworth |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity | Welcome the inclusion of the final paragraph of Policy GS8  which enables consideration to be given to proposals for the  limited extraction of stone in specific circumstances for the  repair of historic buildings in the area where there are no  viable alternative sources available. | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.003.031 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity | Likely only a very small portion of sites will affect rock outcrops or LGS. | No change proposed. Where this applies then development will need to comply with the policy. | No | PDSP.086.050 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity | Suggest amendments to parts (a) to (d) to include 'historical significance' after 'geological' reference. Suggest inserting new paragraph on metal trades after paragraph 8.29. | No change proposed. Heritage references covered under other policies. | No | PDSP.116.068 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity | Suggest amendments to parts (a) to (d) to include 'historical significance' after 'geological' reference. Suggest inserting new paragraph on metal trades after paragraph 8.29. | No change proposed. Heritage references covered under other policies. | No | PDSP.116.069 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity | Suggest amending paragraph 3.21 in relation to policy ES7 to allow geological examination of recently exposed surface material at new development sites. Suggest amendments to GS8 and supporting text to address potential harm to Local Geological Sites from stone extraction and need for a prior assessment to identify suitable areas, if any. | No change proposed to ES7.  No change proposed to GS8 as this would be considered at planning application stage. | No | PDSP.128.002 | Sheffield Area Geology Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity | Suggest amendments to GS8 and supporting text to address potential harm to Local Geological Sites from stone extraction and need for a prior assessment to identify suitable areas, if any. | No change proposed to GS8 as this would be considered at planning application stage. | No | PDSP.128.003 | Sheffield Area Geology Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Multiple changes are required to the policy to make it clearer with regard to flood risk and mitigation. | Recommended changes are accepted. | Yes | PDSP.002.014 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Welcome policy if taken in line with consideration of heritage assets. | Support is welcomed. Proposed policy DE9 "Development and heritage assets" provides protection/consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets | No | PDSP.003.032 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Policy is lengthy and repetitive. | Policy has been reworded to improve clarity. | Yes | PDSP.086.051 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Policy requires consideration of heritage assets. | Proposed policy DE9 "Development and heritage assets" provides protection/consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Any proposals for removal of assets would be considered on their merits on the basis of the whole plan, not just this standalone policy. | No | PDSP.116.070 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Policy requires consideration of heritage assets. | Proposed policy DE9 "Development and heritage assets" provides protection/consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Any proposals for removal of assets would be considered on their merits on the basis of the whole plan, not just this standalone policy. | No | PDSP.116.071 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Reword policy to improve clarity. | No change proposed. Restarting of the lettering for bullet points is intentional where there are multiple lists within a policy. Continuation of the lettering would imply that the points are one list, rather than multiple lists. | No | PDSP.116.072 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Paragraph numbering restarts from (a), so that (a) to (f) appear twice. | No change proposed. There are two separate criterion lists within the policy, so this restart of numbering is intentional. | No | PDSP.116.073 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Proposed buffers may impact on Local Wildlife Sites. Strengthen working on preventing new culverts. | The 8 metre minimum buffer is derived from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1). The Environment Agency are likely to object to development that is within 8m of a main river. Any impacts on designations such as Local Wildlife Sites would be assessed under proposed policy GS5 (Development and biodiversity), plus NPPF requirements. This assessment could lead to the establishment of a wider buffer on specific sites, where suitable impacts are identified. Strengthening of wording on culverting welcomed. Management of waterflow across sites may be required in some instances and would require detailed assessment at planning application stage (in conjunction with Local Lead Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, where necessary). | Yes | PDSP.125.013 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Introductory text does not comply with NPPF. Proposed buffers may impact on Local Wildlife Sites. Strengthen working on preventing new culverts. | Propose rewording of paragraph 8.30 and 8.31. The 8 metre minimum buffer is derived from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1). The Environment Agency are likely to object to development that is within 8m of a main river. Any impacts on designations such as Local Wildlife Sites would be assessed under proposed policy GS5 (Development and biodiversity), plus NPPF requirements. This assessment could lead to the establishment of a wider buffer on specific sites, where suitable impacts are identified. Strengthening of wording on culverting welcomed. Management of waterflow across sites may be required in some instances and would require detailed assessment at planning application stage (in conjunction with Local Lead Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, where necessary). | Yes | PDSP.127.014 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Impact of Flood Storage Area on heritage assets. Proposed buffers may impact on Local Wildlife Sites. | The policy restricts future development that may have an adverse impact on the ability of Land that is Safeguarded for Flood Storage to operate as flood storage. The Plan does not set any specific requirements or site allocations for future flood alleviation works. Any works such of these would be subject to separate consultation with the community and would need to pass through the planning application process. The impact of any future works on things such as heritage assets would then be assessed via proposed policy DE9 "Development and heritage assets". The 8 metre minimum buffer is derived from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1). The Environment Agency are likely to object to development that is within 8m of a main river. Any impacts on designations such as Local Wildlife Sites would be assessed under proposed policy GS5 (Development and biodiversity), plus NPPF requirements. This assessment could lead to the establishment of a wider buffer on specific sites, where suitable impacts are identified. | No | PDSP.260.017 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Welcome policy if taken in line with consideration of heritage assets. | Support is welcomed. Proposed policy DE9 "Development and heritage assets" provides protection/consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets. | No | PDSP.270.005 | Jim McNeil |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Proposed buffers may impact on Local Wildlife Sites. | The 8 metre minimum buffer is derived from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1). The Environment Agency are likely to object to development that is within 8m of a main river. Any impacts on designations such as Local Wildlife Sites would be assessed under proposed policy GS5 (Development and biodiversity), plus NPPF requirements. This assessment could lead to the establishment of a wider buffer on specific sites, where suitable impacts are identified. | No | PDSP.271.017 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Introductory text does not comply with NPPF. | Propose rewording of paragraph 8.30 and 8.31. | Yes | PDSP.333.010 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Proposed buffers may impact on Local Wildlife Sites. Strengthen working on preventing new culverts. | The 8 metre minimum buffer is derived from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1). The Environment Agency are likely to object to development that is within 8m of a main river. Any impacts on designations such as Local Wildlife Sites would be assessed under proposed policy GS5 (Development and biodiversity), plus NPPF requirements. This assessment could lead to the establishment of a wider buffer on specific sites, where suitable impacts are identified. Strengthening of wording on culverting welcomed. Management of waterflow across sites may be required in some instances and would require detailed assessment at planning application stage (in conjunction with Local Lead Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, where necessary). | Yes | PDSP.333.011 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Introductory text does not comply with NPPF. | Propose rewording of paragraph 8.30 and 8.31. | Yes | PDSP.393.010 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Proposed buffers may impact on Local Wildlife Sites. | The 8 metre minimum buffer is derived from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1). The Environment Agency are likely to object to development that is within 8m of a main river. Any impacts on designations such as Local Wildlife Sites would be assessed under proposed policy GS5 (Development and biodiversity), plus NPPF requirements. This assessment could lead to the establishment of a wider buffer on specific sites, where suitable impacts are identified. | No | PDSP.393.011 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk | Strengthen wording on preventing new culverts. | Strengthening of wording on culverting welcomed. Management of waterflow across sites may be required in some instances and would require detailed assessment at planning application stage (in conjunction with Local Lead Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, where necessary). | Yes | PDSP.393.012 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | There is no requirement under the Water Framework Directive that new development must enhance the quality of water bodies in those areas. The requirement to ‘enhance’ is not justified. | No change. As well as avoiding deterioration of water bodies, the Water Framework Directive requires water bodies to reach good status by 2027, which emphasizes the need for improvements. | No | PDSP.051.010 | Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Unclear how development proposals can achieve the goal of not negatively impacting water bodies or increasing risk of groundwater pollution. If this would mainly affect drainage of surface water it could be combined with policy GS11. | Propose additional text supporting the Environment Agency approach to groundwater protection. This will provide sufficient guidance regarding what measures can be taken not to increase groundwater pollution. | Yes | PDSP.086.052 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Conservation of watercourses should not prioritise a return to a 'natural state' at the expense of industrial heritage. Amend policy to expect conservation of historic waterpower infrastructure. | No change necessary. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries, and policy DE9 states that particular regard will be paid to these assets. An amendment has also been made to Policy BG1 to reference conservation of heritage assets. | No | PDSP.116.074 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Conservation of watercourses should not prioritise a return to a 'natural state' at the expense of industrial heritage. Append to GS10: “Development will be expected to conserve heritage assets, including historic waterpower infrastructure.” | No change necessary. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries, and policy DE9 states that particular regard will be paid to these assets. An amendment has also been made to Policy BG1 to reference conservation of heritage assets. | No | PDSP.116.075 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Possible removal of heritage assets due to overzealous application of Water Framework Directives objectives. Add 'while maintaining heritage assets' to GS10. Amend policy to include reference to impact on water quality. | No change proposed. ‘Water Quality’ is covered under GS10(a)(ii).   Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries, and policy DE9 states that particular regard will be paid to these assets. An amendment has also been made to Policy BG1 to reference conservation of heritage assets. | No | PDSP.125.014 | Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Add policy/supporting text to paragraphs 8.34, 8.36 or policy GS10 to continue Water Framework Directive commitments. Amend policy to include reference to impact on water quality. | No change. The Water Framework Directive has been retained in UK law following Brexit. | No | PDSP.127.015 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Support Joined Up Heritage Sheffield comments on water bodies and heritage. Support the comments by Simon Ogden on the Sheffield Waterways Strategy. Need to recognise and celebrate the wellbeing and environmental benefits of heritage.  The 'vision of growing a coherent connected well cared for network of green blue spaces' is not so strongly presented in the Sheffield Plan as in the UDP Policy GE17 and in Policy CS73 and should be strengthened. | No change necessary. | No | PDSP.260.018 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Add policy/supporting text to paragraphs 8.34, 8.36 or policy GS10 to continue Water Framework Directive commitments.  Amend policy to include reference to impact on water quality. | No change. ‘Water Quality’ is covered under GS10(a)(ii). | No | PDSP.333.012 | NicolaDempsey99 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources | Add policy/supporting text to paragraphs 8.34, 8.36 or policy GS10 to continue Water Framework Directive commitments. Amend policy to include reference to impact on water quality. | No change. The Water Framework Directive has been retained in UK law following Brexit and ‘Water Quality’ is covered under GS10(a)(ii). | No | PDSP.393.013 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems | The policy should reflect that if the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) includes an infiltration device it should not pose an unacceptable risk of pollution to controlled waters by mobilising potential contaminants in the ground. Reference the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection. Develop a groundwater policy compliant with EA position statements. | Minor change necessary. Add reference to Environment Agency approach to groundwater protection to GS11 and GS10. No specific groundwater policy is warranted. | Yes | PDSP.002.015 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems | Where development drains to a protected site, additional treatment component may be required to ensure no impact on water quality. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) require appropriate resources to ensure long term monitoring, maintenance and funding. | Policy GS10 and GS11 have been amended to reference the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection.  Detailed requirements are better suited to a supplementary planning document. | Yes | PDSP.006.017 | Natural England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems | Whilst this policy is broadly supported, the poor standards of maintenance of existing SUD's schemes undermine the objectives of this. | No change necessary. A supplementary planning document will be produced to accompany GS11 which will provide further detail. | No | PDSP.086.053 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems | Policy requires edge detection along foot and roadways. Need to ensure that edges of footways and roadways are tactilely detectible by the blind and partially sighted. Any footway width requirements must not include the ‘kerbs’ on the SUDS. | No change necessary. A supplementary planning document will be produced to accompany GS11 which will provide further detail. | No | PDSP.093.009 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems | Risk that the requirement for on-site SuDS will be used as justification to make significant changes to historic waterpower infrastructure to provide on-site storage. Amend policy to include requirement to conserve historic waterpower infrastructure and protect dam or channel levels. Amend policy to conserve historic waterpower infrastructure and protect dam or channel levels. | No change necessary. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries, and policy DE9 states that particular regard will be paid to these assets. An amendment has also been made to Policy BG1 to reference conservation of heritage assets. | No | PDSP.116.076 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency | Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems | Risk that the requirement for on-site SuDS will be used as justification to make significant changes to historic waterpower infrastructure to provide on-site storage.  Amend policy to conserve historic waterpower infrastructure and protect dam or channel levels. | No change necessary. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries, and policy DE9 states that particular regard will be paid to these assets. An amendment has also been made to Policy BG1 to reference conservation of heritage assets. | No | PDSP.116.077 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Add "community gardens and urban farms" to the text in paragraph 8.5. | Agree to the suggested change. | Yes | PDSP.121.025 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Add "agroecological food production" to the text in paragraph 8.2. | Propose to add ‘food production’ to paragraph 8.2. | Yes | PDSP.121.026 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Add "agroecological food production" to the text in paragraph 8.2. | Propose to add ‘food production’ to paragraph 8.2. | Yes | PDSP.121.027 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Add "community gardens and urban farms" to the text in paragraph 8.5. | Agree to the suggested change. | Yes | PDSP.121.028 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Suggested amendment: c) safeguard, or not otherwise adversely affect, a greenspace of high amenity \*\*\*or of food growing\*\*\* value;. | Agree to the suggested change to GS1 (c). | Yes | PDSP.121.029 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | The wording of policies GS5, GS6, GS9, GS10 and GS11 must be amended to refer explicitly to and protect the heritage value of historic waterways and waterpower infrastructure, and their settings. There should be specific prohibition of measures such as the destruction of historic weirs, changes to water levels in dams and goits, or decanalisation of historic artificial channels. | Propose amendment to BG1 to refer to heritage assets. Heritage covered under proposed policies D1 ‘Design Principles and Priorities’ and DE9 ‘Development and heritage assets’ which provides protection/ consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Any proposals for removal of assets would be considered on their merits on the basis of the whole Plan. No change to GS5, GS6, GS9, GS10 & GS11 proposed. |  | PDSP.122.005 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Suggest minor amendment to paragraph 8.4 to read “The implementation of BG1 alongside other local and national policies and strategies will also help to address the loss of nature and help create, restore and connect a range of habitats to provide a network of places for wildlife to thrive.” | No change needed. Paragraph 8.3 cross references to BG1. |  | PDSP.127.009 | Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | There are no comments in this representation. Specific comments about chapter 8 – specifically policy GS8 - are in a separate comment (ref: 1842839). | Noted - no comment made. | No | PDSP.128.001 | Sheffield Area Geology Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | The green and blue network in complete and needs extending. The Local Plan should require initiatives to deliver improvements where opportunities arise. The Green Space Network map 17 is at too small a scale and does not indicate how improvements could be made or identify current initiatives. The Plan should set out which improvements should be made, and link the benefits of blue and green infrastructure routes to policies on improving health inequalities, active travel, flood management, sustainable tourism and greening the city. It should acknowledge the role of other organisation and commit to delivering Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Standards  for England (2023). | Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed to incorporate in the draft Plan. Aim to include it when complete in an SPD and/or in the Plan at next review stage. |  | PDSP.151.004 | Upper Don Trail Trust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | The wording of policies GS5, GS6, GS9, GS10 and GS11 must be amended to refer explicitly to and protect the heritage value of historic waterways and waterpower infrastructure, and their settings. There should be specific prohibition of measures such as the destruction of historic weirs, changes to water levels in dams and goits, or decanalisation of historic artificial channels.   