

REPORT TO FULL COUNCIL 6TH SEPTEMBER 2023

APPENDIX 2c

**Responses to Comments on Annex A of the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan (Site
Schedule)**

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Introduction	Some site conditions don't reflect the mitigation requirements of the Heritage Impact Assessment. Need to amend to reflect HIA.	Points raised in the representation with regards to Site Conditions in Annex A have been addressed on a site-by-site basis and will be reflected in the Statement of Common Ground between Historic England and Sheffield City Council.	No	PDSP.003.040	Historic England	All sites subject to a HIA
Annex A: Site Allocations	Introduction	Lack of Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	The lack of a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is acknowledged. The Council is proactively working with the Environment Agency on producing a Level 2 SFRA.	No	PDSP.002.017	Environment Agency	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Introduction	Site allocation schedule requires more heritage information.	Annex A contains proposed conditions on development and their text is considered sufficient for providing guidance as sites proceed to planning application stage. Further details on the sites and their respective constraints are contained within the Site Selection Methodology (which contains detailed site appraisals) and other supporting documents such as Heritage Impact Assessments.	No	PDSP.116.103	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Introduction	Annex A: Site Allocations – Recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities residing in Sharrow, Nether Edge and Millhouses; Spital Hill, Burngreave, Firth Park/Fir Vale and Tinsley/Darnall.	The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. No change is needed as the Local Plan does not allocate land for new cemeteries; however, planning applications brought forward to meet this need will be considered under existing national planning policy.	No	PDSP.143.003	South Yorkshire Muslim Community Forum	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Response seems to suggest that there is only one employment allocation in the area (KN02) and so may not have sufficient supply of employment within CA1.	The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the Integrated Impact Assessment and Employment Land Review. The long-term need for employment land can be reassessed when the Plan is reviewed after 5 years so it is not necessary to identify a full 15 year supply.	No	PDSP.060.003	Mr A Spurr (Submitted by Spring Planning)	KN02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Site Allocation KN02 should either be updated to reflect a more flexible approach to development on this site or removed and covered by the wider policies governing this area.	The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework in regard to making effective use of land. The General Employment	No	PDSP.060.004	Mr A Spurr (Submitted by Spring Planning)	KN02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Zones provide opportunity and flexibility for a wide range of business to expand, locate and relocate. Other uses are not appropriate in these areas, therefore KN02 is considered to be appropriately allocated.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Sites KN03, KN07, KN21 and KN24 should come forward in a masterplan as there are quite a few key heritage assets on all these sites.	Accept change. The heritage condition on development has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. The site is proposed to come forward as part of emerging masterplanning work. Added reference to the emerging masterplanning work.	Yes	PDSP.003.041	Historic England	KN03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	HE concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.042	Historic England	KN04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN04 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.042	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.043	Historic England	KN05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN05 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.043	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Sites KN03, KN07, KN21 and KN24 should come forward in a masterplan as there are quite a few key heritage assets on all these sites. Concerned that decision making process is not explicit.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Site is proposed to come forward as part of emerging masterplanning work.	Yes	PDSP.003.044	Historic England	KN07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN07 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.044	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN08 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see</p>	No	PDSP.042.045	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN08

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	No	PDSP.003.045	Historic England	KN09
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.046	Historic England	KN10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN10 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.046	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Site is near to a listed building, and a scheduled monument. It is also within a conservation area. Historic England require further assessment to determine suitability of development.	Points raised in the representation with regards to Site Conditions in Annex A have been addressed on a site-by-site basis and will be reflected in the Statement of Common Ground between Historic England and Sheffield City Council. An additional assessment will be carried out for this site.	Yes	PDSP.003.047	Historic England	KN11
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN11 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of	No	PDSP.042.047	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN13 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet	No	PDSP.042.048	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developmen	KN13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			ts Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend,	Comment suggests that site KN18 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.049	Hallam Land Management, Strata	KN18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations	Philadelphia, Woodside		<p>Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are</p>			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN19 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.050	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN19

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN20 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.051	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN20

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Sites KN03, KN07, KN21 and KN24 should come forward in a masterplan as there are a number of key heritage assets on all these sites. The Heritage Impact Assessment for this site does not go far enough to determine whether development would be feasible without harm to significance of heritage assets.	Points raised in the representation with regards to Site Conditions in Annex A have been addressed on a site-by-site basis and will be reflected in the Statement of Common Ground between Historic England and Sheffield City Council. The site is within the Neepsend Priority Location where further emerging masterplanning is being carried out which will take account of heritage assets.	Yes	PDSP.003.048	Historic England	KN21

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN21 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.052	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN21

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN22 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see</p>	No	PDSP.042.053	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area as well as the listed building.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.049	Historic England	KN23
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Sites KN03, KN07, KN21 and KN24 should come forward in a masterplan as there are a number of key heritage assets on all these sites. There is concern that the decision-making process is not explicit.	Points raised in the representation with regards to Site Conditions in Annex A have been addressed on a site-by-site basis and will be reflected in the Statement of Common Ground between Historic England and Sheffield City Council. An addendum to the Heritage Impact Assessment will clarify and	Yes	PDSP.003.050	Historic England	KN24

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			remove references to enabling development. The site is within the Neepsend Priority Location where further emerging masterplanning is being carried out which will take account of heritage assets.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Representation suggests that proposed development for site would be unviable if existing structure is to be retained. Suggests that site needs to be levelled in order to be delivered. Also questions the affordable housing requirement. Suggests a new condition of requiring a 'Structural report' and also suggests that the site needs to be moved further back in the Housing trajectory and not be delivered in the first 5 years of the plan.	The Site Selection Methodology identifies the site as being potentially suitable for development and the Heritage Impact Assessment has considered the site. Although recognising the challenge for complex City Centre sites, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that there are active schemes in the Central Sub-Area, suggesting that development remains viable. Homes England have made a commitment to continue working with the City Council throughout the local plan-making process and help deliver key sites in the city, see Statement of Common Ground. Requirements for the preservation of heritage assets	No	PDSP.035.016	Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN24

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			have come from consultation with Historic England. Any further detail and proposals on site will be dealt with through the planning application stage.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN25 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see	No	PDSP.042.054	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN25

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area as well as the listed building.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Site is proposed to come forward as part of emerging master planning work.	Yes	PDSP.003.051	Historic England	KN27
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment states that KN27 is not available for development as current occupier is looking to expand the business (Unit 1). States that there is no objection to principle of development in the area but objects to the site being delivered in the first 5 years of the Local Plan. Also objects	It is acknowledged that site has been indicated as not being available for development in the first 5 years of the Local Plan. This is reflected in the trajectory. Allocation site KN27 is subject to future master planning work, which includes further	No	PDSP.045.002	HD Sports (Submitted by Avison Young)	KN27

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		to the site being identified for developing a park only.	discussions with landowners regarding the potential of the site.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment requires site-specific guidance for the allocated priority housing sites to recognise the full opportunity offered where they include a green corridor or waterway. The reference within site conditions is deemed by to be vague and open to a wide variety of interpretations. The accompanying plan fails to clarify the concept spatially or show how this and adjoining priority sites could provide a key links in the Upper Don green corridor linking new and existing housing areas.	The topic of green and blue infrastructure networks and proposed future provision will be covered by the emerging Local Nature Recovery Network Strategy. Amended wording proposed in part 1 paragraph 5.24 reiterates the importance of Sheffield’s watercourses.	No	PDSP.151.005	Upper Don Trail Trust	KN27
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comments suggests that site KN29 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of	No	PDSP.042.055	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN29

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comments suggests that site KN30 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet	No	PDSP.042.056	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developmen	KN30

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			ts Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend,	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area as well as the listed building.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals	Yes	PDSP.003.052	Historic England	KN32

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations	Philadelphia, Woodside		should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comments suggests that site KN32 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see	No	PDSP.042.057	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN32

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN33 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.	No	PDSP.042.058	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN33

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Bolsterstone request clarification on whether KN34 will have both housing and flexible use allocations to ensure site can come forward with best possible option based on market circumstances.	The site is covered by both the Housing Site Allocation and the Central Area Flexible Use Zone. Policy AC1 (as amended) states that the required uses should make up at least 80% of the gross floorspace on the site. Policy VC3 lists the non-residential uses that are acceptable in the Central Area Flexible Use Zone.	No	PDSP.023.002	Bolsterstone Group (Submitted by Asteer Planning)	KN34
Annex A: Site	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend,	Comment suggests that site KN34 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.059	Hallam Land Management, Strata	KN34

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations	Philadelphia, Woodside		<p>Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are</p>			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Comment suggests that site KN35 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.060	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	KN35

