

The Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future

Executive Summary of the Responses on the City-wide Options

**July 2016
Development Services**



Purpose of this Document

This document provides a summary of the comments made in response to the consultation on Citywide Options for Growth which was held between 11 November 2015 and 15 January 2016.

A total of 3,540 answers were received to the consultation questions. These were made by 359 respondents comprising of a range of organisations and individuals.

The document includes links to a fuller summary of the comments and to the full submissions that were made by respondents.

Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms

A616(T)	Stocksbridge By-pass
AMID	Advanced Manufacturing and Innovation District
AMP	Advanced Manufacturing Park
AMRC	Advanced Manufacturing and Research Centre
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
B1, B2, B8	Part B of the Planning Use Classes B1 = Business, B2 = General industrial, B8 = Storage or distribution
BBEST	Broomhill, Broomfield, Endcliffe, Summerfield and Tapton
BC	Borough Council
DC	District Council
CC	County Council
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
CEG	Commercial Estates Group
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CIQ	Cultural Industries Quarter
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
CPRE	Campaign to Protect Rural England
CS	Core Strategy
DLP	Development Land and Planning Ltd
dph	Dwellings per hectare
ELR	Employment Land Review
FLUTE	Forecasting the interactions of Land Use, Transport and Economy
ha	Hectare
HBF	Home Builders Federation
HS2	High Speed 2 (rail line)
HS3	High Speed 3 (rail line)
LDV	Lower Don Valley
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LVPS	Loxley Valley Protection Society
MBC	Metropolitan Borough Council
MP	Member of Parliament
NE	North East

NHS	National Health Service
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NRQ	New Retail Quarter
P&R	Park and Ride
RIS	Road Investment Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCC	Sheffield City Council
SCR	Sheffield City Region
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEP	Strategic Economic Plan
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHU	Sheffield Hallam University
SPACE	Sheffield and Peak against City Encroachment
SRN	Strategic Road Network
SW	South West
SYPTTE	South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive
UDV	Upper Don Valley
UofS	University of Sheffield
URBED	Urbanism Environment and Design
vph	vehicles per hour

1. Introduction

Question 1: Does the document raise any specific equality impacts which would affect particular groups or communities of people in Sheffield?

Comments

There are no equality issues.

- 4 organisations, 4 developer/landowner/business, 20 individuals

The equality aspects of the Sheffield Plan are integrated across all the economic and social Sustainability Aims. All sustainability aims relate well to the Vision, Aims and Objectives.

- 5 developer/landowner/business

The document could help small businesses and encourage up-cycling.

- 1 developer/landowner/business

An Equality Impact Assessment and Objective Assessment of Need, including for gypsy and travellers and older people, will be needed as part of the next version of the document

- 1 developer/landowner/business:

Consider who housing is for (if for older people, disabled, low incomes) and direct it to the best locations for their needs, to prevent social exclusion and isolation (through lack of access to a car).

- 2 organisations and 2 individuals:

Consider needs of those who would benefit from social housing: council tenants/homeless and those likely to be excluded from home ownership/long-term rental.

- 1 organisation and 1 individual

Account should be taken of the faith and voluntary sectors and breweries and pubs and music venues which contribute to the City's life.

- 1 organisation and 1 individual

The Plan should prevent inequality worsening, but also provide for needs of people in all areas

- 4 individuals

The Plan should plan positively for students; Core Strategy CS41 is currently prejudicial against them

- 1 developer/landowner

More densely packed housing, less green space, and continued need for private cars will negatively impact on those with breathing difficulties

- 1 individual

Increased densities and smaller dwellings will lead to impact of overcrowding on children.

- 1 individual

Destruction of village communities through Options D and E

- 1 individual

Loss of Green Belt and wildlife, building on floodplains, document does not plan for infrastructure and there are already over-subscribed schools and need for transport improvements.

- 4 individuals

It was too short a timescale, minimal consultation, too much or too little information which could deter people from reading (especially dyslexic and those not fluent in English or less socially connected/mobile). Questionnaire reduces discussion on complex issues.

- 3 organisations and 9 individuals

2. Challenges and Opportunities for Sheffield to 2034

Question 2(a) Have we identified the right challenges for Sheffield between now and 2034?

Support 9, Conditional Support 5, Not Support 0 Neither 83

NB – these were identified from responses to Question 2(b), so the actual number of responses to Question 2(a) may be different.

Support:

- 5 organisations (including Highways England, Environment Agency and Sheffield City Region); 2 developers/landowners/business; 2 individuals

Conditional Support:

- 2 individuals; 3 developers/landowners/businesses

Question 2(b) – If not, what other challenges does the Sheffield Plan need to address?

Other challenges the Plan should address:

- Environmentally sustainable development
 - 5 organisations (including Historic England and the Peak District National Park Authority); 6 individuals
- Attracting inward investment
 - 2 developers/landowners/businesses; 3 individuals
- Impact of HS2 station location
 - Ecclesfield Parish Council; Sheffield Hallam University; University of Sheffield; 16 developers/landowners/businesses; 4 individuals
- Creating a mixed community at Meadowhall
 - 2 organisations (Sheffield Hallam University; University of Sheffield); 15 developers/landowners/businesses
- The NRQ and regeneration of other centres
 - Sheffield Hallam University; University of Sheffield; 16 developers/landowners/businesses; 2 individuals
- Providing community/cultural facilities
 - 3 organisations; 1 individual

- Protecting and promoting heritage assets
 - 10 organisations (including Historic England and BBEST Neighbourhood Planning Forum); 1 individual
- More emphasis on walking/cycling/public transport
 - 4 organisations (including BBEST Neighbourhood Planning Forum); 3 individuals
- Protection of open space/ecology/Green Belt
 - 5 organisations (including Peak District National Park Authority); 5 individuals
- Traffic/transport/demand management
 - 4 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council); 3 individuals
- Climate change and air quality
 - 4 organisations; Angela Smith MP; 6 individuals
- Growing a dynamic economy/job opportunities
 - 3 organisations; 2 developers/landowners/businesses; 2 individuals
- More homes (including affordable homes) in appropriate locations
 - Dore Neighbourhood Forum; 6 developers/landowners/businesses; 1 individual

Question 3(a) Have we identified the right opportunities for Sheffield between now and 2034?

Support 6, Conditional Support 4, Not Support 1 Neither 73

NB – these were identified from responses to Q3(b), so the actual recorded number of responses to Q3(a) may be different.

Support:

- 5 organisations (including Highways England); 1 individual

Conditional Support:

- Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust ; NHS Clinical Commissioning Group; 2 individuals

Not support:

- 1 developer/landowner/business

Question 3(b) – If not, what other opportunities could the Sheffield Plan support?

Other opportunities the Plan could support:

- Role of Universities/students/student accommodation
 - Sheffield Hallam University; University of Sheffield; 1 developer/landowner/business; 2 individuals
- Green spaces/green infrastructure/natural environment
 - 4 organisations (including Peak District National Park Authority); 4 individuals
- Role of manufacturing/AMID
 - Sheffield Hallam University; University of Sheffield; 14 developers/landowners/businesses; 3 individuals
- Transport - general improvements & modal shift
 - 10 organisations including South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and BBEST Neighbourhood Planning Forum; 4 individuals
- Economic growth in a variety of sectors
 - 3 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council); 2 developers/landowners/businesses; 3 individuals
- Potential of Green Belt review to accommodate growth
 - Sheffield Hallam University; 17 developers/landowners/businesses
- Benefits of HS2
 - Ecclesfield Parish Council; Sheffield Hallam University; 12 developers/landowners/businesses; 4 individuals
- Mixed use at Meadowhall
 - Sheffield Hallam University; 12 developers/landowners/businesses
- Health and equality
 - 3 organisations (including Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust); 1 individual
- City Region/co-operation
 - 2 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council); 1 developer/landowner/business; 3 individuals

3. The Vision for Sheffield in 2034

Question 4: Do you support the Sheffield Plan Aims, Visions and Objectives?

Support 22, Conditional Support 20, Not Support 0 Neither 83

NB – these were identified from responses to Question 5, so the actual recorded number of responses to Question 4 may be different.

Support:

- 8 organisations (including Highways England, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, Bassetlaw District Council and the Environment Agency); 6 developers/landowners/developers and 8 individuals

Conditional Support:

- 3 organisations (including Historic England); Sheffield Hallam University; University of Sheffield; 15 developers/landowners/developers and 2 individuals

Question 5: Do you think anything is missing from the Vision, and if so, what?

Additional issues that should be covered in the vision:

- Preserve heritage/landmarks/buildings of character/culture/Antiques Quarter
 - 5 organisations (including BBEST Neighbourhood Planning Forum and Ecclesfield Parish Council); 4 developers/landowners/businesses; 7 individuals
- Housing for all including. affordable, students, families, elderly & disabled
 - 3 organisations (including Sheffield Hallam University and The University of Sheffield); 23 developers/landowners/businesses; 3 individuals
- Reuse of brownfield sites/buildings including flexibility of use
 - 3 organisations; 2 developers/landowners/businesses; 1 individual
- More job opportunities/new businesses/highly skilled jobs
 - 3 organisations (including Sheffield Hallam University and The University of Sheffield); 22 developers/landowners/businesses; 1 individual
- Protection of open spaces/'green frame'/nature/trees
 - 4 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum); 5 individuals
- Improve transport connections including rail and tram
 - 3 organisations; 1 developer/landowner/business; 4 individuals

- Needs to be more Sheffield-specific
 - 2 organisations (including Historic England); 1 individual
- Reflect role and relationship with Sheffield City Region including delivering housing
 - 3 developers/landowners/businesses; 1 individual
- Make reference to the Advanced Manufacturing and Innovation District
 - 2 organisations (including Sheffield Hallam University and The University of Sheffield); 21 developers/landowners/businesses
- Improve health & social care/equality/quality of life
 - 2 organisations (including Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust); 3 individuals

4. How much Growth are we planning for?

How much land do we need for New Employment?

Question 6 – Should the employment land requirement be based on the SEP jobs target of 10 hectares/year or a lower scenario of 8 hectares/year?

Support 17, Conditional Support 3, Not Support 20 Neither 15
(Support is classed as support for the 10 hectares figure)

A mix of responses but the 10ha figure was generally supported by the other city region authorities who reasoned that it responded to the higher jobs growth target in the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan:

Support:

- 6 organisations (Sheffield City Region, Rotherham MBC, Bolsover District Council, North East Derbyshire District Council, the University of Sheffield and Rivelin Valley Conservation Group); 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 7 individuals

Conditional Support:

- 1 developer/landowners/businesses and 2 individuals
- 8 hectares could be suitable if lower quality sites are excluded - 1 developer/landowner/business

Not support:

- 2 organisations (Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Group), 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 14 individuals
- An even higher requirement of 160 hectares, or 10.7 hectares per annum should be set – 3 developers/landowners/businesses
- It does not effectively account for working from home – 2 organisations
- 8 hectares is appropriate - 1 developer/landowner/business

Question 7(a) – Should some of Sheffield’s land requirement for manufacturing, distribution and warehousing (B1c, B2 and B8) be accommodated elsewhere in the city region?

Question 7(b) - If so, where could Sheffield’s needs be accommodated?

Support 30, Conditional Support 11, Not Support 2 Neither 8

(Support is classed as providing for some of the requirement elsewhere)

There is very strong support for this, including some city region authorities.

However, note that this support conflicts with the general support for a 10 hectare requirement figure set out in Question 6.

Support:

- 7 organisations (Bolsover District Council, North East Derbyshire Council, the University of Sheffield, Rivelin Valley Conservation Group, Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust, Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment and Grenoside Conservation Society), 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 19 individuals
- Bolsover District Council and North East Derbyshire Council (in those districts, particularly in the M1 corridor [Junctions 28, 29, 29a and 30])
- Tangent Properties (provision should be in Barnsley)
- Harworth Estates (in Rotherham, especially near the border and around the AMP/AMID)
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group and the University of Sheffield (Rotherham for advanced manufacturing, Barnsley and Doncaster for logistics and related to the airport)
- Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust (in Rotherham once the tram-train is running)
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd (M1 and A61 corridors)
- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (particularly Rotherham, as this would reduce pressure on the Green Belt)
- Ackroyd and Abbott and Grenoside Conservation Society (anywhere in the city region).