Increase the Biodiversity Net Gain target to a minimum of 20% for all development.  Be more specific and ambitious about requirements for wildlife-friendly design features in new buildings. | Propose amendment to BG1 to refer to heritage assets. Heritage covered under proposed policies D1 ‘Design Principles and Priorities’ and DE9 ‘Development and heritage assets’ which provides protection/ consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Any proposals for removal of assets would be considered on their merits on the basis of the whole Plan. No change to GS5, GS6, GS9, GS10 & GS11 proposed.  A minimum 10% requirement for BNG, and higher percentage under certain circumstances, was assessed as policy option in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Increased requirements would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Policy GS5 amended regarding requirement of swift bricks/bat boxes. |  | PDSP.188.005 | Boo |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | No consideration given to the canal corridor from the city eastwards. Other cities have made more effective use of canalside land. Rezone the land between the canal and Effingham Rd for housing and plan for a high quality walking and cycling route into town along the canal. | The spatial strategy plans for a variety of uses along the canal corridor, including housing at the Attercliffe Canalside sites. | No | PDSP.200.001 | Chris Rust |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Although the role of wildlife and green spaces in combating and adapting to climate change is mentioned in point 8.2 this needs to be given greater weight in the points and policies that follow.  In GS5 much greater clarity is needed around the requirement for incorporation of wildlife-friendly design features into new buildings.  GS7 should clarify that not all new trees are of equal wildlife value. More specific guidance is required on which species would best enhance biodiversity. | No change regarding combatting climate change already covered in chapter introduction.  Policy GS5 amended regarding requirement of swift bricks/bat boxes.  Additional text proposed in GS7 that gives greater guidance on new trees. |  | PDSP.201.008 | Claire |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | The introduction to chapter 8 needs to cross reference policy BG1 in part 1. | No change needed, BG1 already referenced in chapter introduction (paragraph 8.3). |  | PDSP.260.007 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | The wording of policies GS5, GS6, GS9, GS10 and GS11 must be amended to refer explicitly to and protect the heritage value of historic waterways and waterpower infrastructure, and their settings. There should be specific prohibition of measures such as the destruction of historic weirs, changes to water levels in dams and goits, or decanalisation of historic artificial channels. | Propose amendment to BG1 to refer to heritage assets. Heritage covered under proposed policies D1 ‘Design Principles and Priorities’ and DE9 ‘Development and heritage assets’ which provides protection/ consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Any proposals for removal of assets would be considered on their merits on the basis of the whole Plan. No change to GS5, GS6, GS9, GS10 & GS11 proposed. |  | PDSP.271.011 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | In GS5 much greater clarity is needed around the requirement for incorporation of wildlife-friendly design features into new buildings.  GS7 should clarify that not all new trees are of equal wildlife value. More specific guidance is required on which species would best enhance biodiversity. | Policy GS5 amended regarding requirement of swift bricks/bat boxes.  Additional text proposed in GS7 that gives greater guidance on new trees. | Yes | PDSP.271.012 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Although the role of wildlife and green spaces in combating and adapting to climate change is mentioned in point 8.2 this needs to be given greater weight in the points and policies that follow.  In GS5 much greater clarity is needed around the requirement for incorporation of wildlife-friendly design features into new buildings.  GS7 should clarify that not all new trees are of equal wildlife value. More specific guidance is required on which species would best enhance biodiversity. | No change regarding combatting climate change already covered in chapter introduction.  Policy GS5 amended regarding requirement of swift bricks/bat boxes.  Additional text proposed in GS7 that gives greater guidance on new trees. | Yes | PDSP.285.007 | Jonathan789 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | The Council advises that the wooded area at the top of Bridle Stiles is considered an informal nature reserve. This adds weight to the land being considered as Green Belt as part of the current local plan consultations. | No change proposed. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to alter the Green Belt boundary, other than where a sustainably located brownfield site is proposed for removal from the Green Belt to allow housing development, and to rectify minor anomalies. The land at Bridle Stile is designated as an Urban Green Space Zone and much of it is also designated as a Local Wildlife Site, so it has significant protection from built development in the Plan. | No | PDSP.309.001 | Lyn Marlow |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Need to maintain what greenspace there is and not take down trees to build on the land. Community wish to keep greenspace. Develop brownfield sites and maintain green space as green. | Policies in the Plan, notably GS1 and NC15, seek to ensure that greenspace is retained and improved where possible and new greenspace created. The overall spatial strategy for development is very much a "brownfield first" strategy, focussing on the central part of the city. | No | PDSP.313.001 | Mark |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Although the role of wildlife and green spaces in combating and adapting to climate change is mentioned in point 8.2 this needs to be given greater weight in the points and policies that follow.  In GS5 much greater clarity is needed around the requirement for incorporation of wildlife-friendly design features into new buildings.  GS7 should clarify that not all new trees are of equal wildlife value. More specific guidance is required on which species would best enhance biodiversity. | No change regarding combatting climate change already covered in chapter introduction.  Policy GS5 amended regarding requirement of swift bricks/bat boxes.  Additional text proposed in GS7 that gives greater guidance on new trees. |  | PDSP.341.006 | PaulMaddox1960 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Notes some allocation sites may have had their biodiversity/geodiversity value increased and allocations sites affected should account for these. Would like to see nature/wildlife corridors established to help with these. | Site allocation conditions have been included to cover this. |  | PDSP.343.003 | penny71 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | The Biodiversity Net Gain requirement needs to be more ambitious with wording changing to make it a minimum of 10% although a higher target will be more ambitious. I appreciate that the plan needs to be economically viable but the inclusion of e.g. Swift bricks into all new properties will be done at minimal cost to the construction firms involved. | A minimum 10% requirement for BNG, and higher percentage under certain circumstances, was assessed as policy option in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Increased requirements would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Policy GS5 amended regarding requirement of swift bricks/bat boxes. |  | PDSP.375.007 | Sean Ashton |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 8:  A Green City – Responding to the Biodiversity Emergency |  | Enable parts of greenspaces to provide for nature and rewilding while maintaining recreation use. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.375.008 | Sean\_Ashton |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character | Final paragraph raises concerns that policy may give the wrong impression to developers in that the highest standards of design to only be expected in specific areas rather than throughout the city. | Accept suggested policy amendment to remove reference to specific locations. | Yes | PDSP.003.033 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character | Suggest generic criteria are replaced by a place-based design guide or code. | The policy introduction and listed criteria set out elements (although not exhaustive) to be covered as part of a Site Appraisal in an applicants’ Design & Access Statement. It has been necessary to include these criteria due to the continued poor quality of some site appraisals submitted as part of planning applications, which have resulted in a weak response to the local context and character. These criteria will be supported in more detail, for city centre schemes by the City Centre Design Guide which is currently in production. | No | PDSP.086.054 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character | Signpost developers to South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation in Policy DE1. Signpost developers to Urban Design Compendium in Policy DE1. Policy D1 would benefit from a Government definition of 'Beautiful' development. Without guidance, could be just referred to in applications without actually achieving it. | Accept suggested policy amendments to include signposting to the relevant documents. | Yes | PDSP.113.004 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character | The Urban Design Compendium (UDC) is very useful design guidance document. Embed reference to it in Policy DE1. | The Council is currently in the process of updating the UDC with a new City Centre Design Guide, which will become SPD. This will complement the policies with greater detail on character and development requirements within the city centre. | No | PDSP.116.079 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character | The Urban Design Compendium (UDC) is very useful design guidance document. Embed reference to it in Policy DE1. | The Council is currently in the process of updating the