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Conservation Area as well as the listed building.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Site is proposed to come forward as part of emerging master planning work.	Yes	PDSP.003.053	Historic England	KN36
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Points raised in the representation with regards to Site Conditions in Annex A have been addressed on a site-by-site basis and will be reflected in the Statement of Common Ground between Historic England and Sheffield City Council. An additional condition on development is proposed to	Yes	PDSP.003.054	Historic England	CW02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			reflect the need for development proposals to take account of the impact on nearby heritage assets.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Add new condition on development to ensure the culverted River Sheaf is protected and its ecological value is enhanced.	Policy GS9 supports the removal of culverts wherever practicable. Proposed modifications to Policy SA1 and Policy BG1 emphasise the valuable role that rivers play within the network of green and blue infrastructure. Two minor amendments to the conditions that relate to de-culverting of the River Sheaf.	No	PDSP.125.015	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust	CW02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment argues that policy seems too prescriptive for the City Centre. Site allocation CW03 designation is unclear on how it will be applied. Capacity at West Bar for housing only reflects Phase 1 and should be increased to state up to 525 units.	The Office Zones contain a significant amount of flexibility, given that 40% of the floorspace can be non-office use. Some requirement for office uses is necessary in order to deliver the spatial strategy of the Plan to meet the City's need for office space. The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to making effective use of land. The Central Sub Area is intended to play a key role in	No	PDSP.088.014	Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning)	CW03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			delivering future housing and retail growth as well as commercial activity to ensure long-term viability to the city centre. Flexible Use Zones allow for a wide variety of uses and are not considered restrictive to future development. No change proposed to residential capacity for this site. However, a separate schedule of changes will be prepared to reflect updated housing site capacities as a result of annual HELAA updates.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building, therefore mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.055	Historic England	CW04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comments suggests that site CW04 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a	No	PDSP.042.061	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and	CW04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW06 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.062	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW06

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building therefore mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets. Building needs to be retained.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Add condition to require retention of the listed building.	Yes	PDSP.003.056	Historic England	CW07
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW07 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of	No	PDSP.042.063	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW07 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet	No	PDSP.042.064	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developmen	CW07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			ts Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The	Comment suggests that site CW08 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.065	Hallam Land Management, Strata	CW08

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations	Wicker, and Victoria		<p>Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are</p>			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building and Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.057	Historic England	CW09
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW09 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will	No	PDSP.042.066	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW09

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.058	Historic England	CW12
Annex A: Site	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The	Comment suggests that site CW12 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.067	Hallam Land Management, Strata	CW12

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations	Wicker, and Victoria		<p>Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are</p>			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets. Historic England are requiring further criteria for development of site.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Condition to provide views of Aizlewoods Mill and the New Testament Church of God through the site from the A61 has been added.	Yes	PDSP.003.059	Historic England	CW13
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW13 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of	No	PDSP.042.068	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets. Site is adjacent to listed building. Historic England are requiring further criteria for development of site.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Condition to maintain	Yes	PDSP.003.060	Historic England	CW14

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			views of Aizlewoods Mill from Mowbray Street and Nursery Lane' has been added.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW14 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.069	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW14

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW15 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.070	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW15

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building and Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.061	Historic England	CW16
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW16 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.071	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	CW16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is opposite a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.062	Historic England	CW20
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW20 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.072	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW20

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.063	Historic England	CW21
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW21 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.073	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	CW21

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Comment suggests that site CW22 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.074	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	CW22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site allocation should be for residential use rather than for general employment use.	No change needed. The site lies within an area where Purpose Built Student Accommodation may be acceptable. However, the site is appropriately allocated for employment uses as it is related to the University and as it falls within the University/College policy zone. The Site Selection Methodology considered the appropriateness of allocation. It would not be appropriate to allocate the site for residential use as this is not the preferred use in the University/College Zone.	No	PDSP.086.063	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU01
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Local RSPB group should make comments on site allocations.	Noted. The Consultation Statement demonstrates that all Local Plan consultations have been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning regulations and	No	PDSP.123.001	RSPB Sheffield local group	SU01

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site allocation should be for taller buildings.	The Sheffield Central Area Strategy Capacity Report is consistent with national policy and provides a robust basis to set an appropriate height datum for each City Centre neighbourhood. Any further detail on future proposals will be dealt with at application stage.	No	PDSP.086.064	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is opposite a listed building and Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.064	Historic England	SU05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU05 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet	No	PDSP.042.075	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developmen	SU05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			ts Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St	Comment suggests that site SU08 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.076	Hallam Land Management, Strata	SU08

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations	George’s and University of Sheffield		<p>Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are</p>			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU10 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.077	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site contains a listed building and is in a Conservation Area. It is also on the Heritage at Risk register. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.065	Historic England	SU11
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU11 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.078	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SU11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building and in a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets. A new criterion is also required for better mitigation measures.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation	Yes	PDSP.003.066	Historic England	SU12

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			measures. Added condition to retain and incorporate the existing buildings along West Bar that are within the Conservation Area.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment queries the Site Selection Methodology and the lack of Landmark Building allocations and Tall Building areas.	The Site Selection Methodology is consistent with national policy and provides a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the housing requirement. A Tall Building Study will inform the locations for the tall buildings in a control plan, which will be an element of the emerging Central Area Design Guide.	No	PDSP.036.001	Gerald Duniec	SU12
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU12 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.079	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SU12

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU13 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.080	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SU13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggest that site allocation should be for flexible use rather than solely residential. Also suggests that site would make a good opportunity to link the Sheffield Innovation Spine proposals. Notes that site used to be a former laboratory.	No change needed. The site is allocated for housing and forms part of the Priority Location where new communities will be developed. A reference to the Sheffield Innovation Spine is proposed in an amendment to Policy SA1.	No	PDSP.086.065	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU15
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU16 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.081	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU17 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.082	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU18 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan	No	PDSP.042.083	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted	SU18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and	Comment states that site is adjacent to a listed building and in a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the	Yes	PDSP.003.067	Historic England	SU20

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	University of Sheffield	future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU20 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.084	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU20

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is adjacent a listed building, contains Grade II listed buildings and in a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets. A new criterion is also required for better mitigation measures.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Added condition to retain the listed building.	Yes	PDSP.003.068	Historic England	SU21
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU21 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions	No	PDSP.042.085	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SU21

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area which is on the Heritage at Risk register and adjacent a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or	Yes	PDSP.003.069	Historic England	SU23

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU23 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.086	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU23

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU23 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.087	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU23

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU24 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.088	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU24

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that that site SU26 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan	No	PDSP.042.089	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted	SU26

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area which is on the Heritage at Risk Register and adjacent a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the	Yes	PDSP.003.070	Historic England	SU27

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	University of Sheffield	conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU27 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.090	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU27

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and contains a Scheduled Monument. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.071	Historic England	SU30
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU30 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.091	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SU30

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Generally supportive of conditions on development on site but object to the allocated use being exclusively for housing and would propose a mixed-use or employment use scheme on the site. Would like to deliver a pocket park and deliver a strong local landmark.	The Site Selection Methodology and Heritage Impact Assessment identify the site as being potentially suitable for development. As stated in Annex A, any further detail in relation to mitigation measures and future	No	PDSP.141.001	South Yorkshire Industrial History Society (Submitted by Sheffield	SU30

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			proposed use will be considered through the planning application process. No change proposed to residential site allocation. The site is within a Priority Location where masterplanning is being carried out to support delivery of new homes.			Historic Buildings Trust)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to a listed building and contains a Grade II listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Added condition to retain the Listed Building.	Yes	PDSP.003.072	Historic England	SU31
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU31 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions	No	PDSP.042.092	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SU31

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comments suggests that site SU32 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a	No	PDSP.042.093	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and	SU32

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU33 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.094	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU33

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU34 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see</p>	No	PDSP.042.095	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU34

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.073	Historic England	SU35
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU35 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan	No	PDSP.042.096	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted	SU35

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area which is on the Heritage at Risk Register and adjacent a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the	Yes	PDSP.003.074	Historic England	SU37

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	University of Sheffield	conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU38 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.097	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU38

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU39 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the</p>	No	PDSP.042.098	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU39

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.075	Historic England	SU40
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU40 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.099	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SU40

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.076	Historic England	SU41
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU41 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.100	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU41

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.077	Historic England	SU42
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU42 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.101	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SU42

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Sketches for allocation site SU43 were submitted. However no text was submitted alongside the images.	Noted.	No	PDSP.036.002	Gerald Duniec	SU43
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment queries Site Selection Methodology and questions lack of Landmark Building allocations and tall building areas.	It is considered the Site Selection Methodology is consistent with national policy and provides a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the housing requirement. A Tall Building Study will inform the locations for the tall buildings in a control plan, which will be an element of the emerging Central Area Design Guide.	No	PDSP.036.003	Gerald Duniec	SU43
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU43 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions	No	PDSP.042.102	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SU43

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area. The site is also adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or	Yes	PDSP.003.078	Historic England	SU45

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comments suggests that site SU45 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.103	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU45

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area which is also on the Heritage at Risk Register. Site is also adjacent to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.079	Historic England	SU47
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU47 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.104	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SU47