Conditional Support:

- 6 organisations (Bolsover District Council, North East Derbyshire Council, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Highways England and Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group), 1 developer/landowner/business and 4 individuals
- Bolsover District Council and North East Derbyshire Council (as long as provision is guided by FLUTE modelling)
- Rotherham MBC and Turley representing Sheffield Business Park (to accommodate the growth aspirations set out in the city region Strategic Economic Plan)

- Doncaster MBC (but note that Doncaster and Sheffield are not within the same functional economic market area, although logistics may be appropriate)
- Highways England (depending on the location of the sites)
- Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group (as long as they are accessible locations).

Not support:

- 2 organisations (Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Group), 0 developers/landowners/businesses and 0 individuals
- Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Group (as it would increase commuting).

Question 8(a): Should employment land requirements be expressed as a single figure?

Question 8(b): If not, should they be separated out by employment type, either:

- 2 hectares for B1a/b and 8 hectares for B1c, B2 and B8; or
- 2 hectares for B1a/b and 6 hectares for B1c, B2 and B8

Support 23, Conditional Support 5, Not Support 6 Neither 12

(Support is classed as separating B1a/b from B1c/B2/B8)

Support:

- 9 organisations (Highways England, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Bolsover District Council, North East Derbyshire Council, the University of Sheffield, Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group, Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment, Sheaf Valley Heritage Group and Sharrow Heritage Group), 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 12 individuals
- Turley representing Sheffield Business Park (all due to their different needs in terms of site requirements, transport and infrastructure)
- Bolsover District Council and North East Derbyshire Council (in order to deliver the growth requirements of the city region)
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (due to the need for B1a offices to locate according the NPPF sequential test)
- Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group (to take account of housing provision)
- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (as long as the base data is reliable), and Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Group.
- University of Sheffield (should also separate the requirement figures for Use Classes B1b from B1a).

Conditional Support:

- 0 organisations, 1 developer/landowner/business and 4 individuals
- Ackroyd and Abbott (all due to their different needs in terms of site requirements, transport and infrastructure)

Not support:

- 2 organisations (Rivelin Valley Conservation Group and Archaeological Research Services Ltd) and 4 individuals
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group (due to the need for allocations to be flexible)
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd (as it's simpler to use just one figure).

Question 9(a): Do you agree with the Council's assessment of housing need in Sheffield local authority area and the Sheffield/Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Area?

Question 9(b): If not, what are your reasons for suggesting different figures?

Support 3, Conditional Support 5, Not Support 46, Neither 28

General support for the figure proposed from 3 organisations (including Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council); 1 developer/landowner/business and 1 individual.

Although the majority of respondents did not support the figure, there was a split between those who felt the figure is too high and those who feel it is too low.

Figure proposed for housing need is too high

- 3 organisations; 9 individuals.

Reasons:

- If economic growth is not as strong as predicted fewer homes will be needed
- An ageing population will free up homes as they downsize
- A move to a high tech economy requires fewer people and therefore less housing
- Concerned about achievability as the target is significantly higher than recent delivery
- Government projections (by the Office of National Statistics) should be a maximum
- Economic growth should be met through the existing population
- The population should be reduced
- Economic growth assumptions are too high
- Land could be unnecessarily allocated and risk more Green Belt than necessary
- Green space is important and should be protected

Figure proposed for housing need is too low – the figure should be more aspirational.

- 36 developers/landowners/businesses; Home Builders Federation; 2 individuals.

Reasons for the figure being too low included:

- The figure is insufficient to deliver the economic plan - the target should be aligned with the jobs-led aspirational scenario
- The figure is insufficient to deliver a range of housing sites to meet needs and speed up delivery

- Based on the Chelmer model the figure should be 3,100 per annum
- The figure is based on migration assumptions that are too low
- Household formation rates are not correctly considered
- Is not based on an up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment
- It should not be assumed that the economic activity rate will improve
- The figure should include unmet need from previously low levels of delivery

Other concerns about the target included:

- The plan period is too long to predict housing growth
- A lower figure would help manage land release
- A range would be more appropriate than a target
- The target should be considered at the Sheffield City Region level
- Student accommodation is important and should be considered

General comments about housing delivery included:

- Focussing on high end housing can lead to deprivation
- The figure should be kept under frequent review as it is based on many assumptions
- Housing should be focussed on regenerating previously developed sites in the urban area
- More affordable housing and smaller homes should be built
- Delivering housing within Sheffield will help reduce commuting and avoid pressure on neighbouring areas and Green Belt

Question 10: Is the Council right to use the Sheffield and Rotherham local authority areas as being representative of the Strategic Housing Market Area?

Support 28, Conditional Support 8, Not Support 2, Neither 22

Many respondents agreed that Sheffield and Rotherham have a strong housing market relationship

- 5 organisations (including North East Derbyshire, Bolsover District Council, HBF, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council); 22 developers/landowners/businesses; 5 individuals.

However most of these respondents also recognised that Sheffield has links to other housing markets such as Barnsley, North East Derbyshire and Chesterfield, and therefore that cross boundary issues need to be considered. Where sites in Barnsley are functionally part of Sheffield they should contribute to Sheffield's need.

- Looking at a wider housing market area would help to protect Sheffield's green environment
 - 3 individuals
- The wider region should be considered to broaden the housing market.
 - 2 individuals

- The housing and employment distribution should be considered across the whole City Region.
 - 3 respondents
- A significant number of organisations represented by DLP also highlighted that Sheffield does represent a relatively self-contained housing market area
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council added that the relationship between Sheffield and Rotherham is only strong for certain housing types and households.
- Further relevant comments included:
 - Sheffield should meet its full 'objective assessment of housing need' and consider meeting cross boundary housing needs
 - Affordable housing is needed
 - More student accommodation is needed and student issues should be considered
 - The good transport links with Rotherham should be recognised
 - Improved connectivity would make commuting more feasible, and links between homes and jobs are important
 - Consider delivery in North East Derbyshire's Green Belt

Question 11: How many years' supply of housing sites should be allocated in the Plan? Please provide reasons for your answers.

Support N/A, Conditional Support N/A, Not Support N/A

- This question did not require a level of support to be attributed.
- A variety of responses were received, many suggesting subtle differences. The responses given by multiple respondents are summarised below.
 - **Whole plan period** (i.e. to 2034):
 - 3 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum); 10 developers/landowners/developers; the HBF; 2 individuals
 - **At least to 2028**
 - HBF, North East Derbyshire, Bolsover District Council and 1 individual
 - **Enough for 20 years of house building and a further 10 years of safeguarded land outside of the Green Belt** (to meet needs after the end of the plan period)
 - 25 developers/landowners/businesses (all represented by DLP Planning Ltd)
 - **5 years**
 - 3 organisations; 5 individuals
 - **At least 10 years**
 - 2 developers/landowners/businesses

5. What are the Citywide Options for Growth to 2034?

Employment Growth Options

Question 12: Should the plan identify only the City Centre, Upper Don Valley, the Lower Don Valley and Outer South East as the main locations for new offices and manufacturing, distribution and warehousing?

Support 7, Conditional Support 15, Not Support 23 Neither 1
(Support is classed as identifying only the main areas)

Overall not supported although amongst groups the response was mixed.

Support:

- 2 organisations (Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust and Rivelin Valley Conservation Group), 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 3 individuals
- Aberdeen Asset Management (City Centre is the most sustainable location for offices as identified by the National Planning Policy Framework)
- Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust (and release out-of-centre offices for other uses)

Conditional Support:

- 5 organisations (Highways England, the University of Sheffield, Ecclesfield Parish Council, Grenoside Conservation Society and Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment), 1 developer/landowner/business and 9 individuals
- Highways England (supporting the city centre but voicing concern over the impact of the other locations on the M1 Junctions 31, 33 and 34)
- University of Sheffield (The AMID should be separately named)
- Ecclesfield Parish Council (other areas should be added with better public transport, including rural areas)
- Grenoside Conservation Society (but the role of the city centre may reduce with changing working practices and industry should be located where it is accessible),
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd (other areas should be included, especially as broadband access improves)
- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (but avoid Oughtibridge, Wharnccliffe Side, Worrall and Ecclesfield and analyse what types of jobs are needed and where)

Not support:

- 4 organisations (Loxley Valley Protection Society, Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group, Sheaf Valley Heritage Group and Sharrow Heritage Group), 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 15 individuals
- Tata Steel (Stocksbridge/Deepcar should also be identified as a main location with improved transport links)

- Hallam Land Management (Chapelton should be included as a sustainable location)
- Loxley Valley Protection Society (better to have a larger number of smaller locations to reduce the need to travel)
- Ackroyd and Abbott (there should be no restriction and policies should be flexible)
- Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group (the city centre is not the best location and they should be near the motorway)
- Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Group (more locations so as to reduce commuting)

Some views were that more areas should be identified in order to reduce trips and provide local employment.

Many other locations were suggested, particularly Stocksbridge/Deepcar, but also Chapelton, Ecclesfield, North Sheffield, Sharrow, Ecclesall Road, Abbeydale and Crookes.

Question 13: Should the Plan acknowledge the Strategic importance of Chapelton/Ecclesfield, Stocksbridge/Deepcar, Sheaf Valley, Blackburn Valley, Holbrook and Orgreave for B-Class uses in terms of employment opportunities close to new homes?

Support 6, Conditional Support 11, Not Support 2 Neither 4

(Support is classed as agreeing that the Plan should acknowledge the Strategic importance of Chapelton/Ecclesfield, Stocksbridge/Deepcar, Sheaf Valley, Blackburn Valley, Holbrook and Orgreave)

General support, although much is conditional on improving infrastructure, especially transport links. Stocksbridge/Deepcar dominated responses in terms of specific locations.

Support:

- 1 organisation (Rivelin Valley Conservation Group), 1 developer/landowner/business and 4 individuals
- Tata Steel (for Stocksbridge, which should also be recognised as a Principal Town)
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group (will help deliver Option D for housing growth).

Conditional Support:

- 5 organisations (Highways England, Ecclesfield Parish Council, the University of Sheffield, Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group and Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment), 0 developers/landowners/businesses and 6 individuals
- Highways England (depending on the location of the sites)
- Ecclesfield Parish Council (on brownfield land close to new homes)
- University of Sheffield (some areas may be more appropriate for housing, avoid negative impact on the AMID and include Blackburn Valley).
- Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group (several locations required to support new housing)

- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (avoid Stocksbridge/Deepcar to preserve natural character and analyse what jobs are needed and where)

Not support:

- 0 organisations, 1 developer/landowner/business and 1 individual
- Ackroyd and Abbott (some employment allocations are better suited to housing).

Question 14: Should the Plan focus advanced manufacturing development in and around the Sheffield Business Park and Advanced Manufacturing Park?

Support 22, Conditional Support 9, Not Support 4 Neither 3

(Support is classed as agreeing that the Plan should focus advanced manufacturing development in and around the Sheffield Business Park and Advanced Manufacturing Park)

Generally supported on the basis that clustering benefits businesses and that the area is well located. However, some objections on the grounds that we should not be constraining the types of manufacturing and other parts of the city can also contribute to this type of manufacturing.

Highways England noted that there are capacity issues at Junctions 33 and 34.

Support:

- 4 organisations (Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council, Sheffield City Region, the University of Sheffield, 3 developers/landowners/businesses and 15 individuals)
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (recognise the benefits of cooperating across the boundary on advanced manufacturing to support the AMID)
- Derbyshire County Council (it is well located to provide Derbyshire residents with employment opportunities)
- Sheffield City Region (identified in the SEP as a priority through an AMID)
- University of Sheffield (clustering such uses will attract further new development, the area is already well-established and should be encouraged to grow, development will help to deliver the SEP, it will release brownfield sites and there will be academic benefits as well as economic)
- Turley for Sheffield Business Park (already well-established and successful – policy should be consistent between Sheffield and Rotherham)
- Harworth Estates (support further development in this location as part of the AMID)
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd (benefits of the clustering effect).