UDC with a new City Centre Design Guide, which will become SPD. This will complement the policies with greater detail on character and development requirements within the city centre. | No | PDSP.116.080 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character | Policies don't contain adequate provision to cover sustainable local food growing infrastructure. | Propose amendment to GS1 to include safeguarding land with food growing value. Amend policy BG1 in part 1 to include support for local food production. | Yes | PDSP.121.033 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character | Concerns with approach over potential quality of new character in areas currently lacking distinctiveness. | Accept suggested policy amendments to establish a strong sense of place in areas that currently lack positive or distinctive character. | Yes | PDSP.260.019 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Support this policy which should help to ensure that proposals for new buildings and alterations to existing buildings are designed and constructed to a high standard. We particularly welcome the inclusion of criteria a, c, e and g | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.003.034 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Suggest the list could be made more concise as some criteria could be combined as question practicality of achieving all criteria. | The criteria covered in the policy have been included to address recurring issues and ensure buildings provide a positive intervention within their context, are functional, safe and legible while sensitively responding to their surroundings. | No | PDSP.086.055 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Emphasis needed in (q) on disability access to utility areas.  Add new point to ensure level access to amenity areas. | No change needed. Accessibility within the built environment covered by policy D1. | No | PDSP.093.010 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Emphasis needed in (q) on disability access to utility areas.  Add new point to ensure level access to amenity areas. | No change needed. Accessibility within the built environment covered by policy D1. | No | PDSP.093.011 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Need greater cross referencing to DE1 regarding new development to reflect character of locality. | Accept suggested policy amendment to include a cross reference to policy DE1 within the policy. | Yes | PDSP.113.005 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Concerns over quality of extensions and Permitted Development Rights.  Concerns over quality of schemes being watered down through planning conditions, non-material amendments or new planning applications and potential impact on heritage assets.  Concerns over buildability, need to ensure enough detail provided to demonstrate achievability. | No change needed in relation to extensions. Upward extensions are subject to a prior approval process where the Local Planning Authority can reject a prior notification on various grounds, including potential highways impacts; impact on neighbour and occupier amenity/overlook others, or curb natural light and the external appearance of the building.  No change needed in relation to subsequent changes to planning permissions. This is covered by paragraph 135 of the NPPF.  No change needed in relation to concerns about buildability. The premise for a planning application is that it is buildable. Covered by Building Regulations. | No | PDSP.116.081 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Concerns over quality of extensions and Permitted Development Rights.  Concerns over quality of schemes being watered down through planning conditions, non-material amendments or new planning applications and potential impact on heritage assets.  Concerns over buildability, need to ensure enough detail provided to demonstrate achievability. | No change needed in relation to extensions. Upward extensions are subject to a prior approval process where the Local Planning Authority can reject a prior notification on various grounds, including potential highways impacts; impact on neighbour and occupier amenity/overlook others, or curb natural light and the external appearance of the building.  No change needed in relation to subsequent changes to planning permissions. This is covered by paragraph 135 of the NPPF.  No change needed in relation to concerns about buildability. The premise for a planning application is that it is buildable. Covered by Building Regulations. | No | PDSP.116.082 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings | Part (p) should state the type and specification of lighting that meets criteria for sensitive areas. | No change. This would be too detailed for policy, and will be covered in future SPD. | No | PDSP.260.020 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design | Support the policy. | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.003.035 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design | Suggest rewording text of part (a) to apply to 'all areas' not just urban. | No change. Policy already covers all public areas. | No | PDSP.007.014 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design | Suggest list could be made more concise as some criteria could be combined as question practicality of achieving all criteria. | The criteria covered in the policy have been included to address recurring issues and ensure public realm design provides a positive intervention within its context, is functional, safe and legible while sensitively responding to its surroundings. | No | PDSP.086.056 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design | Suggest expanding features listed in part (d) to include 'historic street pattern'. | Accept suggested policy amendment. | Yes | PDSP.113.006 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design | Policies don't contain adequate provision to cover sustainable local food growing infrastructure. | Propose amendment to GS1 to include safeguarding land with food growing value. Amend policy BG1 in part 1 to include support for local food production. | Yes | PDSP.121.034 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design | Suggest cross-reference in part (d) to policy statement GS7(a) to ensure that public realm schemes achieve an equivalent amenity value of trees at the time of development & tree planting. | No change proposed – part (d) relates to existing features. | No | PDSP.137.005 | Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design | Suggest rewording text of part (h) to include planting of native species for wildlife.  Suggest rewording text of part (d) to include incorporating heritage features.  Suggest rewording text of part (n) to include safety of women. | Accept suggested policy amendment cross reference to GS5-GS7 in part (h)No change proposed to part (d) as this is already covered by policy**.**  Propose an amendment to part (n) to ensure safety for all. | Yes | PDSP.260.021 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking | Opportunity to include in policy inclusion of parklets on streets. Consideration could be given to including specific reference to ensure the provision of safe, accessible connections to public transport infrastructure for all. | No change. Covered by policies SP1 and T1. | No | PDSP.015.012 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking | Suggest list could be made more concise as some criteria could be combined as question practicality of achieving all criteria. | The criteria covered in the policy have been included to address recurring issues and ensure the design of streets, roads and parking provide a positive intervention within their context, are functional, safe and legible while sensitively responding to its surroundings. | No | PDSP.086.057 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking | Suggest minor rewording of part (a) “and steps only when necessary and as a parallel alternate route”.  Shared surfaces cause conflict between pedestrians and cyclists and many disabled people. Policy wording in part (c) should discourage use of them. | No change proposed in relation to part (a). Accept suggested policy amendment to part (c) to remove reference to shared surfaces. | Yes | PDSP.093.012 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking | Suggest minor amendment to policy by including new item - 'Adhere to the latest national guidelines on walking and cycling infrastructure'. | Accept suggested policy amendment to include reference to adhering to national guidelines. | yes | PDSP.130.007 | Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking | Suggest minor amendment to part (f) to refer to 'right tree, right place'. | No change proposed to DE4. However, this principle is proposed to be incorporated into policy GS7. | Yes | PDSP.135.004 | Sheffield Street Tree Partnership (SSTP) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking | Suggest adding text to part (m) to include preserving heritage of historic street patterns. | Accept suggested policy amendment. | Yes | PDSP.260.022 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking | Roads and footpaths need maintaining. Removal of speed humps and traffic calming can help reduce noise and air pollution. Need greater enforcement of road traffic laws to make highways safer for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles and help reduce pollution. | No change needed. Maintenance in new development covered by policy, other issues not within scope of Local Plan. | No | PDSP.336.006 | Patricia Dawson-Butterworth |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE5: Design of Shop Fronts | Support policy approach regarding the assurance that new and replacement shop fronts reflect the character of the street scene and retain existing traditional features. | Support noted and welcomed. | No | PDSP.003.036 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE5: Design of Shop Fronts | Protection and enhancement of new and replacement shop fronts should be considered in more detail within a design guide or code for a specific area or neighbourhood instead of the policy. The policy does not specifically refer to the city centre or district centres or other shopping areas in relation to shop fronts. | The policy is townscape led and seeks to achieve shopfronts that are specific to their context. Assessments will be on case by case basis, and if further guidance is needed, it will be detailed out in future SPDs or masterplans. | No | PDSP.086.058 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE5: Design of Shop Fronts | Suggest inclusion of a requirement for level access entry as part of shop fronts (wherever practicable) within policy criteria. | Accept proposed amendment to include disabled access as additional