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU48 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.105	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SU48

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area which is also on the Heritage at Risk Register. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets. An additional condition is required on development to ensure appropriate mitigation.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Added condition to require retention and repair of the listed buildings	No	PDSP.003.080	Historic England	SU51
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment suggests that site SU51 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.	No	PDSP.042.106	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SU51

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA3: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and is surrounded by a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.081	Historic England	SU55
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site wraps around a Conservation Area and is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the	Yes	PDSP.003.082	Historic England	SV01

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment is supportive of site allocations SV01, SV02 and SV05 as well as policy approach and zones in relation to City Centre Office Zone and Central Area Flexible Zone. Comment is also supportive of Policy AS1.	Support welcomed and noted.	No	PDSP.053.002	London and Continental Railways (LCR) (Submitted by Lichfields)	SV01
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is adjacent to a Conservation Area and is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.083	Historic England	SV02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment is supportive of site allocations SV01, SV02 and SV05 as well as policy approach and zones in relation to City Centre Office Zone and Central Area Flexible Zone. Comment is also supportive of Policy AS1.	Support welcomed and noted.	No	PDSP.053.003	London and Continental Railways (LCR) (Submitted by Lichfields)	SV02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment believes conditions on development to be unsound and weak in regard to impacts on the Porter River.	It is considered that the current conditions on site for development are appropriate. Any further details on future proposals and their	No	PDSP.125.016	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust	SV02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			appropriateness in relation to the development's merits will be dealt with at the planning application stage.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is adjacent to a Conservation Area and is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.084	Historic England	SV03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.085	Historic England	SV04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV04 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet	No	PDSP.042.108	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developmen	SV04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			ts Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore,	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals	Yes	PDSP.003.086	Historic England	SV05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations	Quarter, Sheaf Valley	mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV05 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see</p>	No	PDSP.042.109	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SV05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment is supportive of site allocations SV01, SV02 and SV05 as well as policy approach and zones in relation to City Centre Office Zone and Central Area Flexible Zone. Comment is also supportive of Policy AS1.	Support welcomed and noted.	No	PDSP.053.004	London and Continental Railways (LCR) (Submitted by Lichfields)	SV05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.087	Historic England	SV07
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries	Comments suggests that site SV07 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection	No	PDSP.042.110	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes,	SV07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	Quarter, Sheaf Valley		<p>Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are</p>			Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that SV07 site conditions should include minimum 10m natural buffer to watercourse.	Accept proposed change. Condition on development amended.	Yes	PDSP.127.016	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	SV07
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.088	Historic England	SV08
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV08 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.111	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SV08

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV09 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.112	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SV09

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area and in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.089	Historic England	SV10
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is adjacent a Conservation Area and in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.090	Historic England	SV11
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comments suggests that site SV11 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.113	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	SV11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV13 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.107	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SV13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.091	Historic England	SV15
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV15 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.114	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SV15

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is north of listed buildings and is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.092	Historic England	SV16
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV16 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.115	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SV16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV16 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.116	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SV16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is north of listed buildings and is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.093	Historic England	SV17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV17 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.117	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SV17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is within a Conservation Area with buildings on site making a positive contribution to the character. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.094	Historic England	SV18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV18 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.118	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SV18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV19 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see</p>	No	PDSP.042.119	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SV19

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is adjacent to a number of listed buildings and is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.095	Historic England	SV21
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV21 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan	No	PDSP.042.120	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted	SV21

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings and is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the	Yes	PDSP.003.096	Historic England	SV22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		future proposals do not harm heritage assets. Additional conditions should be added to site being developed to protect non-designated assets.	Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Added condition to retain non-designated heritage assets if possible.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Comment suggests that site SV22 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see</p>	No	PDSP.042.121	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SV22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment). Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Site is on the interactive map but not on the PDF map. Comment states that conditions on site allocation SV22 should include a minimum 10m natural buffer to watercourse.	Accept proposed change. Condition on development amended.	Yes	PDSP.127.017	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	SV22
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings and is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.097	Historic England	HC01
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings and is within a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the	Yes	PDSP.003.098	Historic England	HC02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC03 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.122	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	HC03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that HC03 is deemed as not available, suitable, achievable (including viable) or deliverable as envisaged by the proposed site allocation. The ownership is questioned and there is a substation on site that limits development. Recommends the removal of HC03 as a site allocation.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed allocation HC03 is part of a key Catalyst Site (see Policies CA5 and CA5A) and will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area and be delivered as part of emerging master planning work, thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear	No	PDSP.051.011	Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning)	HC03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA), the WPVA report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that HC03 remains viable, deliverable and appropriate. Allocation site HC01 is within the scope of emerging master planning work, which includes further discussions with landowners regarding the potential of the site.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC04 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions	No	PDSP.042.123	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	HC04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street,	Comment suggests that site HC05 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a	No	PDSP.042.124	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and	HC05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	Springfield, Hanover Street		<p>robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC08 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.125	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	HC08

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	The plan does not meet the criteria for the duty to cooperate. Respondent states they have personal opinions on cycle provision, electric vehicle charging points and CA5, however these are not detailed.	There has been ongoing and continuous engagement and cooperation with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies through the duty to cooperate bodies on strategic matters. This is set out in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement.	No	PDSP.212.001	David Watkins	HC08
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	No Issues raised.	Noted.	No	PDSP.219.001	dhtwatkins	HC08
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street,	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a listed building. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or	Yes	PDSP.003.099	Historic England	HC11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	Springfield, Hanover Street		other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC11 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.126	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	HC11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.100	Historic England	HC15
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC15 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.127	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	HC15

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street,	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings and is adjacent a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or	Yes	PDSP.003.101	Historic England	HC16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	Springfield, Hanover Street		other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC16 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.128	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	HC16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment states that site is in between two listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.102	Historic England	HC17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC17 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.129	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	HC17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street,	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or	Yes	PDSP.003.103	Historic England	HC22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	Springfield, Hanover Street		other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC22 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>	No	PDSP.042.130	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	HC22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment states that site contains a listed building, is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings and is included on the Heritage at Risk register. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.104	Historic England	HC24
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC24 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.131	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	HC24

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street,	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or	Yes	PDSP.003.105	Historic England	HC25

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
	Springfield, Hanover Street		other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC25 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.132	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	HC25

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.106	Historic England	HC26
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Comment suggests that site HC26 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.133	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	HC26

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensures an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation HC26 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. It is considered that the condition on development relating to biodiversity net gain is in accordance with the relevant requirements of the Environment Act 2021 and emerging national legislation, therefore it is necessary. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA), the WPVA report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that HC26 remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.</p>			<p>Planning Limited)</p>	

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen's Road	Comment suggests that site LR01 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.134	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	LR01

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a listed building and is adjacent a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.107	Historic England	LR02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment suggests that site LR02 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.135	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	LR02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment suggests amendment to conditions on development to “shall have its ecological condition improved” as current wording is deemed weak.	It is considered that the current conditions on site for development are appropriate. Any further details on future proposals and their appropriateness in relation to the development's merits will be dealt with at application stage.	No	PDSP.125.017	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust	LR02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen's Road	Comment suggests that site LR04 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies</p>	No	PDSP.042.136	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	LR04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment states that site is in close proximity to a listed building and is adjacent a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.108	Historic England	LR05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment suggests that site LR05 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.137	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	LR05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen's Road	Comment believes conditions on development to be unsound and weak in regard to impacts on the Sheaf and Porter Rivers as there is no established Local Nature Recovery Strategy.	The current conditions on site for development are appropriate. Any further details on future proposals and their appropriateness in relation to the development's merits will be dealt with at application stage. Further detail will be given in the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy.	No	PDSP.125.018	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust	LR06

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment requires LR06 site conditions to include min 10m natural buffer to watercourse.	Accept proposed change. Condition on development amended.	Yes	PDSP.127.018	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	LR06
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment states that site includes a listed building, is in close proximity to a listed building and is in a Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures should be included in site conditions to ensure future proposals do not harm heritage assets. Condition on development criteria should be updated to require retention and retainment of listed buildings.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Added condition to require retention and repair of the listed building.	Yes	PDSP.003.109	Historic England	LR07
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment suggests that site LR07 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed	No	PDSP.042.138	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	LR07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen’s Road	Comment suggests that site LR08 should be removed on viability and suitability grounds.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing	No	PDSP.042.139	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited	LR08

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p> <p>Whilst the WPVA modelling suggests that development is unviable for certain typologies the report acknowledges that this is not the experience in reality (Table 10.8), and that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre.</p>			(Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS01 is within close proximity to Wadsley Fossil Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England notes this allocation has planning	The SSSI is approximately 1.7 km from the centre of the site. Given the distance and the amount of built development between the	No	PDSP.006.018	Natural England	NWS 01