Conditional Support:

- 7 organisations (Sheaf Valley Heritage Group, Sharrow Heritage Group, Rivelin Valley Conservation Group, Portland Works Business, Education and Culture Group, Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment and Grenoside Conservation Society), 1 developer/landowner/business and 1 individual.

- Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Group (but it cannot provide all the new jobs required).
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group (more land will be required in the longer term).
- Ackroyd and Abbott (encourage growth in all sectors in all parts of the city).
- Portland Works Business, Education and Culture Group (advanced manufacturing can also be located in other areas such as the city centre, to support the AMRC).
- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (as long as it is brownfield land to reduce pressure on green space and the Green Belt).
- Grenoside Conservation Society (there is a good nucleus but expansion will depend on how quickly businesses upscale).

Not support:

- 0 organisations, 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 2 individuals
- Rae Watson Development Surveyors (more flexibility needed to encourage growth)
- Hallam Land Management Ltd (the area should not be constrained).

Question 15: Should this require the identification of land not currently designated for business and industrial use?

Support 9, Conditional Support 12, Not Support 12 Neither 5

(Support is classed as agreeing that more land around Sheffield Business Park and Advanced Manufacturing Park should be designated for business and industrial use)

Overall there was a mix of responses, although more support from groups. Individual objections focused on avoiding greenfield/Green Belt.

Support:

- 2 organisations (Derbyshire County Council, the University of Sheffield), 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 5 individuals
- Derbyshire County Council (it is well located to provide Derbyshire residents with employment opportunities)
- University of Sheffield (some consented land for the Advanced Manufacturing and Research Centre (AMRC) Phase 2 is designated Green Belt which needs addressing and it will encourage future investment from small and medium enterprises)
- Ackroyd and Abbott (sufficient land is needed to attract inward investment)
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd (flexibility is important to attract new firms).

Conditional Support:

- 3 organisations (Ecclesfield Parish Council, Rivelin Valley Conservation Group and Grenoside Conservation Society), 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 7 individuals
- Hallam Land Management Ltd (if additional land is needed), Harworth Estates (also identify more residential land)

- Ecclesfield Parish Council (only with safeguards)
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group (more allocations may be required for the longer term)
- Grenoside Conservation Society (in principle, but the future of these activities is uncertain).

Not support:

- 2 organisations (Sheaf Valley Heritage Group and Sharrow Heritage Group, 1 developer/landowner/business and 9 individuals)
- Turley for Sheffield Business Park (adequate land has already been identified and allocated in Sheffield and Rotherham)
- Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Groups (already sufficient land)

Question 16: Should targets for office development be for both B1a (Offices) and B1b (Research and Development) uses, rather than just B1a?

Support 7, Conditional Support 1, Not Support 11 Neither 14

(Support is classed as agreeing that targets for office development should be for both B1a and B1b uses combined together)

Very limited response, especially from groups. Not generally supported, due to the differences in the requirements of users and the need to promote offices specifically, especially in the city centre. Greater flexibility was also requested.

No support from any groups.

Support

- 7 individuals

Conditional Support:

- 1 individual

Not Supported

- 1 organisation (the University of Sheffield), 0 developers/landowners/businesses and 10 individuals
- University of Sheffield (they have different characteristics including employment densities and end users, so should have a separate target, B1a in the city centre would be diluted by B1b, which is more suited to the AMID and would not be supported by City Centre land values)
- Turley for Sheffield Business Park neither supported nor objected but requested flexibility.

Question 17a: Should the City Centre continue to be the main location for new office development?

Question 17b: If so, is the target of 65% appropriate, or should this be different?

Support 26, Conditional Support 11, Not Support 12, Neither: 3

Support:

- 9 organisations (including Highways England and Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust), 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 13 individuals
- Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group and 3 individuals recognised the benefit to sustainable transport and communications.

Conditional Support:

- 2 organisations (including SHU), 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 7 individuals
- Sheffield Hallam University, The University of Sheffield: should not preclude offices in other areas to stimulate regeneration (e.g. at Meadowhall) and priority office areas should not be located at and around the universities to enable development that supports their objectives.
- Sheffield Business Park (submitted by Turley): should not constrain Sheffield Business Park.

Not Support:

- 3 organisations (including the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and the UofS) and 9 individuals
- Sheffield Hallam University, The University of Sheffield: percentage proportions are overly complicated and reliant on monitoring which the LPA does not have the resources to do; permitted development rights make it hard to deliver; it will dissuade investment.
- Several individuals raise concerns about City Centre preference in relation to market demand, accessibility, parking, and current vacancy rates.
- Sheffield Chamber of Commerce agreed with the City Centre sequential approach but considers that 65% is arbitrary, inflexible, not business friendly and will not meet wider objectives of the Local Plan.

Neither:

- Doncaster MBC commented that higher employment sectors should be spread out across the City Region because it functions as one economic market area.

Question 18: Should the approach to identifying Priority Office Areas in the City Centre be continued?

Support 12, Conditional Support 6, Not Support 10 Neither 4

Support:

- 4 organisations and 8 individuals.
- A number of individuals recognised the benefits to sustainable transport modes and city centre vitality (particularly retail).

Conditional Support:

- 3 organisations, 1 developer/landowner/business and 2 individuals
- Sheffield Hallam University: not to restrict other uses and take account of universities' needs.
- Aberdeen Asset Management and Sheffield Hallam University: allow some flexibility for other uses.

Not Support:

- 1 organisation, 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 7 individuals
- 1 individual questioned the market demand
- Ackroyd and Abbott Ltd and Rae Watson Development Surveyors: not necessary to restrict the market in this way, let the market decide.
- Aberdeen Asset Management: a 60% minimum is too prescriptive.

Question 19: Should we promote higher density office development on sites within the Priority Office Areas?

Support 11, Conditional Support 11, Not Support 11 Neither 0

Support:

- 2 organisations and 9 individuals
- The benefits higher density offices can bring to public transport networks, sustainability and city centre vitality are mentioned by several individuals.

Conditional Support:

- 4 organisations and 7 individuals
- Sheffield Hallam University recognise that offices in the city centre are appropriate but do not want to see them prioritised around the university campus.
- Some individuals would like to see flexibility

Not Support:

- 1 organisation, 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 8 individuals
- A number of individuals question the market demand for higher densities.

Question 20: Should there be a target for office development in the Sheffield Business Park/Advanced Manufacturing Park area on the Sheffield and Rotherham boundary?**Support 11, Conditional Support 9, Not Support 16 Neither 4**

(Support is classed as agreeing there should be a target for office development at the Sheffield Business Park/Advanced Manufacturing Park).

There was a majority not in support, particularly due to concerns that an office target could constrain the development of advanced manufacturing companies and may have a negative impact on City Centre office development. Individual support was related to the relatively good transport access in the area.

Support:

- 0 organisations, 1 developer/landowner/business and 10 individuals
- Harworth Estates (important to have a mix of uses to support the AMID)

Conditional Support:

- 1 organisations (Rotherham MBC), 1 developer/landowner/business and 7 individuals
- Rotherham MBC (concerned that office development would not meet NPPF sequential test requirements)
- Turley for Sheffield Business Park (as long as the target is ambitious does not act as a 'cap' on development).

Not support:

- 8 organisations (the University of Sheffield, Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment, Friends of the Peak District/CPRE, Grenoside Conservation Society, Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group, Rivelin Valley Conservation Group, Sheaf Valley Heritage Group and Sharrow Heritage Group), 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 6 individuals.
- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (office accommodation should be only to serve the needs of advanced manufacturing)
- Ackroyd and Abbott (a target requires a strategy for delivery)
- Friends of the Peak District/CPRE (a target would threaten the main role of the area)
- Grenoside Conservation Society (flexibility is needed so as not to threaten advanced manufacturing)
- Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group (targets will constrain manufacturers and the city centre is more suitable for offices)

- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group (flexibility is required so as not to threaten advanced manufacturing)
- Rae Watson Development Surveyors (let the market decide)
- Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Groups (targets based on the ELR which is not supported and existing buildings should be reused)

Question 21: Should the Plan promote a limited amount of office development in other outlying areas or well-connected locations to help reduce the need to travel and support sustainable housing growth in those locations (e.g. Hillsborough, Crystal Peaks, Chapeltown, Stocksbridge)?

Support 15, Conditional Support 24, Not Support 8 Neither 3

(Support is classed as agreeing the Plan should promote a limited amount of office development in other outlying areas or well-connected locations).

Generally supported on the basis that it would reduce commuting and support housing by providing local jobs, but much of the support was conditional on the option having a positive impact on reducing traffic and congestion, not being at the expense of housing delivery or the development of the city centre, and that it would meet a local need.

Opposition was based on a belief that the occupiers of new employment space would not necessarily be local and it could actually increase commuting.

Some objection on the grounds that the areas should be used for housing.

Support:

- 1 organisation (Ecclesfield Parish Council), 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 12 individuals
- Warborough Investments Ltd (specifically the former Joseph Glover site at Station Road, Halfway)
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd (to promote sustainable communities)
- Ecclesfield Parish Council (to reduce travelling and congestion and promote local jobs)

Conditional Support:

- 9 organisations (Highways England, Friends of the Peak District/CPRE, Sheaf Valley Heritage Group, Sharrow Heritage Group, Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust, Rivelin Valley Conservation Group, Loxley Valley Protection Society, Grenoside Conservation Society and Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment), 1 developer/landowner/business and 14 individuals
- Highways England (more detail will be required on the location of sites to assess the impact on the Strategic Road Network)
- Friends of the Peak District/CPRE (to increase daytime activity but sceptical given vacancy rates)

- Rae Watson Development Surveyors (near the motorway and rail station in Chapeltown)
- Sheaf Valley/Sharrow Heritage Groups (targets are based on the Employment Land Review which is not supported and existing buildings should be reused)
- Sheffield Health & Social Care NHS Foundation Trust (away from the main urban area to complement the city centre, brownfield sites in the main urban area should be used for housing)
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group (but use existing buildings where possible)
- Loxley Valley Protection Society (to reduce travel and support local housing)
- Grenoside Conservation Society (only if there is an identified demand)
- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (although much of the demand could be met by the reuse of existing floor space)

Not support:

- 2 organisations (the University of Sheffield and Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group), 1 developer/landowner/business and 5 individuals
- University of Sheffield (would be contrary to the NPPF and not promote town centres)
- Ackroyd and Abbott (should be left to the market)
- Bolsterstone Archaeology and Heritage Group (better to be where there is a critical mass of offices than where people live)

Retail and Leisure Growth Options

Question 22: Should Meadowhall or retail parks be preferred over other out of centre locations for retail/leisure development?

Question 23: If so, what types of retail or leisure development should be acceptable under the sequential approach?

Question 22

The number of respondents was limited and their responses mixed.

Support 16, Conditional Support 13, Not Support 22 Neither 6

(Support is classed as agreeing that Meadowhall or retail parks should be preferred over other out-of-centre locations)

Support:

- University of Sheffield; 6 developers/landowners/businesses; 10 individuals

Conditional Support:

- 7 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council and Derbyshire County Council); Archaeological Research Services Ltd; 6 individuals

Not support:

- 4 organisations (including Historic England); 3 developers/landowners/businesses and 15 individuals

Those against supporting Meadowhall and retail parks over other out of centre locations emphasised the need to support the City Centre and locally based shops and centres instead.

Some wanted the plan to emphasise that the preference is for in- and edge-of-centre sites.

Four non-supporters, including Highways England, gave traffic impact as a reason for not supporting out of centre development.

On the other hand reasons given by supporters were:

- the need to take account of the popularity of out of centre shopping;
- that Meadowhall and retail parks are accessible by public transport;
- that development at Meadowhall would support High Speed 2/the Advanced Manufacturing and Innovation District

Some respondents wanted the plan to take account of the implications of internet shopping – click and collect, warehousing etc.