criteria. | Yes | PDSP.093.013 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE5: Design of Shop Fronts | Comment is supportive of policy approach. | Comment noted. | No | PDSP.113.007 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Need to carefully consider where tall buildings are appropriate, to avoid negatively impacting on distinctive character of existing lower storey buildings/areas. | A Tall Building Area review/assessment will form part of the new City Centre Design Guide, which is currently work in progress. This will update the Tall Building Zone study in the Urban Design Compendium. | No | PDSP.003.037 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Policy refers to the need for 'exceptional design quality' of tall buildings within 'Tall Building Areas'. How is this defined? Seems too high a standard for development to be encouraged. | Tall buildings by definition can bring positive benefits, perform as landmark structures in areas of strategic importance and contribute positively to the skyline. However, by reason of their height, scale and design, they have the capacity to result in broader city-wide visual impacts as well more localised negative effects in respect of scale, presence, microclimate etc. Their potential to result in significant negative impacts demands exceptional design quality is achieved to ensure they make a positive contribution to the skyline and image of the city, as well as respond with care to their immediate environs. The City Centre Design Guide when complete will provide more detail on tall building design. | No | PDSP.014.018 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Policy refers to Tall Building Areas, however these aren't shown on the city centre policies map. Could clarification be given on where this study/evidence is?. | The Council is currently in the process of producing the City Centre Design Guide (CCDG), which will replace the Sheffield Urban Design Compendium. The CCDG will include further information on Tall Building Areas. | No | PDSP.035.014 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Policy refers to Tall Building Areas, however these aren't shown on the city centre policies map. Could clarification be given on where this study/evidence is?. | The Council is currently in the process of producing the City Centre Design Guide (CCDG), which will replace the Sheffield Urban Design Compendium. The CCDG will include further information on Tall Building Areas. | No | PDSP.086.059 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Concerns that buildings with only a single lift access to enable level access to/from accommodation can trap people who rely on it when it fails. Suggest policy reworded to require minimum 2 lifts in buildings. | No change, this is covered by Building Regulations. |  | PDSP.093.014 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Policy notes that Tall Buildings Areas are to be shown on the policies map, but they aren't. | The definitions to Policy DE6 explain that Landmark Buildings & Tall Building Areas will be identified in a SPD, not on the policies map. The SPD showing these locations will be the City Centre Design Guide SPD, which is currently in progress. | No | PDSP.116.083 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Policy notes that Tall Buildings Areas are to be shown on the policies map, but they aren't. | The definitions to Policy DE6 explain that Landmark Buildings & Tall Building Areas will be identified in a SPD, not on the policies map. The SPD showing these locations will be the City Centre Design Guide SPD, which is currently in progress. | No | PDSP.116.084 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Tall Building Areas and Landmarks are not shown on policies map. | The Council is currently in the process of producing the City Centre Design Guide (CCDG), which will replace the Sheffield Urban Design Compendium. The CCDG will include further information on Tall Building Areas. | No | PDSP.116.085 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre | Policy refers to Tall Building Areas & Landmark Buildings, however these aren't shown on the city centre policies map. Could clarification be given on where this study/evidence is?. | The Council is currently in the process of producing the City Centre Design Guide, which will replace the Sheffield Urban Design Compendium. The CCDG will include further information on Tall Building Areas. | No | PDSP.116.086 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE7: Advertisements | Criteria j) should be amended to read “internally illuminated fascia signs will be permitted on shop fronts in Conservation Areas where it can be demonstrated that there is an appropriate luminous intensity in order to be consistent with the NPPF’’. | No change proposed. The policy is townscape led and seeks to achieve shopfronts that are specific to their context. Assessments will be on case by case basis, and if further guidance is needed, it will be detailed out in future SPDs or masterplans. | No | PDSP.055.003 | Marks and Spencer (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE7: Advertisements | The policy criteria have been written from a design perspective and do not meet the requirements of the NPPF. The Framework is clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Criteria should be removed/ or re-written. | The policy is townscape led and seeks to achieve shopfronts that are specific to their context. Assessments will be on case by case basis, and if further guidance is needed, it will be detailed out in future SPDs or masterplans. | No | PDSP.086.060 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE7: Advertisements | The policy is not sufficiently effective in highlighting the hazard of excessive glare from illuminated and digital advertising displays. Suggests changes that could include reference to ‘glare’ or similar and requirements for interior, LED or digital signage to include light sensitivity circuitry (that must be functional) or be turned off particularly after dark and when the business is not open. | No change proposed. The policy is townscape led and seeks to achieve shopfronts that are specific to their context. Assessments will be on case by case basis, and if further guidance is needed, it will be detailed out in future SPDs or masterplans. | No | PDSP.093.015 | Access Liaison Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE7: Advertisements | Re-word part (h) to read: "do not impede movements". Then split into two sections:  - do not create impede movements on key active travel routes; and  - do not cause risks to highway safety or create hazards for disabled people, pedestrians or cyclists. | Accept proposed amendment to reword part (h) to remove the word ‘create’. No change proposed to the criteria as the effect would remain the same with the proposed amendments. | Yes | PDSP.116.087 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE7: Advertisements | Policy DE7 (h) should be divided into two parts as follows:  - do not impede movements on key active travel routes; and  - do not cause risks to highway safety or create hazards for disabled people, pedestrians or cyclists. | No change needed. The policy criteria would remain the same with the proposed amendments. | No | PDSP.116.088 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE7: Advertisements | Support policy but suggests that policy criteria's c) d) e) and i) should mention that heritage assets need protection from excessive signage. | Support noted and welcomed. It is considered that Strategic Policy D1 addresses the protection of heritage assets under all circumstances. | No | PDSP.260.023 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | Queries how the policy will apply when several development proposals within an area want to contribute towards a larger public art project, and whether it should be possible to consider one large public art intervention which is financially contributed to by each of the proposals. | The emerging Sheffield Design Guide will provide further detail in relation to contributions towards public art. Any further details on future proposals and their contributions to public art will be dealt with at application stage. | No | PDSP.086.061 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | Supportive of policy as long as the scope of requirement is appropriate to the scale and nature of the scheme. | Support welcomed and noted. Any further details on future proposals and their appropriateness relation to the development's merits will be dealt with at application stage. | No | PDSP.088.013 | Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | The policy should be amended to ensure the retention or sensitive relocation of existing artwork, support the reinstatement of previously removed artworks, reflect national policy on statues and commemorative objects, incorporate Historic England guidance on contested heritage, and ensure that the largest possible number of developments incorporate locally distinctive artwork by allowing finance in lieu only as a last resort. | No change proposed – the suggested change is too detailed for a Development Management policy. The principles in the emerging Sheffield Design Guide and/ or a Public Art Strategy will address points raised. The currently worded planning condition does allow for retention of artworks on site, where possible. The Council also have a public art officer in post to implement the policy, who takes into account the site specific situations while advising on specific proposals. There is no need to repeat national policy.  Some matters raised in point h of the comment are unrelated to the public art policy. | No | PDSP.113.008 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | The policy should be amended to ensure the retention or sensitive relocation of existing artwork, support the reinstatement of previously removed artworks, reflect national policy on statues and commemorative objects, incorporate Historic England guidance on contested heritage, and ensure that the largest possible number of developments incorporate locally distinctive artwork by allowing finance in lieu only as a last resort. | No change proposed – the suggested change is too detailed for a Development Management policy. The principles in the emerging Sheffield Design Guide and/ or a Public Art Strategy will address points raised. The currently worded planning condition does allow for retention of artworks on site, where possible. The Council also have a public art officer in post to implement the policy, who takes into account the site specific situations while advising on specific proposals. There is no need to repeat national policy.  