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		permission, yet they have no record of consultation. Due to the potential for large non-residential developments to impact on water supply mechanisms to SSSIs Natural England advise further hydrological investigation is required.	site and the SSSI, the development of the site is not felt to be relevant to the allocation.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Development of site NWS02 is likely to have a harmful impact on the Bardwell Road Railway Bridge Grade II Listed Building, which is considered unsuitable to be used as the sole access to the site, the adjacent NWS29 site and existing employment uses served via the bridge. Further consideration needs to be given to the suitability of the road tunnel linking Bardwell Road and Douglas Road as the sole means of access to expanded employment uses on this site, and to whether there are options to deliver a second access point to serve the area. Conditions on development for this site need to ensure mitigation measures to protect the heritage asset in line with the HIA are attached to any planning application.	Add the two mitigation measures suggested in the Heritage impact Assessment to the site conditions.	Yes	PDSP.003.110	Historic England	NWS 02
Annex A: Site	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS02 due to lack of information provide in Site Allocation. An ecological assessment of the site should	An archaeological assessment informed this allocation and resulted in a condition on	No	PDSP.006.019	Natural England	NWS 02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		be completed prior to its allocation. NWS02 is close to Neepsend Railway cutting SSSI. To protect the site NE notes the inclusion of a 'staged archaeological evaluation' and advises this should be carried out prior to allocation. The allocation should require the protection and long-term management of the priority habitats on site, including lowland deciduous woodlands.	development requiring the results of a staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal to support the submission of any planning applications for the site's development. The allocation also requires on-site provision of Biodiversity Net Gain and maintenance of connective ecological corridors/areas (including buffers) shown on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and combined natural capital opportunity maps and removing them from the developable area. Ecological assessment took place as part of the Site Selection process.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS02 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of allocated site NWS02, as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed. The site allocation contains a condition that preserves identified connective ecological corridors/areas (which include Local Wildlife sites) and their buffers, within or adjacent to the site and excludes them from the developable area of the site,	No	PDSP.103.002	Friends of Parkwood Springs	NWS 02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			while ensuring delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain within these designated corridors/ areas.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS02 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of allocated site NWS02, as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed. The site allocation contains a condition that preserves identified connective ecological corridors/areas (which include Local Wildlife sites) and their buffers, within or adjacent to the site and excludes them from the developable area of the site, while ensuring delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain within these designated corridors/ areas	No	PDSP.127.019	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	NWS 02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Remove a small portion of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from allocated site as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed. The LWS can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. The conditions attached to the allocation already make this clear.	No	PDSP.131.005	Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum	NWS 02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS02 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of	No change needed. The site allocation contains a condition that preserves identified connective ecological corridors/areas (which include Local Wildlife sites) and their	No	PDSP.331.002	Neil99	NWS 02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		allocated site NWS02, as incompatible with LWS policies.	buffers, within or adjacent to the site and excludes them from the developable area of the site, while ensuring delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain within these designated corridors/ areas				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS02 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of allocated site NWS02, as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed. The site allocation contains a condition that preserves identified connective ecological corridors/areas (which include Local Wildlife sites) and their buffers, within or adjacent to the site and excludes them from the developable area of the site, while ensuring delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain within these designated corridors/ areas	No	PDSP.344.002	PeteB1951	NWS 02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Woodland Trust is concerned that site allocation NWS03 will have potentially adverse impacts on an areas of ancient woodland 180 metres west of the site. Ancient woodland should not be included in sites are allocated for development, whether for residential, leisure or community purposes as this leaves them the ancient woodland open to the adverse impacts of development. Allocation	Add a condition on development to the site “Any Ancient Woodland/ Woodland adjacent to or within the site and its buffer must be excluded from the developable area of the site “.	Yes	PDSP.148.001	The Woodland Trust	NWS 03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		NWS03 is likely to cause damage and/or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to its boundaries. Suggest the site allocation is unsound and should not be taken forward. Secondary woodland should also be retained to ensure that ecological networks are maintained and enhanced.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	National Grid policy is to retain the 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line on site NWS04 as a national grid asset. Safety clearances between the line, ground, and structures must not be violated. Changes in ground levels beneath the line should not compromise these safety clearances. National Grid's land rights prohibit erecting buildings, altering ground levels, or storing materials on their assets. Written permission is necessary for work within 12.2m of their buildings, and a deed of consent is needed for crossing their easement.	Add condition on development to the allocation, that requires submission of a strategy for responding to national grid assets within or adjacent to the site in support of a planning application. The strategy must demonstrate that the National Grid Electricity Transmission Design Guide and Principles have been applied to the proposal at the design stage. It must also show how any adverse impacts on the National Grid's assets, or the development proposal have been reduced.	Yes	PDSP.004.001	National Grid (Submitted by Avison Young)	NWS 04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS04 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. NWS04 is close to Wadsley Fossil Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which contains a number of 'in situ' fossil	The SSSI is approximately 1.7 km from the centre of the site. Given the distance and the amount of built development between the site and the SSSI, the	No	PDSP.006.020	Natural England	NWS 04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		tree stumps, two of which have been exposed for many years. Potential for large non-residential developments to impact on water supply mechanisms to SSSIs. Further hydrological investigation is required to avoid significant harm to protected species/habitats in accordance with both national and local policy.	development of the site is not felt to be relevant to the allocation.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Respondent supports the industrial allocation. Respondent feels the range of industrial uses should be broadened to include the whole of E Class, with B2 and B8 class uses. This conflicts with the Flexible Use Zone.	Support for the allocation is welcomed. No change is proposed to the Flexible Use Zones as Use Class E(g) contains uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to amenity. Employment uses on the site allocation delivered in this policy zone would not be incompatible with nearby residential uses.	No	PDSP.084.005	Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)	NWS 04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The proposed employment allocation would perform a key strategic role in association with the existing surrounding employment area to help Sheffield City achieve its economic growth ambitions. Support strategic site allocation NWS04. Annex A shows that the employment uses proposed for the site are limited to Use Class E(g) iii only which comprises any	No change needed. Support for the allocation is welcomed. No change is proposed to the Flexible Use Zones as Use Class E(g) contains uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to amenity. Employment uses on the site allocation delivered in this policy	No	PDSP.084.006	Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH	NWS 04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		industrial process which can be carried out in any residential area without causing detriment to the amenity of the surround area. Given the existing mixed use character of the surrounding area and the fact that the allocation is also proposed to form part of a wider policy known as 'Flexible Use Zone – Policy NC16' we request that the proposed types of employment uses should be broadened to include the uses within the whole of Class E as well as Classes B2 and B8 subject to reasonable restrictions.	zone would not be incompatible with nearby residential uses.			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Whilst it could be consistent with national policy, the draft Plan does not contain adequate policies for the sustainable development of local food infrastructure. nor does it use the NPPF to achieve sustainable development of local food infrastructure. Therefore, the draft Local Plan cannot be considered to be positively prepared and is therefore unsound. Allocating this allotment (site NWS04) for industrial use represents a net loss of local food production capacity with no provision in the plan for a replacement is contrary to Draft policy GS1.	Strategic policy BG1 and development management policies GS1 to GS11 ensure the city's blue and green infrastructure (including allotments) is protected from inappropriate development. Valuable allotments are normally designated within Urban Green Space Zones and are protected from inappropriate development by policy GS1. Site NWS04 is privately owned and is now surplus to requirements. The Plan has no powers to insist on a	No	PDSP.121.037	Regather	NWS 04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			private landowner maintaining the existing use of the site once it becomes surplus to requirements. The site has therefore been allocated as a Strategic Employment Site, which is the most appropriate alternative use in that location. No change needed.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	National Grid acknowledges the 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line on site NWS04 as their asset and aims to keep it in place. Safety clearances between the line, ground, and structures should not be compromised by development and during proposed changes in ground levels. National Grid's land rights prohibit erecting buildings, altering ground levels, or storing materials on their assets. Written permission is necessary for work within 12.2m of their buildings, and a deed of consent is needed for crossing their easement.	Add a condition on development that requires submission of a strategy for responding to national grid assets within or adjacent to the site in support of a planning application. The strategy must demonstrate that the National Grid Electricity Transmission Design Guide and Principles have been applied to the proposal at the design stage. It must also show how any adverse impacts on the National Grid's assets or the development proposal have been reduced.	Yes	PDSP.004.002	National Grid (Submitted by Avison Young)	NWS 05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS05 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. NWS05 is close to Wadsley Fossil Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest, which	The SSSI is approximately 1.74 km from the centre of the site. Given the distance and the amount of built development between the	No	PDSP.006.021	Natural England	NWS 05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		contains a number of 'in situ' fossil tree stumps, two of which have been exposed for many years. Potential for large non-residential developments to impact on water supply mechanisms to SSSIs. Further hydrological investigation is required to avoid significant harm to protected species/habitats in accordance with both national and local policy.	site and the SSSI, the development of the site not felt to be relevant to the site allocation.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Requires a buffer to Oxspring Dam to be consistent with other site conditions and policies. Include buffer to Oxspring Dam Local Wildlife Site in site conditions.	No change needed. The second condition on NWS06 Site Allocation ensures that valuable ecological corridors or areas (including their Buffers) are removed from the site's developable area.	No	PDSP.127.020	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	NWS 06
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS07 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. NWS07 is close to Wadsley Fossil Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest, which contains a number of 'in situ' fossil tree stumps, two of which have been exposed for many years. Potential for large non-residential developments to impact on water supply mechanisms to SSSIs. Further hydrological investigation is required to avoid significant harm to	The SSSI is approximately 1.92 km from the centre of the site. Given the distance and the amount of built development between the site and the SSSI, the development of the site not felt to be relevant to the site allocation.	No	PDSP.006.022	Natural England	NWS 07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		protected species/habitats in accordance with both national and local policy.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS09 due to lack of information provided regarding existing biodiversity interests. An ecological assessment of the site is required to ensure harm to priority species and habitats is avoided. The scale and location of the development will result in adverse impacts on the adjacent area of Ancient Semi Natural woodland. Proposed development should be considered in the context of NPPF paragraph 180 (c). Allocation should require the protection and long-term management of the priority habitats on site, including lowland deciduous woodlands. Proposed developments should be considered as “major” in the context of NPPF paragraph 177 and should be required to meet the policy’s “exceptional circumstances” test. Exceptional circumstances will not exist unless all three national policy criteria can be satisfied. Further information is required to demonstrate that the necessary exceptional circumstances exist to justify the proposed allocations.	The site has planning permission and is under construction.	No	PDSP.006.023	Natural England	NWS 09