Question 23

- 11 respondents who supported Meadowhall and retail parks over other out of centre locations did not prefer any particular type of development there.
- 10 respondents would limit uses to: activity and sporting centres; focussing on leisure; retailing just bulky goods that require showrooms.
- 4 would allow out of centre development only where public transport is good.

Housing Growth Options

Option A: Urban Capacity

Question 24(a): Do you agree with our estimate that 4,000 homes will come forward on small windfall sites over the period 2014-2034?

Question 24(b) If not, what is your evidence for suggesting a different figure?

Support 0, Conditional Support 1, Not support 29

Support

- None

Conditional Support:

- Sheffield Association National Trust

Not Support (*includes representations stating that further evidence/information is required to justify the figure*)

- 4 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council, Dore Neighbourhood Forum and Sheffield Hallam University); The Home Builders' Federation; 24 developers/landowners/businesses
- 7 organisations were unsure, didn't know, were unable to comment or stated that they **neither supported or objected**
- Coda on behalf of several clients including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and private landowners considered that a weakness of Option A is the tendency for supply to be focussed on sub-optimal locations and allocation of unviable sites

Question 25(a): Do you agree with our estimate that 2,000 homes will come forward on larger windfall sites (excluding the City Centre, Kelham Island and other areas covered under Option C) over the period 2014-2034?

Question 25(b) If not, what is your evidence for suggesting a different figure?

Support 0, Conditional Support 1, Not support 25 Neither: 9

Support

- None

Conditional Support:

- Sheffield Association National Trust

Not Support (*includes representations stating that further evidence/information is required to justify the figure*)

- 2 organisations (including Sheffield Hallam University); The Home Builders' Federation; 22 developers/landowners/businesses
- 9 organisations were unsure, didn't know, were unable to comment or stated that they **neither supported or objected**
- Coda on behalf of 4 clients including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry – state that Option A should be fully exploited, and density should be assessed site by site and not just based on 'similar densities to those achieved in the past': But a weakness of this option is a tendency for sub-optimal locations and allocation of unviable sites;

Option B: Urban Intensification

Question 26(a): Should the densities required by the current Local Plan on sites outside the City Centre be increased? (b) If so, by how much?

Support 3, Conditional Support 5, Not Support 8, 41 neither

NB: support means densities outside the City Centre should be increased

- There was a range of responses to what appropriate densities should be outside the City Centre:
 - 45-50 dph (Blackamoor Limited, Friends of the Peak District/CPRE)
 - 40 dph (1 individual)
 - 60 dph near centres and good public transport (1 individual)
 - Maximum 55 dph (1 individual)
- 1 individual felt densities should be as low as possible, 2 as high as possible, whilst 2 considered current densities sufficient, as well as Cheetham & Co who noted that the SHLAA density assumptions have been tested with the development industry and are appropriate. Sharrow Heritage Group felt that housing should be no higher than 5 storeys outside the City Centre.
- Many comments were received about the impact of higher density housing, for example:
 - Increased densities support and attract services, as well as assisting in provision of infrastructure
 - Higher densities will avoid the need to build on greenfield sites
 - Increased densities make efficient use of land
 - Higher density housing needs good planning to work well
 - Increased densities should not harm heritage assets
 - Concerned about the demand for higher densities
 - There can be associated problems with living in higher density housing
- Some respondents comment on the need for lower densities:
 - To ensure family housing is delivered in suburban areas
 - Due to an oversupply of apartments
 - There should be no minimum density
 - A range of densities are needed to meet a variety of needs
 - Increased density can result in town cramming
 - Densities should not be increased in the South West
- DLP, responding on behalf of a large number of landowners and developers, felt that blanket density policies do not necessarily deliver desirable housing and that density should respond to individual site characteristics, market demand, and capacity for growth. Sufficient sites should be allocated to allow for market choice to meet a range of needs.

Question 27: Will there be sufficient demand for higher density housing in the locations suggested (City Centre, around District Centres, close to railway stations and other public transport hubs)? Please provide reasons for your answer.

Support 20, Conditional Support 12, Not Support 5, 33 neither

NB; support interpreted to mean that there will be sufficient demand for higher density housing in the locations suggested.

- There was a split in the respondents between:
 - (a) Those who think that there will be continued demand for higher density City Centre housing
 - 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 2 organisations
 - (b) Those unsure that there is demand for higher density
 - 8 developers/landowners/businesses and 8 individuals.
 - (c) those that considered there would be demand for higher densities in some locations
 - 17 developers/landowners/businesses and Sheffield and 1 organisation.

DLP (on behalf of the developers/landowners/businesses) also made the point that density will be a response to individual site demand and viability, and that taller buildings will be needed if higher density housing is to be achieved. 2 individuals thought that demand for higher density housing will vary between areas.

- The reasons given for there being less demand for higher density housing included:
 - More houses are needed
 - Domination of a single type of housing in high density areas
 - People still need gardens and parking
 - Higher density housing can have social, environmental and visual amenity problems
- The reasons given for continued or increased demand for higher density housing included:
 - Higher density housing is suitable for smaller households, including older people
 - Higher density housing is suitable for households who rely on public transport and being closer to facilities.
 - Higher density housing is suitable for younger people, as well as students
 - Improved public transport will attract investment and increase population
 - Quality affordable housing in accessible locations will always be in demand
 - Current and lower densities are less affordable
 - Accessibility to employment options in the City Centre is important in supporting higher density housing
- Other comments included:
 - Affordable housing is needed

- Student accommodation plays a role in increasing densities and should not be capped
- There should be a range of sites to meet market demands
- High density housing is predominantly for students and the buy to let market
- Delivery rates of higher density private rented accommodation may stay the same but not increase
- Quality design is important when considering higher density

Question 28: What are the main barriers to delivering higher densities?

- 17 developers/landowners/businesses represented by DLP put forward the following barriers:
 - Perception of poor design quality (also 4 individuals)
 - Location (also 1 individual)
 - Limited locations for tall buildings
 - Increasing residential areas limits late night activity and can undermine City Centre vitality
 - There are a range of different housing requirements and higher density housing is not desired by all households (also HBF and Cheetham & Co)
 - Concern over pressure on infrastructure and facilities (also 3 individuals and Rivelin Valley Conservation Group)
 - Concerns over parking (also Rivelin Valley Conservation Group and 5 individuals)
 - Concerns over lack of amenity space and private gardens (also Ackroyd and Abbott Ltd, Cheetham & Co and 3 individuals)
- McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd were concerned about the lack of suitable sites (also Archaeological Research Services Ltd and Ecclesfield Parish Council), as well as viability (also 1 individual), high land values and higher build costs.
- A selection of the further barriers raised were as follows:
 - Topography
 - Concerns about privacy, noise and quality of life
 - Lack of demand
 - Lack of social diversity
 - The need for access to open/green spaces
 - Developer preference for low density housing
 - Planning/Sheffield City Council
 - Improvements required to public transport network as well as road network
 - Poor space standards
 - Issues relating to flooding
- Other comments raised included:
 - Heritage assets and character are a factor but not necessarily a barrier (Historic England)
 - Existing housing should be used more efficiently

Question 29: What would encourage people to choose to live in higher density housing?

- There were both positive and negative reasons given as answers to this question.
- The key negative reason given was a restricted supply of alternative property types (15 organisations represented by DLP and 1 individual)
- Grenoside Conservation Society, Ackroyd & Abbott Ltd and 2 individuals stated that most people will not choose high density housing, whilst 4 individuals were concerned that high density housing is not successful
- Organisations represented by DLP listed the following positive reasons why people would choose to live in higher density housing:
 - Affordability (also 4 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council), Rae Watson Development Surveyors, and 17 individuals)
 - Private renting as an alternative to buying
 - Good locations for smaller households, mixed communities with a variety of smaller households
 - Access to retail, services and facilities (also 2 organisations and 16 individuals)
 - Access to leisure and night time economy (also Rivelin Valley Conservation Group and 5 individuals)
 - Links to public transport (also 5 organisations including Ecclesfield Parish Council), Ackroyd & Abbott and 12 individuals)
 - Quality of place, environment and public realm (also 2 organisations and 2 individuals)
 - Pedestrianisation and vibrancy
 - Perception of safety
 - Distinctive identity
 - Good design (also 3 organisations, 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 9 individuals)
 - High quality apartment servicing and communal facilities
 - Open space provision (also 3 organisations, Ackroyd and Abbott Ltd and 5 individuals)
 - Opportunities to conserve energy through design (also Archaeological Research Services Ltd, Strip the Willow, and 3 individuals)
- Other reasons put forward primarily by individuals included access to education, good space standards, community, provision of health facilities, adequate parking, safe and secure design.

Question 30(a): Do you agree with our estimate that 10,000 more homes could be provided in the City Centre by 2034?

Question 30(b): If not, what evidence do you have to justify a different figure?

Support 1, Conditional Support 0, Not support 19, Neither 6

Support

- 1 developer/landowner/business

Conditional Support

- None

Not Support (*includes representations stating that further evidence/information is required to justify the figure*)

- Sheffield Hallam University and 18 developers/landowners/businesses
- 1 developer/landowner/business and 5 organisations were unsure, didn't know, were unable to comment or stated that they neither supported or objected

Other comments

- Coda on behalf of 4 clients including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and private landowners felt that the ambitious targets for the City Centre in the URBED report should be aspired to.

Question 31: Whereabouts in the City Centre should tall buildings be located?

- The question received four categories of responses – suggested locations for tall buildings within the City Centre and edge of City Centre, suggestions for locations elsewhere, principles to guide tall buildings, and other concerns.
- City Centre locations included: Charter Row, Suffolk Road, Hanover Way, Kelham Island, Shalesmoor, Lady's Bridge, the canal basin, Park Square, between Surrey Street and the Peace Gardens, around Pond Street bus station, around Sheffield rail station, CIQ, along the Inner Ring Road, University of Sheffield Central Campus, University of Sheffield Houndsfield Site/Brook Hill, Netherthorpe Road, Broad Lane, West Street, Fargate, St Vincent's Quarter, Arundel Gate, the Moor, Sheffield Hallam University's City Centre Campus.
- Less specific City Centre suggestions included the edge of the City Centre, anywhere in the City Centre, a separate high rise zone like Canary Wharf and not in the south west quadrant of the City Centre.

- Locations suggested outside the City Centre included Bramall Lane, Queens Road, Neepsend, Parkwood Springs, Shirecliffe, Broomhall, Northumberland Road and 'random locations'.
- A number of respondents set out principles or considerations for tall buildings
 - Ensure existing buildings with heritage or architectural merit are taken into account
 - Less prominent locations below the skyline/in the valleys
 - Locate tall buildings where they can provide shade or shelter/minimise heat island and wind tunnel effects
 - There should be protected views
 - On old industrial sites
 - Clustered together
 - Take account of the setting of the Peak Park
 - Tall buildings where there is infrastructure/amenities
 - Tall buildings where the ground conditions are suitable
 - Design aspirations of tall buildings are too high if intensification is to be achieved
 - There should be a definition of tall buildings
 - Locations for tall buildings in the Urban Design Compendium should be reviewed
 - Require high design standards
 - Higher density in the most accessible locations
- Other key concerns focused on the negative aspects of tall buildings such as wind tunnels, not vernacular and an unwelcoming pedestrian environment, as well as statements that there is no need for further demand for tall buildings or housing in the City Centre.

Question 32: Should parking policies be changed so that less off-street parking is required (meaning more parking on-street)?

Support 8, Conditional Support 5, Not Support 47, Neither/Unclear: 10

Overall the indication is that this option is not supported. The reasons for that are varied but include for example comments that actually more off-road parking is needed as on-street parking causes obstruction and congestion, that reducing parking provision won't result in less cars, and that streets should have an amenity value, where priority should be for cyclists and pedestrians. Those who do support this aim, suggest that better public transport, walking and cycling facilities would be needed so that people do not need to own a car. Others have suggested that there are other ways of dealing with this such as underground parking.