Some matters raised in point h of the comment are unrelated to the public art policy. | No | PDSP.116.089 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | The policy should be amended to ensure the retention or sensitive relocation of existing artwork, support the reinstatement of previously removed artworks, reflect national policy on statues and commemorative objects, incorporate Historic England guidance on contested heritage, and ensure that the largest possible number of developments incorporate locally distinctive artwork by allowing finance in lieu only as a last resort. | No change proposed – the suggested change is too detailed for a Development Management policy. The principles in the emerging Sheffield Design Guide and/ or a Public Art Strategy will address points raised. The currently worded planning condition does allow for retention of artworks on site, where possible. The Council also have a public art officer in post to implement the policy, who takes into account the site specific situations while advising on specific proposals. There is no need to repeat national policy.  Some matters raised in point h of the comment are unrelated to the public art policy. | No | PDSP.116.090 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | The policy should be amended to ensure the retention or sensitive relocation of existing artwork, support the reinstatement of previously removed artworks, reflect national policy on statues and commemorative objects, incorporate Historic England guidance on contested heritage, and ensure that the largest possible number of developments incorporate locally distinctive artwork by allowing finance in lieu only as a last resort. | No change proposed – the suggested change is too detailed for a Development Management policy. The principles in the emerging Sheffield Design Guide and/ or a Public Art Strategy will address points raised. The currently worded planning condition does allow for retention of artworks on site, where possible. The Council also have a public art officer in post to implement the policy, who takes into account the site specific situations while advising on specific proposals. There is no need to repeat national policy.  Some matters raised in point h of the comment are unrelated to the public art policy. | No | PDSP.116.091 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | The policy should be amended to ensure the retention or sensitive relocation of existing artwork, support the reinstatement of previously removed artworks, reflect national policy on statues and commemorative objects, incorporate Historic England guidance on contested heritage, and ensure that the largest possible number of developments incorporate locally distinctive artwork by allowing finance in lieu only as a last resort.  The Policy should be amended to support collaborative and transparent working (with interested parties). The Policy should be amended to support the labelling of existing Public Art so that it can be celebrated with appropriate interpretive signage. New Artwork to be installed should reflect the character and culture of existing communities. A policy should be developed on street art and requirements regarding it. Whilst consideration should also be given to the addition of Art, Culture and Heritage Trails in future planning. | No change proposed – the suggested change is too detailed for a Development Management policy. The principles in the emerging Sheffield Design Guide and/ or a Public Art Strategy will address points raised. The currently worded planning condition does allow for retention of artworks on site, where possible. The Council also have a public art officer in post to implement the policy, who takes into account the site-specific situations while advising on specific proposals. There is no need to repeat national policy.  Some matters raised in point h of the comment are unrelated to the public art policy. | No | PDSP.138.004 | Sheffield Visual Arts Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | The policy should be amended to ensure the retention or sensitive relocation of existing artwork, support the reinstatement of previously removed artworks, reflect national policy on statues and commemorative objects, incorporate Historic England guidance on contested heritage, and ensure that the largest possible number of developments incorporate locally distinctive artwork by allowing finance in lieu only as a last resort. | No change proposed – the suggested change is too detailed for a Development Management policy. The principles in the emerging Sheffield Design Guide and/ or a Public Art Strategy will address points raised. The currently worded planning condition does allow for retention of artworks on site, where possible. The Council also have a public art officer in post to implement the policy, who takes into account the site specific situations while advising on specific proposals. There is no need to repeat national policy.  Some matters raised in point h of the comment are unrelated to the public art policy. | No | PDSP.271.018 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE8: Public Art | The policy should be amended to ensure the retention or sensitive relocation of existing artwork, support the reinstatement of previously removed artworks, reflect national policy on statues and commemorative objects, incorporate Historic England guidance on contested heritage, and ensure that the largest possible number of developments incorporate locally distinctive artwork by allowing finance in lieu only as a last resort. | No change proposed – the suggested change is too detailed for a Development Management policy. The principles in the emerging Sheffield Design Guide and/ or a Public Art Strategy will address points raised. The currently worded planning condition does allow for retention of artworks on site, where possible. The Council also have a public art officer in post to implement the policy, who takes into account the site-specific situations while advising on specific proposals. There is no need to repeat national policy.  Some matters raised in point h of the comment are unrelated to the public art policy. | No | PDSP.393.014 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Suggested minor amendment to the final paragraph: '…..where this is clearly justified and outweighed by the public or ecological benefits…..' | No change needed. Ecological benefits would be considered as part of public benefits. | Yes | PDSP.002.016 | Environment Agency |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Suggest following minor amendment to part (b) to address how heritage assets in the city will be managed, threats addressed and how their long term future can be secured. “…(the detail of supporting information must be proportionate to the importance of the heritage assets and the potential impact of the proposal);”. | Accept suggested policy amendment. | Yes | PDSP.003.038 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | The policy requires development to conserve, enhance and secure future for heritage assets. The three sites owned by the respondent are of varying quality. Can't those of least significance be eligible as a regeneration opportunity? | The fact that buildings are heritage assets does not impact on their ability to be part of regeneration. Heritage led regeneration is a positive driver for placemaking. | No | PDSP.035.015 | Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Concerned the final paragraph is not consistent with NPPF regarding harm to Heritage Assets. Suggest rewording final paragraph to address this. | No change needed. Repeating national policy is not necessary. The exceptional circumstances are detailed in national policy. | No | PDSP.073.003 | Sheffield Forgemasters Engineering (Submitted by JLL) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Sheffield doesn't have a Local Heritage List. Recommends one is undertaken as part of Plan preparation and referenced in DE9.  Suggest reference in policy to Heritage Assets, should be to 'designated and non-designated heritage assets'. The distinctive heritage list (in D1) is too broad and will include some buildings/ structures not of significance. Suggest removal of reference to D1 in DE9.  Part (e) is not compliant with NPPF as it implies proposals would be refused if heritage assets are not preserved. It also appears to contradict item (c), which more reflects NPPF.  Suggest further detail is provided in the last paragraph regarding substantial harm. | Sheffield’s Local Heritage List is in place and covered by policy DE9.  No change needed to include non-designated assets as 'Heritage assets' encompasses both designated and non-designated assets.  No change proposed to policy D1. This is not a comprehensive list but reflects main heritage themes important to Sheffield.  No change proposed to part (e). Disagree that policy suggests that proposals will necessarily be refused. Proposals should make the most of opportunities and will be considered on a case-by-case basis along with other material considerations.  No change proposed to final paragraph. | No | PDSP.086.062 | University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g., Castlegate. | Review of Conservation Area’s and any future designation will progress outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work | No | PDSP.092.001 | Yellow Arch Studios |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Concern policy lacks detail on protection of heritage assets, in particular those associated with city's rivers and water power, as set out in the Sheffield Waterways Strategy. | No change, non-designated heritage assets are covered by policy. Water-powered industries are specifically recognised amongst Sheffield’s distinctive heritage in Policy D1. | No | PDSP.104.008 | Friends of the Loxley Valley |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g. Castlegate.  Policy needs to provide for creation, maintenance, and expansion of Local Heritage List. Concern of loss of industrial uses in Kelham Island Conservation Area. Policy needs to make provision to conserve and enhance accommodation for traditional industries compatible with other uses. | The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process is outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work.  Management of the Local List sits outside the Local Plan process. Assets on the list including new additions would be covered by policy DE9 which also applies to non-designated heritage assets.  On the Policies Map areas in Neepsend have been retained for use by businesses and industry. | No | PDSP.110.001 | Hallamshire Historic Buildings |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Define both Designated and Non Designated Heritage Assets in the Glossary, while referencing South Yorkshire Archaeology Services in the context of data and advice as a service.  