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Fully supports the allocation of site NWS09.	No change needed. Support for the allocation of site NWS09 is welcomed.	No	PDSP.148.002	The Woodland Trust	NWS 09
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Woodland Trust is concerned that site allocation NWS09 will have potentially adverse impacts on an area of ancient woodland adjacent to the site. Ancient woodland should not be included in sites are allocated for development, whether for residential, leisure or community purposes as this leaves them the ancient woodland open to the adverse impacts of development. Allocation NWS09 is likely to cause damage and/or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to its boundaries. Suggest the site allocation is unsound and should not be taken forward. Secondary woodland should also be retained to ensure that ecological networks are maintained and enhanced.	No change needed. This site has planning permission, development is under construction and is near completion.	No	PDSP.148.003	The Woodland Trust	NWS 09
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Heritage Impact Assessment for site NWS10 highlights that the undeveloped southern part of the site is more sensitive to the character of the area and setting of nearby listed assets and development here should be carefully considered in terms of its layout, form and massing.	Partly accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. No change is	Yes	PDSP.003.111	Historic England	NWS 10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		Historic England concurs with this analysis but also suggests that development should be avoided on this part of the site altogether to preserve the rural setting of Oughtibridge Hall. Propose an additional condition; “The undeveloped field adjacent to Oughtibridge Lane should be kept clear of development and retain its agricultural character. Retain and repair the drystone wall along Oughtibridge lane.”	proposed to the site boundary to exclude land adjacent to Oughtibridge Lane, however additional conditions on development are proposed in relation to protection of the heritage asset.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS10 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. An ecological assessment of the site is required to ensure harm to priority species and habitats is avoided. Advises the proposed development should be considered in the context of National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 180 (c). The scale and location of the development will inevitably result in adverse impacts on the adjacent Green Lane Spring which is an area of Ancient Semi Natural woodland. The allocation should require retention, long-term management and enhancement of Priority habitats and the delivery of a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain.	No change needed. An ecological survey must now be submitted in support of a planning application. All applications are considered with due regard to relevant national and local planning policies. The development's impacts on Green Lane Spring Ancient Semi-natural Woodland will be considered at the planning application stage and the need to maintain habitat sites and provide BNG are already conditions on development imposed by the Allocation.	No	PDSP.006.024	Natural England	NWS 10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		NWS10 should be assessed in accordance with policy GS7.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Site NWS10 is unviable because the impacts of a range of constraints on their development are unknown (impact of extent of land contamination, Impact of Biodiversity Net Gain, and the impacts of Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) and they therefore cannot be considered deliverable and should be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.140	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NWS 10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Buffers to the ancient woodland and Local Wildlife Site need to be added to the site NWS10 conditions on development to be consistent with other policies and site conditions in this plan.	An additional condition is proposed relating to provision of a buffer to the ancient woodland.	Yes	PDSP.127.021	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	NWS 10
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Woodland Trust is concerned that site allocation NWS10 will have potentially adverse impacts on an area of ancient woodland adjacent to the site. Ancient woodland should not be included in sites allocated for development, whether for residential, leisure or community purposes as this leaves them open to the adverse impacts of development. Allocation NWS10 is likely to cause damage and/or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to its boundaries. Suggest the site allocation is unsound and should not be taken forward. Secondary woodland should also be retained to ensure that ecological networks are maintained and enhanced.	An additional condition is proposed relating to provision of a buffer to the ancient woodland.	Yes	PDSP.148.004	The Woodland Trust	NWS 10
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS11 is a suitable site for development Hillsborough Arcade is of value to the local community. Developing the whole site for housing will go against the aim of creating community neighbourhoods. Suggest the	No change needed. The site has mixed use outline planning permission (18/03405/OUT) for the partial demolition of the shopping centre and erection of a 5-storey building to provide	No	PDSP.375.009	Sean Ashton	NWS 11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		NWS11 is developed as a mixed use site, including Retail and Housing.	additional ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1-A5) and up to 77 Social Housing apartments (Use Class C3).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS12 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. Development should be considered in accordance with policy GS7.	No change needed. Development proposals for the site will be considered with due regard to relevant national and local planning policies.	No	PDSP.006.025	Natural England	NWS 12
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The site has a history of planning permissions for residential use but has not come forward. This suggests there are potential viability or general deliverability concerns which may be impede regeneration of the site. The University previously expressed its desire to pedestrianize Northumberland Road between the junctions with Whitham Road in the south, and Marlborough Road to the north. This proposed change would encourage cycling and walking. Development of 76 dwellings on this site will cause access and traffic concerns should it proceed, particularly in the context of pedestrianisation of Northumberland Road.	No change needed. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. Concerns related to the site's development and its impact on local traffic movements will be resolved at the planning application stage.	No	PDSP.086.066	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NWS 12

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the two Grade II listed buildings and the locally listed Wiggan Farm within the site.	Amendment proposed. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	No	PDSP.003.112	Historic England	NWS 13
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS13, due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. This allocation is in close proximity to Peak District National Park. NE advise a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be carried out prior to allocation in line with NPPF 176. Furthermore, the allocation should be considered in accordance with Policy GS3.	No change needed. The sites development will be considered with reference to relevant local and national policies.	No	PDSP.006.026	Natural England	NWS 13
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Site NWS13 is unviable because the impact of a range of constraints on development are unknown (impact of historic landfill site Middlewood Quarry, Impact of Biodiversity Net Gain, and impacts of the archaeological passement) and they therefore cannot be considered deliverable and should be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A	No	PDSP.042.141	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	NWS 13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	<p>Objects to NWS14 due to lack of information provide in Site Allocation. An ecological assessment of the site should be completed prior to its allocation. The allocation should require delivery of a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. Suggests the following amendment to allocation conditions: "Priority habitats including species rich grasslands, woodland, trees and hedgerows should be retained and enhanced. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on the site should also be considered at the earliest stage in order to deliver the minimum 10% net gain required".</p>	No change needed. Submission of an ecological survey in support of a planning application is now required and the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain will be mandatory from November 2023.	No	PDSP.006.027	Natural England	NWS 14

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS15 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. An ecological assessment of the site should be completed prior to its allocation. The allocation should require delivery of a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. Suggests an amendment to allocation conditions.	No change needed. A condition exists on the allocation that requires maintenance of the sites ecological value and the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain on site.	No	PDSP.006.028	Natural England	NWS 15
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	To comply with NPPF paragraphs 20(d) and 130(c), The site assessment of site NWS16 must include a consideration of all heritage assets that are potentially impacted by development of the site and should set an expectation that these heritage assets will be retained. Any development should retain The Barracks buildings and related heritage assets.	The site already has planning permission. An additional condition is proposed that would apply if any further or amended developments are proposed: “This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset and due consideration should be given to the impact of any proposal at the planning application stage. Development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared in support of the Local Plan, or other suitable mitigation measures agreed by the Local Planning Authority, to avoid or minimise harm to the significance	Yes	PDSP.271.020	JimC	NWS 16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			of heritage assets and their settings”.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Historic England endorse the first two mitigation measures but feel that all references to enabling development without exhausting all other opportunities to develop the site should be removed from the Heritage Impact Assessment. Amend the final bullet point under the conditions on development in Annex A for this site to read: “Retention of early 20th Century non-designated heritage assets including the brick wall fronting Winter Street and Dart Street.”	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. A condition will be added to retain non-designated heritage assets where possible.	Yes	PDSP.003.113	Historic England	NWS 17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	This site is proposed to be allocated for housing with a total housing capacity of 23 homes on 0.16 hectares. The allocation's development conditions include the early 20th century heritage assets and nearby connective ecological corridors. We welcome this allocation and have no further comment.	No change needed. Support for allocation of site NWS17 is welcomed	No	PDSP.086.067	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NWS 17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS18 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. As site is in an Urban Green Space Zone,	No change needed. Submission of an ecological survey in support of a planning application is now required and the provision of	No	PDSP.006.029	Natural England	NWS 18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		advises the allocation should be considered in accordance with policy GS1.	Biodiversity Net Gain will be mandatory from November 2023.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Site NWS19 is unviable because the impacts of a range of constraints on its development are unknown and it therefore cannot be considered deliverable and should be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.142	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NWS 19