Support:

- Tata Steel supports the notion of making more intensive use of sites within the existing urban areas through the relaxation of certain planning policies on matters such as amenity standards and off-street parking provisions

- One individual felt that if Sheffield develops as a compact city then car ownership will be less essential. Other individual comments included that on-street parking reduces speeds, and that managing it with permits could provide a source of revenue.
- Policies need to reduce the need and incentive for travel by car. A reduction in off-street parking would encourage a change in travel patterns, especially if associated with the development of local community facilities.

Conditional Support:

- Ackroyd and Abbott Ltd support the aim but only in certain situations where roads are wide enough and parking can be provided outside people's homes.
- Loxley Valley Protection Society support this aim if developments are well served by frequent transport links, and within easy walking/cycling distance of facilities, so private transport is not needed.
- Some individuals have commented that they would support this as long as traffic flow is not impacted upon, others that on-street should be managed with parking permits.

Not Support:

- Private Landowners, Gravitas Property Developments Ltd, HFT Ltd, Barclaycare Ltd, Jaguar Estates Ltd & Wortley Developments Ltd, Sheffield Methodist Church, Corker Properties Ltd, J F Finnegan Ltd, Bawtry Road Plot Owners & Committee Members, Redrow Homes Yorkshire Ltd, Hollis's Hospital, Miller Homes, Elsworth Acres Ltd, The University of Sheffield included comments that:
 - requiring on street parking can result in wider roads in developments, increasing the presence of the private car within the street scene.
 - amending parking policies to reduce the need to accommodate private cars will be unsuccessful unless there are substantial improvements to public transport links
 - Parking should be related to the site, use and surrounding area. Reducing standards to bring forward more development is not the way to meet future demand.
 - Need to make adequate allocation for off street parking
- Sharrow Heritage Group, plus several individuals suggest that better public transport would mean lower car ownership and therefore less parking needed.
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd, Rae Watson Development Surveyors, Ecclesfield Parish Council and several individuals felt that there must be more off-street car parking, there is already enough on-street parking which causes obstruction and congestion. Rivelin Valley Conservation Group suggest that outside the city centre, space should be allocated within developments for onsite parking or as communal parking
- BBEST Neighbourhood Planning Forum suggest that on street parking is causing congestion and obstructions and that providing other travel options, including making walking and cycling to public transport is a better solution.
- Cycle Sheffield plus individuals felt that informal on street parking can cause obstructions and danger for people walking and cycling. There were also comments that access for buses and service vehicles is already difficult on narrow streets

- Cycle Sheffield suggest that on-street car parking is an inefficient use of space, but that if it is to be permitted it needs to be designed in to the street. Need more cycle parking as this uses less space, and provide cycle parking where people live.
- Individual comments included: cars parked on street give the wrong impression and imply priority over cyclists/pedestrians, underground parking should be used, need to include charging for electric vehicles, streets should have an amenity value, restricting residential parking will not reduce car ownership,

Neither:

- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (SPACE) suggest a need for a design led approach which demonstrates a hierarchy of streets with appropriate solutions rather than a prescriptive approach.
- Friends of the Peak District/CPRE suggest there are other ways of enabling sustainable intensification including such as substantial remodelling, for example building residential over car parks, improving amenities such as pocket parks, greenspaces, cycleways etc which would add value to sites.
- Individuals comments included: Need free park and ride to enable people to leave the car at home, expand the use of car clubs and car sharing

Question 33: Subject to fitting in with the local character and site conditions, should developments on greenfield or Green Belt sites generally be required to a higher density such as above 40 homes per hectare? Please provide reasons for your answer

Support 3, Conditional Support 4, Not Support 62, 15 neither

Support

- Keen to ensure that efficient use of land is made on Green Belt sites
 - Rotherham MBC, Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and 3 individuals.
- Higher density housing may be acceptable in some circumstances
 - 1 organisation, 3 developers/landowners/businesses and 3 individuals.
- Some higher density housing for example for older people could be appropriate as part of a new neighbourhood
 - 1 organisation.
- Respondents **not supporting** the proposal broadly fell into three themes those which oppose density guidelines and higher densities as a principle and those concerned about the effects on the Green Belt. General concerns included:
 - Density should reflect local circumstances and be considered on a site by site basis
 - o 24 developers/landowners/businesses, 3 organisations (including North East Derbyshire District Council), the Home Builders Federation and 5 individuals.
 - Density should not be prescribed

- 4 developers/landowners/businesses, 2 organisations (including North East Derbyshire District Council) and 2 individuals
- There should be a range of densities to deliver a range of housing (Home Builders Federation and 1 developer/landowner/business).
- Larger households' needs would not be met by higher densities
 - 2 developers/landowners/businesses and 1 individual
- Higher density housing can result in 'town cramming', smaller homes and smaller gardens
 - Home Builders Federation and 1 developer/landowner/business
- Specific concerns related to higher density housing in the Green Belt included:
 - No demand
 - 2 developers/landowners/businesses
 - Inappropriate
 - 1 developer/landowner/business and 5 individuals
 - There should be no Green Belt development, prioritise development elsewhere
 - 5 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council) and 26 individuals)
 - Higher density housing is unlikely to be suitable on Green Belt sites
 - developers/landowners/businesses organisations represented by DLP Planning
 - Higher density housing in these locations would result in greater car use which would be less sustainable
 - (developers/landowners/businesses organisations represented by DLP Planning
 - The impact on the surrounding landscape and the urban/rural interface should be considered
 - Derbyshire County Council, North East Derbyshire District Council, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and 1 developer/landowner/business
 - Higher density housing could impact on the surrounding countryside
 - Derbyshire County Council and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
 - Any Green Belt development should be low density
 - 2 organisations, 1 developer/landowner/business and 5 individuals
- More general issues raised by developers/landowners/businesses represented by DLP Planning covered the issue that development should respond to protection or enhancement of ecology, good design is important, and schemes should ensure sufficient open space or green buffers (also Peak District National Park Authority, , Ackroyd and Abbott Ltd, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council , Loxley Valley Protection Society and 2 individuals). The focus should be on retaining character (Sheffield Association National Trust and 3 individuals)

Question 34: Do you agree that surplus open space should be developed for housing, with the proceeds of development invested in improving remaining open space? Please give reasons for your answer.

Support 17, Conditional Support 37, Not Support 13 Neither 20

NB not all respondents expressed their level of support for this approach.

Support:

- 2 developers/landowners/businesses, 7 organisations (including Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council) and 8 individuals

Conditional Support:

- 18 developers/landowners/businesses (including the Home Builders Federation), 9 organisations (including Derbyshire County Council, Historic England, Sport England, Natural England and Ecclesfield Parish Council) and 10 individuals

Not support

- 1 developer/landowner/business, 1 organisations and 11 individuals

Comments:

Do not compromise character/landscape

- 18 developers/landowners/businesses, 2 organisations (including Derbyshire County Council and Historic England) and 2 individuals

Prioritise private open spaces and assess quality as well as quantity

- 18 developers/landowners/businesses

Overgrown sports grounds have limited value and should be allocated

- 19 developers/landowners/businesses

Remaining open space must be improved and contributions not get 'watered down'

- 20 developers/landowners/businesses, 2 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council) and 4 individuals

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be used to fund open space improvements

- 16 developers/landowners/businesses

What does surplus mean/what is surplus?

- 1 developer/landowner/business, 6 organisations (including Sport England and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council)

Decreases pressure on Green Belt

- 1 developer/landowner/business, Ecclesfield Parish Council and 3 individuals

Increased population will increase the need for open space

- 1 organisation and 1 individual

Sheffield has a lot of poor quality and underused open spaces, the loss of most lacklustre and disused could be developed and remaining open spaces improved therefore win win situation

- Coda on behalf of 4 clients including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Option C Urban Remodelling

Question 35(a): Do you support the option of significant urban remodelling at Neepsend/Shalesmoor?

Question 35(b): What would be the main challenges to delivering this option and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?

Support 37, Conditional Support 15, Not Support 25, Neither (stating the challenges) 64

Support

- 1 developer/landowner/business, 8 organisations (including Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District National Park Authority) and 28 individuals

Reasons

- Will transform the area, improve safety, promote regeneration, improve appearance, promote sustainable transport and services close to the city centre, and is preferred to developing the Green Belt.

Conditional Support

- 2 developers/landowners/businesses, 6 organisation (including CPRE and Ecclesfield Parish Council) and 7 individuals

Reasons

- a mix of uses should be sought
- potential undermining of AMID if quality employment land there is taken up by businesses relocating from UDV & LDV
- buildings with character should be reused
- subject to new homes being sustainably designed

Not Support (significant barriers to delivery):

- 22 developers/landowners/businesses and 3 individuals

Reasons

- there is limited market demand;

- land assembly will take too long due to multiple ownerships;
- The Council do not have the expertise or financial capacity to deliver wholesale remodelling;
- Significant evidence required to prove deliverability to pass the test of soundness.

The challenges:

- 17 developers/landowners/businesses, 14 organisations (including Highways England and 33 individuals

Reasons

- Creating an appropriate delivery model (e.g. development corporation, CPO, incentives for developers, CIL, Council funding).
- Creating an environment that is attractive to house builders/investors.
- Relocating existing businesses currently operating on cheap rents and compensating them.
- Providing community facilities, services and other infrastructure.

Question 36(a): Do you support the option of significant urban remodelling at Attercliffe?

Question 36(b): What would be the main challenges to delivering this option and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?

Support 35, Conditional Support 11, Not Support 19, Neither (stating challenges to delivery) 3

Support

- 5 organisations (including North East Derbyshire District Council and the Peak District National Park Authority) and 30 individuals

Reasons

- Best use of existing infrastructure and brownfield, efficient use of land and better than developing Green Belt.
- It would improve the area's appearance and it would bring life/regeneration to the area and improve safety.
- Excellent transport links to Meadowhall;
- Supports job growth associated with the Advanced Manufacturing and Innovation District (AMID)

Conditional Support:

- 3 organisations and 8 individuals

Reasons

- The place making agenda should be a stated priority

- Must ensure affordable housing is delivered.
- Avoid loss of historic buildings.

Not Support (significant barriers to delivery):

- 15 developers/landowners/businesses, 0 organisations (including Highways England) and 4 individuals

Reasons

- As Question 35a & b above
- Traffic and highways impact on local trunk roads including M1 (Highways England).
- Plus poor linkages to local services.

The challenges:

Neither (stating the challenges): 59

- 19 developers/landowners/businesses, 11 organisations and 29 individuals

Question 37(a): Are there other locations where the urban remodelling approach should be considered?

Question 37(b): What would be the main challenges to delivering this option and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?

No other locations should be considered:

- 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 1 individual

Reasons

- uneconomic for Sheffield and unsustainable.
- market potential is questionable.
- it won't make significant contribution to the 5 year supply which is a priority for the plan.

The challenges:

- As 35b and 36b.
- Coda on behalf of 4 clients including the Chamber for Commerce and Industry – the weaknesses of this option are identification, masterplanning, relocation, and land assembly takes several years but could be mitigated if SCC is willing to act as a facilitator to a market led approach.

Option D: Limited Number of Larger Urban Extensions into the Green Belt

Question 38(a): Do you support the option of focusing major growth at Stocksbridge and in the Upper Don Valley (including land in Barnsley Borough)?

Support 17, Conditional Support 44, Not Support 147 Neither 12

As a result of a leafleting campaign by a local environment group in Worrall (which incorrectly suggested that five sites on the edge of the village were proposed for housing development), this option elicited a large number of comments.

Support:

- Dore Neighbourhood Forum, 14 developers/landowners/businesses and 5 individuals supported this option arguing: the corridor could be a major focus for growth; gives the opportunity to create distinctive new neighbourhoods and enhance the existing larger villages; and provides Sheffield the opportunity to meet some of its identified housing needs.