Define the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Record in the Glossary.  Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g. Castlegate.  Suggest a new policy item to cover requirement of Heritage Statement and reference added to paragraph 11.7 as well.  Suggest new policy items to cover harm to Heritage Assets. | No change needed to definitions as both are covered in the glossary under 'Heritage Asset'.  Review of Conservation Areas and the designation process will progress outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work.  No change needed to requirements for a Heritage Statement as this can be covered by validation requirements rather than policy. No change needed to cover 'harm' as this is already covered under the policy. | No | PDSP.113.009 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Define both Designated and Non Designated Heritage Assets in the Glossary, while referencing South Yorkshire Archaeology Services in the context of data and advice as a service.  Define the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Record in the Glossary.  Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g. Castlegate.  Suggest a new policy item to cover requirement of Heritage Statement and reference added to paragraph 11.7 as well.  Suggest new policy items to cover harm to Heritage Assets, culture and the Local Heritage List. | No change needed to definitions as both are covered in the glossary under 'Heritage Asset'.  Review of Conservation Areas and the designation process will progress outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work.  No change needed to requirements for a Heritage Statement as this can be covered by validation requirements rather than policy. No change needed to cover 'harm' or the Local Heritage List as this is already covered under the policy. | No | PDSP.113.010 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Part (d) Policy on Conservation Areas should use the wording of the statute 21, as the policy on Listed Buildings does.  Suggest inclusion of requirement for a Heritage Statement and replacement of final paragraph in policy. | No change proposed. In relation to Heritage Statements this replicates the NPPF and also goes beyond the provisions of national policy. | No | PDSP.116.098 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | The Plan does not meet the requirement for a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Suggest a policy is needed to cover this. | No change proposed. Some elements of the suggestion are covered by statutory requirements, policy or are not a necessary policy requirement. Some suggestions go beyond what is reasonable to require for individual development proposals or not a legal requirement, or already set as a validation requirement. | No | PDSP.116.099 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Identity 'Areas of Special Character' and designate as Conservation Areas.  Suggest new policy item to cover requirement of Heritage Statement and reference added to para 11.7 as well. DE9 - Suggest new policy items to cover harm to Heritage Assets or new policies unless included in DE9 (See Response Modification). | Review of Conservation Areas and the designation process will progress outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work.  No change proposed to require a Heritage Statement as this can be covered by validation requirements rather than policyNo change proposed to make additional reference to 'harm' as this is covered under policy. | No | PDSP.116.100 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g. Castlegate. | The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process is outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work. | No | PDSP.122.008 | Rivelin Valley Conservation Group |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | The lack of requirement for Whole Life Cycle Assessment should be explained. Greater clarity needed on reuse and recycling of building materials.  Create a Historic Environment Strategy allied to the Local Plan that would be supported by policies in the Plan.  Historic Waterway infrastructure needs greater protection. Concerned that Policies GS5,6, 9, 10 & 11 could have serious impact on historic waterways and waterpower infrastructure if not amended. Need to embed waterway heritage in the Local Plan and improve access to and along it.  New Conservation Areas (CA) should be established and paused Conservation Areas completed. Protect Areas of Special Character, so they can be converted to Conservation Area. Ensure Conservation Areas are reviewed every 10 years.  Heritage Assets in Hospital Zones need protection.  Embed Local Heritage List in Local Plan.  Request Local Plan recognises historical and social importance of Public Houses in historic environment. | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA) advised that it is not currently viable to require Whole Life Carbon Cycle Assessment, but that it would be required by 2030 in line with the Council's Net Zero Carbon target.  Historic waterway infrastructure would be covered by policy DE9 which provides a relevant ‘hook’.  The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process is outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work.  The policy covers non-designated heritage assets including those in Hospital Zones and asserts on the Local Heritage List.  No change proposed in relation to Public Houses, the policy provides a ‘hook’ for protection where appropriate. | Yes | PDSP.160.004 | Sheffield Green Party |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g. Castlegate.  Policy needs to provide for creation, maintenance, and expansion of Local Heritage List. | The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process is outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work.  Management of the Local List sits outside the Local Plan process. Assets on the list including new additions would be covered by policy DE9 which also applies to non-designated heritage assets. | No | PDSP.188.006 | Boo |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. | No change needed. Landscapes are recognized within policy D1 in Part 1 as contributing to Sheffield’s distinctive heritage, and afforded protection under policy GS3. | Yes | PDSP.189.001 | Bridget |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets |  | Welcome support. | No | PDSP.260.024 | Jan Symington |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | DE9 needs to include an item which addresses need for protection, management and enhancement of heritage assets included on the Local Heritage List, with a commitment to maintain & update the list regularly. | No change need, protection of non-designated heritage assets on the Local Heritage List is covered by policy DE9.  Management of the Local List sits outside the Local Plan process. | No | PDSP.270.006 | Jim McNeil |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g. Castlegate.  Policy needs to provide for creation, maintenance, and expansion of the Local Heritage List. | The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process is outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work.  Management of the Local List sits outside the Local Plan process. Assets on the list including new additions would be covered by policy DE9 which also applies to non-designated heritage assets. | No | PDSP.271.019 | JimC |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | No comment made. | No issues raised to respond too. | No | PDSP.315.001 | MarkP20 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Plan needs greater emphasis on protecting and creating Heritage Assets e.g. Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings. | No change, protection of heritage assets is covered by Policy DE9. Designation of assets is outside the Local Plan process. | No | PDSP.315.002 | MarkP20 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City | Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets | Need reinstatement of protection for 'Areas of Special Character' or designate them as Conservation Areas e.g. Castlegate. | The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process is outside of the Local Plan process as a distinct piece of work. | No | PDSP.393.015 | Sue22 |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest inclusion of a new policy for the 'Local Heritage List' including requirements for maintenance of the list, inclusion of Areas of Special Character in the list, extension of the list and protection of assets on the list. | No change needed. Management of the Local List sits outside the Local Plan process. Assets on the list including new additions would be covered by policy DE9 which also applies to non-designated heritage assets. | No | PDSP.116.078 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest a new policy for 'Positive Strategy for Heritage' including extending and enhancing conservation areas, requirements for information boards and stewardship. | No change proposed; some elements of the suggested approach are covered by statutory requirements, policy in the Plan or are not a necessary policy requirement. Some suggestions go beyond what is reasonable to require for individual development proposals or not a legal requirement, or are already set as a validation requirement. | No | PDSP.116.092 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest policy and supporting text amended to emphasize the value of heritage, its contribution to economic, social and environmental sustainability and reasoning for the policies. reasoning. Either in new policy as above or D1, SP1 & or DE1. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.116.093 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest a new policy is needed relating to 'impact of development on diverse communities'. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.116.094 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Representation would like to see a strategic policy that requires development affecting heritage assets to also be considered against a test of diversity. | No change proposed. If relevant the cultural context of heritage assets would be considered as part of an overall assessment of significance. | No | PDSP.116.095 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest inclusion of a new policy for the 'Local Heritage List' including requirements for maintenance of the list, inclusion of Areas of Special Character in the list, extension of the list and protection of assets on the list. | No change needed. Management of the Local List sits outside the Local Plan process. Assets on the list including new additions would be covered by policy DE9 which also applies to non-designated heritage assets. | No | PDSP.116.096 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest a new policy that protects historic and social importance of 'Public Houses'. | No change proposed. | No | PDSP.116.097 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon. Suggest amending policies DE1 and DE2 to give greater clarity on relationship with D1 in Part 1 on the significance of design for combatting and managing the impact of climate change. | A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher level of requirement sooner would therefore render the Plan unviable unless other policies were amended to compensate.  