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	We support the allocation of sites for housing and would like to register our support specifically for NSW19. Many of these sites are owned by Sheffield City Council and we would welcome discussion about opportunities to deliver housing on these or any other available sites in the city.	No change needed. Support for the allocation of Site NWS19 is welcomed.	No	PDSP.072.001	Sanctuary Housing Association	NWS 19
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS23 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. Advises the proposed development should be considered in the context of NPPF paragraph 180 (c). Cumulative impacts on the PDNP with NWS09 should be considered.	No change needed. The acceptability of development has already been considered with due regard to relevant national and local planning policies. The site has planning permission and housing development is under construction.	No	PDSP.006.030	Natural England	NWS 23
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS29 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of allocated site NWS29, as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.	Yes	PDSP.103.003	Friends of Parkwood Springs	NWS 26

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS29 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of allocated site NWS29, as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.	Yes	PDSP.127.022	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	NWS 26
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS29 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of allocated site NWS29, as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.	Yes	PDSP.331.003	Neil99	NWS 26
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	NWS29 includes part of the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site, the allocation is incompatible with LWS policies. Suggests removal of part of Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from within the boundary of allocated site NWS29, as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed	Yes	PDSP.344.003	PeteB1951	NWS 26

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Development of site NWS29 is likely to have a harmful impact on the Bardwell Road Railway Bridge Grade II Listed Building, which is considered unsuitable to be used as the sole access to the site, the adjacent NWS02 site and existing employment uses served via the bridge. Further consideration needs to be given to the suitability of the road tunnel linking Bardwell Road and Douglas Road as the sole means of access to expanded employment uses on this site, and to whether there are options to deliver a second access point to serve the area. At the very least, the conditions on development for this site need to ensure mitigation measures to protect the heritage asset in line with the Heritage Impact Assessment are attached to the planning application.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. A condition will be added retaining non designated heritage assets.	Yes	PDSP.003.114	Historic England	NWS 29
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS29 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. The site is within Neepsend Brickworks SSSI, designated for its exposure of the Greenmoor Rock Formation. The	The SSSI boundary corresponds with the Local Geological Site, and both fall within the boundary of the Local Wildlife Site. Proposed additional conditions	Yes	PDSP.006.031	Natural England	NWS 29

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		allocation does not give the SSSI the appropriate weight afforded as a nationally designated site. However, we welcome the effort to survey the geological interest. Advises the allocation should be considered in accordance with NPPF 180 (b) and policy GS5.	on development ensure those areas are safeguarded from development: “Connective ecological corridors/areas (including buffers) shown on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and combined natural capital opportunity maps are to be maintained on site and removed from the developable area. Biodiversity Net Gain should be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. No development should take place within the Local Wildlife Site. No development should take place within the Local Geological Site”.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Remove Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site from red line boundary as incompatible with LWS policies.	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed	Yes	PDSP.131.006	Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum	NWS 29

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Welcome the focus on excluding Green Belt sites and focussing development on brownfield sites. Note that some brownfield sites are valuable wildlife habitats, and a number of allocations include areas of Local Wildlife Sites. Site allocations should be revised to exclude Local Wildlife Sites.	Support for spatial strategy welcome. No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites	Yes	PDSP.188.007	Boo	NWS 29
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Despite the welcome emphasis on developing brownfield sites, some may have developed into valuable wildlife habitats. NWS29 incorporates part of a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) within its boundary. The boundary of site allocation NWS29 should be reviewed to exclude the Local Wildlife Site.	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.	Yes	PDSP.271.021	JimC	NWS 29
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Objects to NWS06 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. NWS06 is close to Wadsley Fossil Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest, which	No change needed. The SSSI is approximately 1.80 km from the centre of the site. Given the distance and the amount of built	No	PDSP.006.032	Natural England	NWS 06

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		contains a number of 'in situ' fossil tree stumps, two of which have been exposed for many years. Potential for large non-residential developments to impact on water supply mechanisms to SSSIs. Further hydrological investigation is required to avoid significant harm to protected species/habitats in accordance with both national and local policy.	development between the site and the SSSI, the development of the site not felt to affect the SSSI.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The Woodland Trust is concerned that site allocation NES01 will have potentially adverse impacts on an areas of ancient woodland adjacent to the site. Ancient woodland should not be included in sites are allocated for development, whether for residential, leisure or community purposes as this leaves them open to the adverse impacts of development. Allocation NES01 is likely to cause damage and/or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to its boundaries. Suggest the site allocation is unsound and should not be taken forward. Secondary woodland should also be retained to ensure that ecological networks are maintained and enhanced.	Minor amendment needed. Add condition on development to the site allocation requiring that Ancient Woodland/ Woodland and a 15 metre buffer required from the edge of the canopy of the Woodland should be excluded from the developable area of the site.	Yes	PDSP.148.005	The Woodland Trust	NES01

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	No information on NES04 has been provided regarding the existing biodiversity interests on site. An ecological assessment of the site should be completed prior to its allocation in order to ensure the requirement for avoiding harm to priority species and habitats is fully met. The allocation should require delivery of a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. Suggests the following amendment to allocation conditions: "Priority habitats including species rich grasslands, woodland, trees and hedgerows should be retained and enhanced. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on the site should also be considered at the earliest stage in order to deliver the minimum 10% net gain required".	No change needed. Submission of an ecological survey in support of a planning application is now required and the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain will be mandatory from November 2023.	No	PDSP.006.033	Natural England	NESO 4
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The site is near to a Grade II Listed Building and development could harm elements that contribute to the significance of this asset.	Accept proposed change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.115	Historic England	NESO 5

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	<p>Two parts of the site sandwich the Grade II Listed Spital Hill Works, with the southern part situated 40 metres north of the Wicker Arch and adjacent viaduct and buildings Listed Grade II*. Other Grade II Listed Buildings are also nearby. Development of this area could potentially harm elements that contribute to the significance of these heritage assets. If allocated, consideration should be given to whether any of the buildings and structures on the site should be classified as non-designated heritage assets and be preserved as part of the development. There are also serious concerns about use of the term 'enabling development' in the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for this site and others. Enabling development refers to development that does not comply with planning policies; it should not be considered before thoroughly exploring other options to avoid, minimize, or mitigate harm to heritage assets, and it should only be suggested as a last resort. The HIA should be revised and republished to remove all references to enabling development.</p>	<p>Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. A condition will be added to retain non designated heritage assets where possible. An addendum to the Heritage Impact Assessment will remove references to enabling development.</p>	Yes	PDSP.003.116	Historic England	NES09

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		Additionally, the Wicker Arches should be recognised as a heritage asset of 'high' significance instead of its current classification as 'moderate' in the HIA.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES09 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as are the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Requiring an archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal prior to a planning application submission has the potential to prevent or severely restrict development and should be undertaken prior to allocation. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see	No	PDSP.042.143	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES09

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Development of NES11 could harm elements which contribute to the significance of nearby heritage assets including listed structures and buildings. To determine appropriate measures that avoid or minimise harm to these heritage assets, a Heritage Impact Assessment should be undertaken. Its conclusions should be reflected in the conditions on development for this site in the Plan. Plan, appropriate conditions on development should be included based on the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment.	This site is a Grade II listed building that already has planning permission and listed building consent for the first and second floor above 87 - 103 Spital Hill. The buildings to the rear do not have planning permission or listed building consent. A heritage impact assessment should be submitted in support of any future or amended planning application for development of the site.	Yes	PDSP.003.117	Historic England	NES11
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES12 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as are the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions	No	PDSP.042.144	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP	NES12