Conditional Support:

- 6 organisations (including the Peak District National Park Authority), 4 developers/land owners/businesses and 28 individuals conditionally supported the option with various conditions including:
 - development being limited to or prioritising brownfield sites;
 - Green Belt or Greenfield sites only being used as a last resort;
 - investment in transport links and public transport, including reinstating the rail connection for rail/Supertram use;
 - provision of enhanced park and ride;
 - Sheffield meeting its housing requirements within its own boundaries;
 - Stocksbridge as a focus for growth but not at the levels set in the Sheffield Plan; and
 - a study of the impact on biodiversity being undertaken
 - investment in infrastructure including schools, surgeries and medical facilities, sewage treatment, flood alleviation, ground drainage, the road network;
 - the load being shared with other areas of the city;
 - full consultation with local communities.
- Tangent Properties supported focussing growth at Hoyland (Barnsley Borough).

Not support:

- 13 organisations (including Angela Smith MP, Bradfield Parish Council and North East Derbyshire District Council) and 135 individuals (mainly Worrall village residents) objected to this option for various reasons including:

- Inadequate infrastructure/services (including public transport, school places, sewage treatment, medical services) to support major housing growth;
- Development will cause flooding and drainage problems;
- Unacceptable loss of Green Belt/Greenfield land;
- Inadequate transport links;
- irreversible harm to the environment, heritage, archaeology, flora and fauna;
- Better served, more sustainable areas to focus housing growth;
- Sheffield's countryside is a major asset that would be irreversibly harmed – adverse impact on Sheffield's reputation as a green city.
- option would cause merging of settlements;
- Need for major housing growth is not proven;
- Harm to the character of Worrall village; and
- the level of growth proposed would have very significant, unacceptable impact on the main communities within Bradfield parish.

Question 38(b): What would be the main challenges to delivering this option, and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?

Suggested challenges are arranged into seven themes (listed in order of popularity):

- **Improved Connectivity Theme.** Main issues:
 - Improvements to access and connectivity between the City Centre and the rural areas - delivery of new passenger rail route along existing Don Valley railway, linking Stocksbridge to the City Centre and AMID
 - A6102 is currently operating at full capacity and a new bridge link route from A6102 to Claywheels Lane is required
- **Infrastructure Improvements Theme.** Main issues:
 - Improvements to local facilities and infrastructure - sewerage and effluent treatment, schools, shops and health care – currently all inadequate
 - Improved facilities making Stocksbridge more attractive to home owners and support to develop the tourist potential of the area;
 - delivery of appropriate infrastructure;
 - flood prevention;
- **Socio Economic Conditions Theme.** Main issues:
 - The need for job creation
 - The challenge is building the Stocksbridge and Upper Don social and economic structure to make the area an attractive proposition to house builders and home owners;
- **Environmental Protection Theme.** Main issues:
 - Loss of Green Belt
 - Impact of character of existing settlements
 - Impact on biodiversity, landscape and archaeological features;
 - prioritising the use of brownfield land while protecting green spaces;

- not overdeveloping the area - avoiding urban sprawl
- limiting development to brownfield sites;
- flood risk

- **Growth Distribution Theme.** Main issues:
 - Equitable distribution of development across the city.
 - Getting the right focus on different sectors for each area that are sustainable and not just one sector focus; less houses; build elsewhere;

- **Deliverability Theme.** Main issues:
 - Option is not deliverable, physically feasible, viable or sustainable.
 - Topography and viability;
 - Site constraints such as contamination and viability
 - Development will not come about without significant investment and project management by the Council and its partners.

- **Improved Engagement Theme. Main issues:**
 - Improvements to community engagement and consultation.
 - Duty to cooperate with Barnsley MBC
 - Resistance to growth from local communities – need to engage/involve/be led by them
 - Political attitude of the Council towards Stocksbridge/Upper Don;

Question 39: Do you support the option for a large urban extension in East Sheffield (as an extension to the Waverley development in Rotherham Borough)? Please provide reasons for your answer.

Support 24, Conditional Support 17, Not Support 25, Neither 5 (generally because they felt didn't know area or have enough specific site information)

Support:

- 2 developers/landowners/businesses; and 4 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum) and 14 individuals

Reasons for support

- Yes because its already developed/good use of brownfield land/agreement needed with Rotherham/area needs redevelopment [due to use of the term 'as extension to Waverley' some support comments indicated a misunderstanding of site location giving misleading responses]
- It's a good location with lots of space - large enough to support new local amenities.
- It's a less environmentally sensitive area, further away from the National Park.
- Better topography and transport links than the north or west of the city.
- Area already has excellent transport links to new areas of employment and to the M1, with opportunities to promote further improvements to public transport networks.

4 developers/landowners/support option but add that all areas should be considered as part of the options process, a combination of large scale and smaller green belt releases will deliver range and choice.

Conditional Support:

- 5 organisations, 2 developers/land owners/businesses and 9 individuals

Reasons

- Support provided supportive infrastructure (especially transport) is in place and implementation is carefully planned and communicated
- Wider issue needs to be resolved by working with surrounding local authorities on regional planning of housing;
- Only if it's on brownfield land/no loss of recreation land/no loss of wildlife sites;
- Provided link road onto the B6200 at Woodhouse and an alternative open space is provided;
- Must be balanced with high quality developments to the west and south of Sheffield

Rotherham MBC also commented that:

- Sheffield should meet its own needs within its administrative boundaries;
- Is a logical expansion area and well related to the development underway at Waverley;
- Needs consideration of cross boundary issues and infrastructure requirements for the area as a whole

Not support:

- University of Sheffield and 13 developers/landowners/businesses commented that:
 - Housing should not limit the growth potential of the AMID. Potential for conflict with potentially sensitive research and development uses.
 - Tinsley Golf Course is an existing amenity that workers, residents, and visitors benefit from, losing this feature would be short-sighted
 - Would not deliver a range of housing to all markets including the western and southern edges of the city where demand is strongest
 - There are other East Sheffield Green Belt locations that could provide additional housing without prejudicing the operation of AMID/Sheffield Business Park or resulting in the loss of the existing golf course (promoting specific site)

Other not support reasons:

- 5 Individuals: Not in the Green Belt/no large urban extensions anywhere/lead to increase in car-based commuting/will only benefit developers and landowners
- 1 organisation: Should build more densely in selected areas of Sheffield
- North East Derbyshire District Council and 1 individual: Options A-C should be considered first and maximised before greenfield & Green Belt options
- Highways England and 2 developers/landowners/businesses: Would have a significant cumulative impact on the Strategic Road Network, particularly M1 (J31 and 33) and on the Parkway

Question 40: Do you support the option of focusing major growth in South East Sheffield?

Support 2, Conditional Support 16, Not support 3

Support

- 2 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum)

Conditional Support

- 1 organisation and 15 developers/landowners/businesses

Not Support

- 3 organisations (including Derbyshire County Council and North East Derbyshire District Council) stated that development should only be considered once all other non- Green Belt locations have been discounted

7 organisations (including Historic England and Highways England) and 3 developers/landowners/businesses were **unable to comment** because they needed further information

Question 41: Do you support the option for a large urban extension to the east of Norton (Sheffield District only)?

Support 2, Conditional Support 17, Not support 3

• **Support**

- 2 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum)

• **Conditional Support**

- 1 organisation and 16 developers/landowners/businesses

• **Not Support**

- 3 organisations (including Derbyshire County Council and North East Derbyshire District Council who stated that development should only be considered once all other non- Green Belt locations have been discounted)

7 organisations (including Historic England and Highways England) and 2 developers/landowners/businesses were **unable to comment** because they needed further information

Question 42: Are there any other areas where a large urban extension should be considered? Please provide reasons for your answer.

- 4 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum) and 8 individuals do not agree with development in the Green Belt
- 2 organisations and 6 individuals highlighted the importance of prioritising regeneration of brownfield sites and existing communities
- 1 individual suggested redevelopment of Council estates.
- 2 organisations stated that extensions should only be acceptable if they are master planned with place-making principles, in sustainable locations and meet housing needs.
- 2 organisations and 2 developers/landowners/businesses were concerned that long timescales for urban extensions mean they won't contribute sufficiently to housing land supply.
- Other general concerns about Green Belt extensions included:
 - Increase in commuting (1 organisation and 1 individual)
 - Loss of farmland, impact on landscape, impact on ecology and archaeology (LVPS)
- Locations for urban extensions suggested by small numbers of individuals included:
 - Parkwood Springs
 - White Lane/Ridgeway
 - Previously developed land in Loxley Valley
 - Aston/Anston (in North East Derbyshire District)
 - Crystal Peaks
 - Jordanthorpe
 - East Sheffield
 - Burngreave
 - Sheaf Valley
 - Lodgemoor
 - Claywheels Lane
 - British Tissues at Oughtibridge
 - Smaller developments in all areas
- A large number of developers/landowners/businesses represented by DLP suggested North East Derbyshire, Dore and Long Line (also developer/landowners/businesses represented by Spawforths) and South West Sheffield. Specific mention is made of the opportunity of Council land in Dore being used to cross fund regeneration elsewhere.
- Several developers/landowners/businesses (including those represented by Spawforths) proposed Ecclesfield/Chapelton.
- 1 developer/landowner/business also suggested Grenoside.
- 2 individuals suggested that there should be no extensions in SW Sheffield due to topography whilst Grenoside Conservation Society, Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and 1 individual suggested extensions should be elsewhere in the city region.

- Coda on behalf of 4 clients including the Chamber for Commerce and Industry stated that this option needs to be explored in areas where they are well served or have potential to be served by Supertram and rail services, as decentralised locations can be made very sustainable.

Option E: Multiple Smaller Green Belt Releases

Question 43: Do you support the option of multiple smaller urban extensions around the built up area?

Support 45, Conditional Support 14, Not Support 42, Neither 3

A mix of responses, including questioning the housing target and Option E's contribution to it.

Support Options E as one of a number of options needed to meet housing supply:

- 3 organisations which are Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield College and Sheffield Property and Regeneration Committee, 33 developers/landowners/businesses and 9 individuals

Reasons

- Contributes to a greater variety of sites/provides choice
- Smaller sites can be delivered more quickly
- Could be delivered with more ease and increase sustainability by supporting the creation of small neighbourhood centres
- Need to attract smaller house builders
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) mitigates the argument that small extensions aren't big enough to justify own facilities
- Supports SCR and Northern Powerhouse growth objectives
- Some support given by individuals only if Option E is last resort, but see concerns below about this.
- Several developers/landowners/businesses promoted development of particular sites

Conditional Support:

- 6 organisations, 1 developers/landowners/businesses and 7 individuals

Reasons

- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and Gladman Developments - support for small extensions if sustainable; Also pursue Option D
- BBEST Neighbourhood Forum - support only if directly linked to public transport and limited car spaces
- Ecclesfield Parish Council - as long as character and Green Belt policies not compromised and affordable housing provided

- Peak District National Park Authority - within context that the majority of Sheffield's Green Belt is too environmentally sensitive to be suitable for development; site-specific impacts need assessing for Habitats Regulations Assessment and impact on Peak District National Park
- Derbyshire County Council - fewer potential implications for purposes of north Derbyshire but recognise this as least sustainable option and more difficult to control design quality than Option D)
- Young People – Sheffield Futures - mixed views in the Group: Keep Green Belt as it is or “nibble at the Green Belt” (Option E) as long as some Green Belt/greenspace kept.

Not support:

- 9 organisations including a councillor on behalf of Sheffield City Council, 1 developers/landowners/businesses and 32 individuals

Reasons

- 2 organisations - Green Belt protects surrounding landscape and offers recreation purposes
- Sheffield Peak against City Encroachment - this option makes so small a contribution as to be negligible but developers will favour this option as the land is easy to develop
- Friends of the Peak District/CPRE - similar to above but fear that housing supply will not materialise from Options A-D and Option E's contribution will substantially increase
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group - same comment as above about developers; Increased commuting/congestion; Incapacity to cope with school infrastructure demands, particularly compared to Option D
- Dore Neighbourhood Forum - Option E would detract from strategic approaches encompassed in Options A-D and would be in conflict with purposes of the Green Belt
- Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust - Green Belt Review need to be made available; Protect Green Belt; Option E is last resort
- Archaeological Research Services Ltd - support Option D – well thought out extensions rather than “many little snips”
- Loxley Valley Protection Society - agree with reasons why Option E would not be sustainable; Flag that loss of farmland/floodplains should be reasons for not developing land, as well as ecological and landscape reasons
- Other objections from individuals include: vehement opposition to development on Green Belt and/or particular areas e.g. Worrall, because of rural settlement character, impact on Peak District, Green Belt character, ecology, recreation use, drainage issues in steep sided valleys in North West, lack of public transport/increased commuting; impact on rural businesses, too remote.