Policy D1 is clear about the importance of ensuring development is designed to mitigate climate change. | Yes | PDSP.140.040 | South Yorkshire Climate Alliance |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest inclusion of a new policy statement to strengthen protection for the non-designated heritage assets including the 'Local Heritage List' and describe a positive strategy for conservation. | No change proposed. Policy DE9 affords protection to non-designated assets and seeks positively to secure a sustainable future for heritage assets. | No | PDSP.147.003 | The Victorian Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Suggest a new policy statement in relation to DE9 which gives greater emphasis to retention, reuse and repurposing of heritage assets and that demolition is a last resort that has to be clearly evidenced. | No change, this is covered by policy DE9. | No | PDSP.147.004 | The Victorian Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 9: A Well-Designed City |  | Align Green Network Map (Map 17) with Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework (NEGIF). Nature Recovery Network (NRN) Map not included on Map 17. Policy needs to refer to South Yorkshire Natural Capital Maps re. 'Access to Nature'. Increase Biodiversity Net Gain target requirement. | Amendment added to policy BG1 to include adoption of Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework, to help develop Blue and Green infrastructure network in the city.  Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed to incorporate in the Plan. Aim to include it when complete in an SPD and/or in the Plan at next review stage.  Minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain was calculated as part of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. An increased minimum percentage would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. | No | PDSP.160.003 | Sheffield Green Party |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Policy** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | Infrastructure Delivery Plans should be prepared for all Strategic Sites, not just Strategic Housing Sites. | No change is proposed. Housing sites will normally have greater infrastructure needs to support the resident population, such as healthcare, education, open space and community facilities. Other, non-housing, strategic sites are not likely to generate such needs, so, in most cases, an IDP would have relatively little value and could adversely impact on development viability. | No | PDSP.003.039 | Historic England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | The principle of Policy DC1 is to ensure key local services (open space, education and health facilities), is in line with the Sheffield Plan objectives for a fair, inclusive and healthy city. | Welcome the support for the policy wording. | No | PDSP.014.019 | Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | There is insufficient evidence in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment as to how the assumption of £1,500 per dwelling as a developer contribution has been derived and it should be further justified. | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has appraised all policies as a whole in the Plan and concluded that they will be affordable on the majority of sites. The policy is therefore considered justified and affordable. Additional Guidance will be set out in an SPD. | No | PDSP.016.025 | AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | Older person’s housing schemes should be excluded from the policy requirement. | All housing schemes should make a contribution to infrastructure where appropriate and viable. | No | PDSP.056.008 | McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal states that £30/m2 has been assumed for commercial floorspace towards infrastructure, which was provided in an email in April 2019 (according to footnote 66). We are concerned that there is no supporting evidence for this assumption. | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has appraised all policies as a whole in the Plan and concluded that they will be affordable on the majority of sites. The policy is therefore considered justified and affordable. | No | PDSP.071.019 | Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal states that £1,500 per residential unit has been assumed for contributions towards infrastructure, which was provided in an email in April 2019 (according to footnote 66). Strata Homes is concerned that there is no supporting evidence for this assertion or how it was derived. | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has appraised all policies as a whole in the Plan and concluded that they will be affordable on the majority of sites. | No | PDSP.079.027 | Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths) |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Other Developer Contributions | A proportion of CIL should be passed to parishes and Local Neighbourhood Forums where there is an adopted Neighbourhood Plan and this should be incorporated in the policy. | This is unnecessary as it repeats existing CIL legislation. | No | PDSP.102.015 | Dore Village Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | The cost of the policy is estimated in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment but has not been fully justified and may not be affordable. | The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has appraised all policies as a whole in the Plan and concluded that they will be affordable. The policy is therefore considered justified and deliverable. Additional Guidance will be set out in an SPD. | No | PDSP.112.017 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Other Developer Contributions | Support the policy. | Welcome the support for the policy wording. | No | PDSP.119.003 | NHS Property Services |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | 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. | No | PDSP.121.035 | Regather |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 10: Developer Contributions | Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions | 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. | No | PDSP.121.036 | Regather |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 11: Implementation | The list of funding sources needs updating - 4th bullet – the Local Growth Fund no longer exists. | Agree - update list of funding sources | Yes | PDSP.015.013 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 11: Implementation | Network Rail should be added to the list of delivery agencies. | Agree - add Network Rail to the list of delivery agencies | Yes | PDSP.015.014 | South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 11: Implementation | Potential to protect Council-owned heritage assets. Council cooperation with developers to facilitate protection of heritage assets. | Agree - the suggested amendment to reference heritage assets in the section on use of public land and resources would provide helpful clarification | Yes | PDSP.116.101 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 11: Implementation | Potential to protect Council-owned heritage assets. Council cooperation with developers to facilitate protection of heritage assets. | Agree - the suggested amendment to reference heritage assets in the section on use of public land and resources would provide helpful clarification | Yes | PDSP.116.102 | Joined Up Heritage Sheffield |

| **Plan Document** | **Chapter** | **Main Issues Summary Comment** | **Council response** | **Potential to Change Plan?** | **Comment reference** | **Respondent Name** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 12: Monitoring | Concerned that there are no monitoring indicators in relation to sport and leisure, protection of playing fields and sports facilities, actions from the Playing Pitch Strategy or active design/active travel. | No change needed. The monitoring section includes an indicator relating to the net change in the total area of open space. | No | PDSP.007.015 | Sport England |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 12: Monitoring | The Council should provide more details as to how the plan will actually be monitored, and identify when, why and how actions will be taken to address any issues identified. | The indicators set out in Section 12 of Part 2 provide a proportionate and appropriate framework for monitoring implementation of the Sheffield Plan. Targets are implicit in a number of policies - for example, SP1 sets the annual housing requirement (target). | No | PDSP.112.018 | Home Builders Federation |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 12: Monitoring | The Plan proposes annual monitoring of the change in numbers of designated assets - Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas. Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens are wholly outside the designatory powers of the council, as are Grade I, II\* and II listed buildings and can't, therefore, be seen as measures of the council's success in implementing the Local Plan. Concerned that this monitoring criterion is wholly a quantitative one without any suggestion as to how any qualitative assessments might be made. There is no proposed assessment of the impacts, either positive or negative, on the non-designated heritage assets that contribute so much to the character and sense of place of the component parts of the city. | Agree that the Plan does not directly control the designation of assets. The indicator should be amended to refer to the change in the number of assets 'at risk'. | Yes | PDSP.113.011 | Hunter Archaeological Society |
| Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation | Chapter 12: Monitoring | Considers that the wording used in some policies (e.g. use of the word 'enhanced') is not specific enough and will be difficult to measure/monitor. | Disagree. The policies are specific about what is required where it is necessary and where it is possible to be specific. In some cases, supplementary planning documents will be used to clarify to developers what is expected. It will be a matter of judgement at the planning application stage as to whether a proposal provides, say, sufficient 'enhancement' in accordance with the aims of the relevant policies. | No | PDSP.350.005 | Polly Blacker |