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Objects to NES13 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. This allocation is registered open greenspace, allocation should be considered in accordance with policy GS1 and should meet the requirement of exception tests.	No change needed. Submission of an ecological survey in support of a planning application is now required and the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain will be mandatory from November 2023. Proposals would be required to comply with Plan policies.	No	PDSP.006.034	Natural England	NES13
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Development of Site NES13 must not prejudice the use of the adjoining Sports facilities and playing fields and should be consistent with NPPF paragraphs 99 and 187.	Minor change suggested. Add a condition to the site allocation requiring a sports and urban green space impact assessment to identifying any detrimental impacts either to sports activities	Yes	PDSP.007.016	Sport England	NES13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			or to the development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES13 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as are the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.145	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES16 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.146	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES16
Annex A: Site	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES17 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.147	Hallam Land Management, Strata	NES17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Requiring an archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal prior to a planning application submission, has the potential to prevent or severely restrict development. Such work should be undertaken prior to allocation. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The site is 75 metres north-east of Longley Hall, a Grade II Listed Building. The site is also opposite Longley Park which is locally designated as a Historic Park or Garden. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the	Accept suggested change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment	Yes	PDSP.003.118	Historic England	NES18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		significance of these heritage assets. As currently worded, the conditions on development do not adequately reflect the mitigation measures set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment. Therefore, amendments are necessary to tie the mitigation measures set out in the HIA into the Plan.	or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Natural England supports the retention of mature trees along Longley Lane but advise that the NES18 site has potential to demonstrate linkages to the wider open greenspace provision at Longley Park and should meet the requirements of policy GS1.	No change needed. Support for the desired for retention of trees on Longley Lane is welcomed.	No	PDSP.006.035	Natural England	NES18
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES18 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of	No	PDSP.042.148	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	We fully support this residential allocation. However, there is an opportunity increase residential capacity. Given the highly accessible urban location and helpful topography, the site can accommodate an apartment led development that could achieve density at the upper end of the 40-80 homes per hectare. This amendment would provide a more substantive contribution to the Council's housing requirements, recognising the challenge imposed by the Government's ambition to secure the 35% uplift.	Support for the site allocation is welcomed, however, there is no reasonable justification for increasing the expected yield to a density range outside what is specified in Policy NC9. Neither is there any justification for changes to policy NC9. This does not prevent an applicant making an application for a higher density as the policy does allow densities outside of the specified ranges in certain circumstances.	No	PDSP.031.003	Derwent Development Management Ltd (DDML) (Submitted by Aylward Town Planning Ltd)	NES19

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES20 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown and could limit the delivery of housing dependent on mitigation measures required, prevent the site from being developed due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.149	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES20
Annex A: Site	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The site is 30 metres east of The Orchard and its adjoining stable, a Grade II Listed Building. Development of this area could	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the	Yes	PDSP.003.119	Historic England	NES22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets. As currently worded, the conditions on development do not adequately reflect the mitigation measures set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment. Therefore, amendments are necessary to tie the mitigation measures set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment into the Plan.	recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Development of Site NES22 must not prejudice the use of the adjoining Recreation Ground. Ball Stop mitigation may be required and the potential for the recreation ground to adversely impact on the development due to noise or nuisance from the adjoining playing field must be considered.	Minor change suggested. Add a condition to the site allocation requiring a sports and urban green space impact assessment to identifying any detrimental impacts either to sports activities or to the development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.	Yes	PDSP.007.017	Sport England	NES22
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES22 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The to deliver the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Requiring an archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal prior to a planning application submission, has	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan	No	PDSP.042.150	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted	NES22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		the potential to prevent or severely restrict development. Such work should really be undertaken prior to allocation. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of materials etc which could have a considerable impact on the scale of development. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Objects to NES23 due to lack of information provided in Site Allocation. Advise that this allocation should be considered in accordance with NPPF 179, 180 and Plan policy GS5.	No change needed. Site has planning permission (21/00699/FUL, granted conditionally, August 2021) for twenty dwellings.	No	PDSP.006.036	Natural England	NES23
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	NES27 should be considered in tandem with NES28 to ensure linkages to the accessible woodland to the north and Parson Cross Park to the south are maintained. This allocation is registered open greenspace and should be considered in accordance with Sheffield City Council LP policy GS1 meeting the	No change needed. The sites were granted permission for clearance in April 2003. Connectivity between Parson Cross Park and Tongue Gutter will remain after development with pedestrian links on both sides of Deerlands Avenue adjacent to the	No	PDSP.006.037	Natural England	NES27

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		requirement of exception tests, and policy GS5.	western boundary of NES28 and adjacent to the eastern boundary of NES27. The need for additional connectivity will be dealt with at the planning application stage.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES27 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Requiring an archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal prior to a planning application submission, has the potential to prevent or severely restrict development. Such work should be undertaken prior to allocation. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an	No	PDSP.042.151	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES27

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Development of Site NES28 must not prejudice the use of the adjoining Sports facilities and should be consistent with NPPF paragraphs 99 and 187.	Minor change suggested. Add a condition to the site allocation requiring a sports and urban green space impact assessment to identifying any detrimental impacts either to sports activities or to the development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.	Yes	PDSP.007.018	Sport England	NES28
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES28 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will	No	PDSP.042.152	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES28

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES28 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.	No	PDSP.042.153	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES28

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES29 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather	No	PDSP.042.154	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	NES29

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The site is adjacent to the Church of St Paul, a Grade II* Listed Building which is included on the Heritage at Risk register 2022. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this heritage asset. As currently worded, the conditions on development do not adequately reflect the mitigation measures set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment. Therefore, amendments are necessary to tie the mitigation measures set out in the HIA into the Plan.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to include reference to the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.120	Historic England	NES33
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocation NES33 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Requiring an archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal prior to a planning application submission, has the potential to prevent or severely	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions	No	PDSP.042.155	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)	NES33

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		restrict development. Such work should be undertaken prior to allocation. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Propose the addition of 4 housing site allocations in and around Shiregreen, as well supporting other housing site allocations in the draft Plan.	No change needed. The four proposed site allocations are dealt with under other comments from the same respondent.	No	PDSP.072.002	Sanctuary Housing Association	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Proposed allocation of Shiregreen Arms and adjoining land. Object to the previously developed part of the open space being included within the open space policy area. The policies map should mirror the UDP in this location, more easily enabling the provision of bungalows for older people.	No change needed. The definition of ' <i>Previously developed land</i> ' in national policy excludes land where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation	No	PDSP.072.003	Sanctuary Housing Association	(<i>new to be added</i>)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape. Therefore, the previously developed part of the land to the rear of the Shiregreen Arms on Mason Lathe Road can no longer be defined as previously developed land and should therefore retain its Urban Green Space Zone designation.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Propose removal of land adjacent to and to the rear of 439 Sicey Avenue from the Green Belt to allow the provision of bungalows or other specialist housing that would complement our care home, Park View, over the road.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development. There are not considered to be exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt except for the former Norton Areodrome.	No	PDSP.072.004	Sanctuary Housing Association	<i>(new to be updated)</i>
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of the site could enhance the Canal's setting and improve public engagement. It is suitable, available and achievable for a Housing Site allocation. Site is supported by the cutting slope and retaining walls. Development loading	Support is noted and welcomed. Accept proposed condition on land stability.	Yes	PDSP.001.010	Canal & River Trust	ES05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		could potentially cause land instability and land slips, unless mitigated. Request condition to determine impact of development and identify sufficient mitigation.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Consider adding buffer to the Canal Local Wildlife Site for Site ES05 as a condition on development.	No change needed as buffers already referred to in site conditions.	No	PDSP.127.023	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	ES05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Site is near to listed buildings. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.	Minor change proposed to add a condition on development.	Yes	PDSP.003.127	Historic England	ES09
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	The site appears to support lowland deciduous woodland. No information has been provided regarding the existing biodiversity interests on site. Ecological assessment required prior to allocation. The allocation should set out the requirement to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. Add an amendment requiring retention and enhancement of priority habitats and enhance biodiversity on site to deliver minimum 10% net gain.	A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal would be required as part of the planning application, as the site contains trees. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal may identify other surveys needed. A tree survey would also be required. The site would need to deliver a minimum 10% BNG from November 2023 onwards, which would include a site assessment using the BNG metric to determine the baseline condition of the site.	No	PDSP.006.038	Natural England	ES12

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Site ES12 sits between the Parkway and the Supertram route. SYMCA own the site but exploratory work is being undertaken to consider the possibility of extending the Supertram Depot. Tram depots may fall within Use Class B8, or sui generis. A depot use may fall under a 'preferred' use for the site, or a proposal could be supported as an 'other use' which Policy EC4 indicates will be considered on their individual merits. For clarity, it is requested that the wording provided for this site allocation is amended to be supportive of use of the site as a tram depot, which would allow for this potential expansion should it be needed. It is also noted that this site is given a different name in the schedule of site allocations in the Part 1 document – consistent naming of sites would be helpful.	Amend site name to 'Land adjacent to 232 Woodbourn Road, S9 3LQ' throughout plan. No change to the site appraisal is required. The industrial allocation would allow the site to be used as a tram depot, but also allow other uses to come forward in the event the depot expansion does not happen.	Yes	PDSP.015.015	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority	ES12
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	The site appears to support lowland deciduous woodland. No information has been provided regarding the existing biodiversity interests on site. In order to ensure the requirement for avoiding harm to priority species and habitats is fully met an ecological assessment of the	A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal would be required as part of the planning application. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal may identify other surveys needed. A tree survey would also be required. The site would need	No	PDSP.006.039	Natural England	ES14