Question 44: Should redevelopment of existing previously developed (brownfield) sites within the Green Belt for housing be permitted? Please provide reasons for your answer

Support 31, Conditional Support 34, Not Support 21, Neither 1

Support:

- 2 organisations (including the Home Builders Federation), 6 developers/landowners/businesses and 20 individuals

Reasons

- Can assist in delivering a range of housing to all markets including local needs
 - Used already so less harm on surroundings & avoids pockets of dereliction
 - Better 'brownfield' green belt than undeveloped greenbelt/greenfield
- 3 developers/landowners/businesses thought that this should not be a question because it is already supported by the NPPF

Conditional support:

- 9 organisations (including Derbyshire County Council, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield Hallam University, Natural England), 12 developers/landowners/businesses and 5 individuals:
 - made the point that it depends on site and circumstances – the surrounding environment is not always suitable or the site may not be sustainably located for residential development, other uses (including greenspace) may be more appropriate (some responses also cited this as a reason for not supporting and releasing only site by site)
- 3 organisations (including Derbyshire County Council), 3 developers/landowners/businesses and 1 individual argued that this should depend on the outcome of a strategic Green Belt review.
- A number of developers/landowners/businesses represented by DLP also considered that previously developed Green Belt land at Waverley/Tinsley Golf course should be considered for business/education uses so there is no conflict with the AMID
- Rotherham MBC stated that such sites may be suitable provided there is suitable supporting infrastructure (including transport links)

Not support:

- 8 organisations, 1 developers/landowners/businesses and 11 individuals
- 5 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum) and some individuals made the following main points:
 - majority of Green Belt is too environmentally sensitive
 - concerns about infrastructure capacity (especially road capacity for extra traffic)
 - delivery of supporting infrastructure would itself impact on the environment
 - Not likely to be affordable housing

- difficult to control further spread once approved - could lead to numerous small developments without good connections and facilities
- 3 organisations and 1 developer/landowner/business:
 - Sites should be considered on a case by case basis (also given as a conditional support reason by some respondents, see above)
 - Should not be prioritised ahead of other sites
- Loxley Valley Protection Society and 3 individuals –
 - Should not offer any sites until Options A-C have been fully explored & developed to avoid ‘cherry picking’. Scale of development should be a consideration; there are some very large sites equivalent size of existing villages (Dysons/Hepworths)
- Strip the Willow and 5 individuals
 - Under no circumstances/should be returned to Green Belt uses

Question 45: What factors should be given greatest weight when deciding which sites should be allocated for development?

52 organisations and 49 individuals answered this question.

- **Key themes** emerging from the comments relate to:
 - availability and deliverability of sites
 - Transport accessibility
 - Impacts on the environment – landscape, ecology, wildlife, flooding, pollution etc.
 - Impact on heritage and listed buildings
 - Infrastructure provision (all types)
 - Critical mass to make a development sustainable
- DLP on behalf of 24 developers/landowners/business and the University of Sheffield and Sheffield Hallam University made the following comments:
 - Must pass the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework of being available, suitable and deliverable
 - Provide a wide range of sites available for development to provide market choice of size, location and type of housing
 - proactively drive and support sustainable economic development as set out in the Strategic Economic Plan
 - deliver the homes required to meet the future requirements of the population as well as the labour increase needed to match the job creation associated with the economic growth plan
 - give a favourable policy context to support locations for business and industrial development,
 - take a definitive approach to future infrastructure requirements including extensions to the Supertram and the necessary links to the new HS2 station

- support thriving local places which recognise the role of the major institutions within the city including the universities and their students, the NHS and their staff and patients.
- consideration should be given to market signals, including land prices and housing affordability, as well as creating a positive policy context in which sites that are available, suitable and deliverable can come forward to secure investment and growth within the city to help meet the needs of the residential and business communities.

What are the Implications of the Options for other Local Authorities in Sheffield City Region?

Question 46: Should Sheffield seek to meet all its own housing needs within the district?

50 organisations and 34 individuals answered this question.

- Sheffield Hallam University, the Home Builders Federation, Rotherham MBC, Derbyshire County Council, North East Derbyshire District Council, 28 developers/landowners/businesses and 3 individuals commented that:
 - The starting point must be that Sheffield, as the City Region centre and one of the Northern Powerhouse hubs, should meet its own housing needs
 - To not do so would risk Sheffield losing out on growth benefits that could undermine the social, economic and environmental objectives of the Local Plan
 - Other authorities have their own growth ambitions and development pressures
- Sheffield Hallam University, the Home Builders Federation, North East Derbyshire District Council, Doncaster MBC, Historic England, Sheffield City Region, 5 other organisations, 26 developers/landowners/businesses and 20 individuals added to this that:
 - There may also be circumstances where to ensure headroom in the housing requirement there may need to be co-operation with neighbouring authorities to meet that level
 - Or there is suitable land close enough for commuters
 - Should behave like a region
 - Good public transport links gives people greater flexibility and choice for school and work, people are prepared to travel further
- Harworth Estates, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council and 4 individuals felt needs should be met in Sheffield & Rotherham
- Rotherham MBC, 6 of the above developers/landowners/businesses, Doncaster MBC, and 1 individual agreed if it is supported by a strategic Green Belt review
- Derbyshire County Council also said it would place less of a burden on parts of Derbyshire having to meet the shortfall in addition to its own needs
- Sharrow Heritage Group, 1 developer/landowner/business and 2 individuals felt that it would be more sustainable, a compact city reduces need to travel and will have better air quality. Looking further brings additional infrastructure issues (including traffic)

- Yorkshire Housing Association and 2 individuals commented that meeting needs outside the district may reduce impact on the Green Belt and protect parts of the city with high landscape value
- 1 individual - may mean unpleasant increase in density and related traffic problems

Question 47: How much of the housing need within the Sheffield/Rotherham housing market area could be accommodated in other districts in Sheffield City Region (i.e. outside Sheffield and Rotherham districts)?

41 organisations and 27 individuals answered this question.

- Doncaster MBC, Grenoside Conservation Society, several individuals
 - Can't answer or have given a guess without reasoning (10%, 30%, 50%)
 - Would have to consider impact of the commute and housing/work locations/infrastructure
- Bolsover District Council, Derbyshire County Council
 - None in Bolsover - district has its own challenges & a poor housing market relationship with Sheffield
- Sheffield City Region, HBF, Doncaster MBC, Rotherham MBC, North East Derbyshire District Council, 4 developers/landowners/businesses and 2 individuals
 - It is dependent on the evidence contained in a Strategic Green Belt review, SHLAA, and the outcome of 'duty to cooperate' discussions
- Sheffield Hallam University, 24 developers/land owners/businesses and 2 individuals suggested that areas in North Derbyshire close to M1 at J29a and J30 should be considered as part of engagement with North East Derbyshire District Council
- Yorkshire Housing Association - all of it
- Hallam Land Management & individuals - as much as needed/is deliverable
- Sharrow Heritage Group, Cheetham & Co and 4 individuals -None/should meet its own needs
- North East Derbyshire – need to look beyond Sheffield and the Housing Market Areas into the wider Sheffield City Region area to identify optimal solutions for housing growth

Question 48: What would be the social, environmental and economic consequences of meeting some of the housing need in Sheffield/Rotherham in other districts in SCR?

41 organisations and 31 individuals answered this question.

- Individuals suggested it would mean building at lower densities, enabling people to live near workplaces and in smaller communities rather than large city

- Yorkshire Housing Association, Grenoside Conservation Society and individuals
 - Would need improved transport links
- Sheffield Hallam University, Doncaster MBC, the Home Builders Federation, 27 developers/landowners/businesses and several individuals all stated that it would mean an increase the number of vehicles on the strategic highway and increase commuting, with adverse air quality consequences
- 20 developers/landowners/businesses, Doncaster MBC, Sheffield Hallam University, the Home Builders Federation , all considered that it:
 - Risks the loss of economic growth for the city (population increase to stimulate growth)
 - Loss of additional community benefits (including affordable homes, education, health and open spaces)
 - Loss of tax revenue and council tax
- Yorkshire Housing Association, Grenoside Conservation Society and 6 individuals
 - Would benefit the whole region/bigger better economic unit/more flexibility
 - Lead to improvement and regeneration of these other areas
 - A new community could serve more than one major centre of activity/Role of City Centre may change
- Natural England, the Home Builders Federation and 6 developers/landowners/businesses, and several individuals
 - Environmental consequences would depend on location & scale, e.g. sensitive close to or within Peak District National Park or/may involve Green Belt elsewhere
 - Sheffield would retain its Green Belt
- Doncaster MBC, 4 developers/landowners/businesses, and 1 individual
 - People may be forced to live away from their preferred location in the city (disaggregation of informal support networks (family & friends)/loss of local identity/sense of place)
 - Create dead dormitory areas/poorer quality of life
- Home Builders Federation, 3 developers/landowners/businesses and 1 individual felt there would be impacts wherever the need is met/impacts will be lessened the closer they are to the Sheffield/Rotherham boundaries
- Home Builders Federation and 4 developers/landowners/businesses also commented that not meeting the needs within the housing market area could lead to:
 - market stress (higher house prices & rents) and worsening affordability
 - increased overcrowding, more concealed households, and
 - businesses struggling to recruit and retain talented employees
- Cheetham & Co
 - Extensive cooperation/negotiation between authorities leads to less certain outcome and potential for delay in delivery

Infrastructure required to support the Growth Options

Question 49: Where should the Supertram network be extended?

Support 71, Conditional Support 12, Not Support 1, Neither: 5

NB: support is where the respondent has suggested where the network should be extended or has supported the principle of extending the network

Overall there is a high level of support for extending the Supertram network. There are a large number of individual suggestions for new routes citywide, but three particular areas that received support are, improved connections to the hospitals, to Stocksbridge, and to the employment opportunities in the Lower Don Valley and AMID.

Support:

- 2 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council) and 2 developers/landowners/businesses – all support extension of the tram network to Stocksbridge. There is also a high level of support from individuals for this route.
- 5 organisations (including Ecclesfield Parish Council and the University of Sheffield) and 10 developers/landowners/businesses all show support for extending Supertram to the hospitals, some refer specifically to the Hallamshire Hospital or Northern General hospital. There is also a high level of support from individuals for this route.
- 2 organisations (including the University of Sheffield) and 9 developers/landowners/businesses all support Supertram links to the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District. Again there is also support from individuals for this.
- Cycle Sheffield support extending the network but say that it should be designed so that it doesn't endanger cyclists.
- The University of Sheffield and 9 developers/landowners/businesses all highlight the importance of links to the city centre from HS2 (wherever it is located).
- 4 organisations (including the Sheffield Hallam University, University of Sheffield and Dore Neighbourhood Forum) and 12 developers/landowners/businesses generally support improved access to the Dore and Topley area, although there is varying support for whether that should be by tram-train or Supertram, and varying routes are suggested (eg Abbeydale Road, Ecclesall Road South).
- Other comments included – areas of housing growth, areas with existing poor transport links, areas with congestion where it will most improve traffic flow.

Conditional Support:

- Friends of the Peak District/CPRE show some support for enhancements to the Supertram network but believe the emphasis should be on improving the bus network to improve its effectiveness and reliability.
- Friends of Dore and Topley Station - suggest the use of tram-train instead of Supertram along the existing rail track bed of the Sheaf Valley to provide a more flexible system. They suggest that more local access (more stops) along the route

will encourage increased access by walking and cycling, reduce pressure on park and ride at Dore and Totley and help reduce vehicle emissions.

- Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (SPACE) - depends where housing growth is concentrated.
- Woodland Trusts view - essential that irreplaceable habitats are not lost, damaged or adversely impacted by the development of transport infrastructure.
- Others – public transport, pedestrian and cycle links from residential areas to the tram system need to be improved. Extensions should be off-road so trams don't delay other traffic.

Not Support:

- 1 individual said that benefits outweigh the cost and disruption that it will cause to extend the network

Neither:

- Don Valley Railway suggested that other forms of fixed track should be considered as they would be better value, as well as improvements to the rail network. There were other individual comments which supported this too.
- Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust stated the need to plan for the potential impacts of proposed HS2, HS3 and trans-Pennine tunnel.
- Sheffield City Region suggested that key priority is to ensure key growth areas are well served by public transport, utilising mass transit where appropriate.

Question 50: Do you support the proposal to expand Park and Ride in the south of the city?

Support 48, Conditional Support 10, Not Support 4, Neither: 7

The majority of responses were supportive. In particular it was felt that there was a need to alleviate congestion and reduce private vehicle trips. It was raised that Park and Ride should be considered on a SCR (and wider) basis.

Support:

- Dore Neighbourhood Forum - to support options to develop land in South East Sheffield and east of Norton.
- Dore Neighbourhood Forum, Archaeological Research Services Ltd and several individuals support additional provision at **Dore/Totley** with additional rail services. Sheffield and Peak Against City Encroachment (SPACE) also highlight that the Dore and Totley provision is full already.
- BBEST Neighbourhood Planning Forum: support Park and Ride on the **Hallam Towers site**.

- Sheffield Association National Trust: **Heeley/Millhouses** should be developed with extended Supertram/Tramtrain alongside the existing rail line.
- DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of 6 developers/landowners/businesses – P&R could support the delivery of more housing in the south west of Sheffield as part of a major extension. Could also mitigate some of the potential impacts of HS2.
- SYPTE noted that provision of park and ride at **Waverley** is no longer expected due to a change in the development mix and uncertainty of BRT south.
- Rivelin Valley Conservation Group and several individuals highlighted that where Park and Ride has been provided it is full and limiting modal switch. They also propose that land for park and ride should be allocated wherever major housing growth is proposed and other key locations served by Supertram, Tram-Train, Rail Stops, HS2 and key bus routes.
- Cycle Sheffield: Park and Ride should also link to the cycle network with cycle hire available.
- The Sheffield Antiques Quarter was concerned with the high cost of parking impacting on how we encourage people to use our City Centre.
- Several organisations (Yorkshire Housing Association, Sheaf Valley Heritage (Sharrow Heritage Group)) highlighted general benefits of Park and Ride including reducing traffic congestion, speeding up journeys, encouraging people to travel into the City and saving resources.
- 31 individuals also expressed their support. There was a mix of responses but in particular it was felt that there was a need to alleviate congestion and that additional Park and Ride facilities would reduce private vehicle trips, particularly to the city centre, and improve access for commuters.
- A number of respondents felt that the public transport link needs to be a direct, reliable, fast and affordable alternative to the car.
- The **Norton aerodrome site** was suggested for a Park and Ride facility (for Herdings Tram stop). Other suggestions were less specific but included a network of sites circling the city and Park and Ride considered on all tram routes/extensions.

Conditional Support:

- Dore & Totley Golf Club, Stainton Planning on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott Ltd, Grenoside Conservation Society and several individuals were supportive but concerned that the public transport link was frequent, fast, convenient, reliable, and affordable. One individual was concerned that the parking should be unobtrusive.
- One individual felt that more work was needed to find out what would get people to use P&R whilst another felt it should be advertised.
- Derbyshire County Council raised no concerns in principle but were concerned that the location did not undermine existing commercially-operated public transport services (by abstracting passengers). They also noted that they would not necessarily object to the introduction of P&R schemes within their administrative area, but should not be expected to meet the costs.
- One individual suggested a congestion charge system could be considered to help fund the provision of P&R and to reduce the cost of public transport.

Not Support:

- 4 individuals felt that it would: encourage people to live out of town, drive into the P&R and result in local pollution and congestion. It was also suggested that the money would be better spent on sustainable public transport.

Neither:

- Several respondents felt that they needed more information, for example Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and Natural England were concerned about the impacts of exact locations on of a number of important areas that were highlighted. Highways England would like to work in partnership to understand the impact of any new sites on the operation of the Strategic Road Network.
- Friends of Dore and Totley Station were concerned that, unless improved sustainable transport options were put in place, increased car parking facilities at Dore and Totley station would not solve the parking problems and result in increased air pollution and congestion on local roads.
- Sheffield City Region has commenced development of the SCR Transport Strategy Refresh which will set out key policies. A key priority will be ensuring that key growth areas are well served by the transport network, utilising mass transit where appropriate. It was also raised that Park and Ride should be considered on a Sheffield City Region basis, including HS2.
- An individual noted that they would prefer improved bus and cycle networks and more local facilities/jobs.

Question 51: Do you support the principle of segregating the cycle network from other traffic?

Support 62, Conditional Support 7, Not Support 8, Neither: 2

The vast majority of responses were supportive, in particular it was felt by both organisations and individuals to encourage people to cycle more and improve safety.

Support:

- 17 organisations (including Dore Neighbourhood Forum, the University of Sheffield, Ecclesfield Parish Council and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council), and 45 individuals.
- Potential benefits highlighted – encouraging cycle use, safety, improved amenity, accessibility and connectivity, ease of movement, the potential to reduce congestion, improve journey times, support economic regeneration, positive impacts on health and the environment/resources.

- Cycle Sheffield reference studies evidencing that for more people to cycle protected space away from traffic is needed. They were supportive of Sheffield's draft cycling network standards that suggest **segregation on busy roads** (>200vph).
- The Sheffield Antiques Quarter however also raised a concern around **cost** and **disruption**.
- University of Sheffield also highlighted the need for **well maintained, direct and appealing routes**.
- BBEST Neighbourhood Planning Forum: Suggest allaying this with a **walking strategy** as in dense space shared space with pedestrians may be required.
- Several organisations highlighted particular locations:
 - Friends of Dore and Totley Station request that space is protected along the **Sheaf Valley Corridor**.
 - Canals & River Trust highlight the **Sheffield - Rotherham towpath** that which is in need of investment.
 - SPACE suggested combining with Park and Ride to reduce congestion and highlight the **A621 through Totley**, the route **into Totley from Dore and Totley Station Park and Ride** and along the **River Sheaf from Totley Rise** as potential routes.
- Some respondents and organisations felt that on road facilities felt were inadequate, whilst others (including Friends of Dore and Totley Station) stressed the need for **parallel investment** and **improved integration** with the wider network.
- The need for provisions to be **direct** and **inclusive** was also raised.

Conditional Support:

- 2 developers/landowners/businesses - as long as there is sufficient space.
- Loxley Valley Protection Society - bikes should not be combined with pedestrians.
- Grenoside Conservation Society - as long as it does not lead to the unnecessary banning of cycles from other routes.
- 3 individuals - cycling on all roads must still be made safer and more acceptable; support for a separate network away from the road; support for a network that creates direct routes

Not Support:

- 2 organisations - space should not be removed from major roads to accommodate this; not if likely to impact negatively on other transport users.
- University of Sheffield - may be supportive in the development of future cycle network routes but felt there may be significant obstacles to a retroactive application of any such policy. They were concerned in particular with the University of Sheffield's public realm objectives, public spaces and understanding pedestrian flows.
- 2 individuals felt that few people cycle as a mode of transport and that road space should not be taken away to create a segregated network, one of which felt that cycling was dangerous and should not be encouraged. 1 individual felt this was not a high priority for investment.

- 2 individuals were supportive of cycling but not segregated routes. Concerns included them being poorly maintained, poorly lit, isolated, containing obstacles and less direct.

Neither:

- Sheffield City Region has commenced development of the SCR Transport Strategy Refresh which will set out key policies. A key priority will be ensuring that key growth areas are well served by the transport network, utilising mass transit where appropriate.
- An individual felt that it would be better to create the conditions to allow mixed use road space. Segregation should not be at the expense of adequate provision where there is no dedicated road space.

Other Miscellaneous Comments

Support 5, Conditional Support 0, Not Support 0, Neither 67

There were a large number of comments that fall under the miscellaneous category, as they did not specifically answer any particular question but provided general views.

Support:

- 3 individuals, Bassetlaw District Council & HOW Planning for Urbo (displayed general support for the Sheffield Plan in terms of the general approach to promote city centre regeneration, redevelopment of brownfield sites and potential tram extensions and other network improvements)

Neither Support/no support

- Chesterfield BC, Bolsover DC, Nottinghamshire CC, Derbyshire CC, North East Derbyshire, Environment Agency, Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners on behalf of CEG, Gladman Developments, Minerals Products Association – all make reference to the need to comply with the Duty to Cooperate
- Environment Agency – Flood risk needs to be assessed and a sequential approach should be advocated in the development of growth options
- SYPTE – there are various transport issues that relate to the options
- Derbyshire County Council - Green Belt to be assessed in terms of its 5 purposes (NPPF) and state some are strategically sensitive i.e. northern areas of NE Derbyshire as they preserve coalescence of settlements
- Highways England – outline that it's likely that some of the major development sites will have significant impacts on the Strategic Road Network and therefore require mitigation. Severe impact will need to be reduced and mitigated. Construction of sites with the greatest impact need to be phased following completion of RIS projects. 2 SRN locations in Sheffield District are M1 J34-35a and A616(T). Key issues are congestion at M1J34 and J33-36 limited capacity that constrains growth. AQMA is an issue. There is no suitable method at present to investigate traffic impact and potential junction improvements
- British Land – plan needs to recognise the role of Meadowhall for the economy's economy and social wellbeing, seek to maintain and strengthen the role
- Young People Sheffield Futures - state a need for housing of different types and tenures to be provided in existing areas– should not be creating large scale new neighbourhoods
- Coda on behalf of 4 clients including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry – state that the 2 universities should feature more in the plan and be increasingly integrated into the objectives set out in the options for growth. The Outdoor City ambition also needs to feature more in the plan. A stronger business offer should be an objective of the City Centre and there needs to be some flexibility to allow mixed use developments. The Devolution Deal is acknowledged and the role of the South Yorkshire Mayor being able to contribute towards more stable and positive planning

atmosphere, which will help guide and encourage investment in the city and SCR. Several pieces of land have been referenced for removal from the Green Belt.

- Individual - seeking better highways/traffic management
- Several individuals - Imaginative solutions to the housing issues are needed and affordable housing should be on brownfield land

Sustainability Appraisal

As part of the consultation, comments were also invited on the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report and Sustainability Appraisal of the Citywide Options.

The Scoping Report sets down a framework for assessing the sustainability of options and proposals. This includes Sustainability Aims.

SA: Do you have any comments on the Scoping Report?

Some consultees gave comments exclusively on the scoping report, as part of statutory consultation on the scoping report itself:

Support for Scoping Report

- Yorkshire Housing Association and 2 other individuals.

Conditional Support – Scoping Report supported subject to some amendments

- 4 organisations (including Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency) and 1 other individual in relation to the ecological, historic, waste, Water and flooding element of the Scoping Report.
- The Environment Agency require blue corridors to be reflected in the Plan

No comments

- Hallam Land Management Ltd and 5 individuals.

Some consultees commented on whether the Sheffield Plan options supported the Sustainability Aims:

- Gladman Developments comment that some Plans have failed the test of legal compliance at Examination, due to an unsatisfactory Sustainability Appraisal
- Many individuals have concern about development on Green Belt
- Grenoside Conservation Society recognises the difficulty of sustainable development, in the light of uncertainty and reliability of Government commitments to policies and rapid development in approaches to sustainability.

SEA: Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal of the Citywide Options?

Yorkshire Housing Association and 2 individuals **support** the Sustainability Appraisal

Conditional Support 2 - Historic England and one individual suggests amendments to the sustainability appraisal in relation to impact on heritage assets and climate change.

Hallam Land Management Ltd, Natural England, Rivelin Valley Conservation Group and 17 individuals **neither support nor not support**.