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		<p>site should be completed prior to its allocation. The allocation should set out the requirement to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Add the following amendment: “Priority habitats including species rich grasslands, woodland, trees and hedgerows should be retained and enhanced. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on the site should also be considered at the earliest stage in order to deliver the minimum 10% net gain required.”</p>	<p>to deliver a minimum 10% BNG from November 2023 onwards, which would include a site assessment using the BNG metric to determine the baseline condition of the site.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	<p>The site is adjacent to two Grade II listed buildings and a locally designated Historic Cemetery. Development could harm elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets. Buildings should be set back from the site’s southern boundary. Archaeological evaluation should take place to inform development proposals.</p>	<p>Minor change necessary. Add condition to require specific mitigation measures as outlined in the Heritage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>An archaeology scoping study has been undertaken, which found little to no archaeological objections. Any further investigation would be undertaken as part of the planning application process.</p>	Yes	PDSP.003.121	Historic England	ES15

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Allocation of Site ES18 for employment must not prejudice the continued use of the adjacent Tinsley Golf Course. The Allocation should be amended to require mitigation measures to protect the site from golf ball strikes.	Agree to add wording to Part 2, paragraph 4.52 to make it clear that planning applications will need to ensure that there is no conflict between adjacent uses such as housing and playing fields by incorporating appropriate mitigation measures, as required.	Yes	PDSP.007.019	Sport England	ES18
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of the site could enhance the Canal's setting and improve public engagement. It is suitable, available and achievable for a Housing Site allocation. Development of the site will put more pressure on the towpath. Request improvement to walking and cycling along the towpath as a condition on development. Site is supported by the cutting slope and retaining walls. Development loading could potentially cause land instability and land slips, unless mitigated. Request condition to determine impact of development and identify sufficient mitigation.	Support is noted and welcomed. Accept proposed condition on land stability and add condition requiring walking and cycling improvements.	Yes	PDSP.001.011	Canal & River Trust	ES20
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Site contains a large group of designated heritage assets and is one of the key historical industrial complexes surviving in Sheffield. The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for this site concluded	Minor change necessary. Amend condition to require specific mitigation measures as outlined in the Heritage Impact Assessment. Add condition to	Yes	PDSP.003.126	Historic England	ES20

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		that the site contains built heritage assets and makes a positive contribution to the setting of nearby heritage assets, of up to high significance, which could be affected by development. Endorse the mitigation measures which have been put forward in the Heritage Impact Assessment. Consideration should also be given to other structures on site that could be considered non-designated heritage assets.	require assessment of non-designated heritage assets.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	No objection to the proposed allocation. However, the site appraisal requirement to meet requirements of policy NC15 is not reflected in conditions appended to the site. Add condition to avoid confusion.	Added condition requiring open space provision in accordance with policy NC15.	Yes	PDSP.006.040	Natural England	ES20
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Need to add buffer to Local Wildlife Site to be consistent with other site allocation conditions and with the policies. Include 10m natural buffer to watercourse in site conditions on allocation ES20.	No change as buffers are already referred to in the conditions on development.	No	PDSP.127.024	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	ES20
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.156	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	ES21

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application has the potential to prevent any development.	most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of ES22 could harm elements which contribute to the significance of Baltic Works Grade II Listed heritage asset nearby. Suggests adding an additional sentence to condition on development or alternatively, appropriate additional conditions on development should be added to fully reflect the mitigation measures set out in their HIA.	The Heritage Impact Assessment states that "there is sufficient distance, landscape features and development between the now demolished heritage assets and the site that redevelopment of the site should not detrimentally affect these assets.". No Change needed.	No	PDSP.003.122	Historic England	ES22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Must be delivered in accordance with Policy GS7.	Submission of an ecological survey in support of a planning application is now a requirement and the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain will be mandatory from November 2023. Policy GS7 will also be considered at planning application stage.	No	PDSP.006.041	Natural England	ES22
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The unknown impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites could limit the level of housing to be achieved or required mitigation could prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the	No	PDSP.042.157	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	ES22

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of ES25 could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the nearby Church of St Lawrence, a Grade II Listed heritage asset. Suggests adding an additional sentence to condition on development or alternatively, appropriate additional conditions on development should be added to fully reflect the mitigation measures set out in their HIA.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.123	Historic England	ES25
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This allocation is registered open greenspace and should be considered in accordance with policy GS1 and further assessment must be undertaken prior to allocation.	The site is a privately-owned derelict sports ground. A suitability assessment has been undertaken that assessed the loss of open space, stating that it is surplus for the current open space function but may be needed for another function. The site appraisal states that open space should be provided on site in accordance with NC15, and a specific area is defined on the	No	PDSP.006.042	Natural England	ES25

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			policies map that should be utilised for this purpose.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Sport England Object to the allocation of the former sports fields (site ES25). The site is protected by NPPF paragraph 99 and should not be built upon unless it is replaced prior to its loss.	Conditions on development require that open space should be provided in accordance with policy NC15. The Council continues to hold discussions with Sport England about establishing the best approach to retaining recreational space on the site.	No	PDSP.007.020	Sport England	ES25
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Barratt support the proposed allocation of site ES25 and consider that it is a sensible that can contribute much needed housing without harm to open countryside. Any Strategic policy approach will start by examining existing urban brownfield and unused open space within the urban area. Regardless of the position taken on Green Belt releases, Barratt consider that site ES25 is an inevitable allocation whatever the strategic policy choices made.	Support is noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.021.006	Barratt and David Wilson Homes Sheffield (Submitted by Sheppard Planning)	ES25
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with	No	PDSP.042.158	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired	ES26

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Subject to amendments this site should be considered in accordance with Policy GS5, and greater consideration given to its potential to impact on Local Wildlife Sites.	The site allocation has a condition attached to require appropriate buffers along the Local Wildlife Site boundary.	No	PDSP.006.043	Natural England	ES27
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection	No	PDSP.042.159	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes,	ES27

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of the site could enhance the Canal's setting and improve public engagement. It is suitable, available and achievable for a Housing Site allocation. Development of the site will put more pressure on the towpath. Request improvement to walking and cycling along	Support is noted and welcomed. Accept proposed condition on land stability and add condition requiring walking and cycling improvements.	Yes	PDSP.001.012	Canal & River Trust	ES28

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		the towpath as a condition on development. Site is supported by the cutting slope and retaining walls. Development loading could potentially cause land instability and land slips, unless mitigated. Request condition to determine impact of development and identify sufficient mitigation.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of ES28 could harm elements which contribute to the significance of nearby heritage assets. Suggests adding an additional sentence to condition on development to implement recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment. Add the following bullet point to the conditions on development for this site: “Development should respond positively to the adjacent canal.”	Accept changes. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures. Additional condition on development refers to the need to respond to the canal.	Yes	PDSP.003.124	Historic England	ES28
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The unknown impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites could limit the level of housing to be achieved or required mitigation could prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs. The extent of land	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing	No	PDSP.042.160	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited	ES28

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application has the potential to prevent any development. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of materials etc could have a considerable impact on the scale of development.	requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			(Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of the site could enhance the Canal's setting and improve public engagement. It is suitable, available and achievable for a Housing Site allocation. Site is supported by the cutting slope and retaining walls. Development loading could potentially cause land instability and land slips, unless mitigated. Request condition to determine impact of development and identify sufficient mitigation.	Support is noted and welcomed. Accept proposed condition on land stability.	Yes	PDSP.001.013	Canal & River Trust	ES31

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.161	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	ES31
Annex A: Site	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This comment is a duplicate.	This comment is a duplicate of PDSP.042.161. No response is needed.	No	PDSP.042.162	Hallam Land Management, Strata	ES31

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations						Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Development of the site could enhance the Canal's setting and improve public engagement. It is suitable, available and achievable for a Housing Site allocation. Development of the site will put more pressure on the towpath. Request improvement to walking and cycling along the towpath as a condition on development. Site is supported by the cutting slope and retaining walls. Development loading could potentially cause land instability and land slips, unless mitigated. Request condition to determine impact of development and identify sufficient mitigation.	Support is noted and welcomed. Accept proposed condition on land stability and add condition requiring walking and cycling improvements.	Yes	PDSP.001.014	Canal & River Trust	ES33
Annex A: Site	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Historic England concerned about impact of site on the Grade II listed buildings.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals	Yes	PDSP.003.125	Historic England	ES33

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations			should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown. Could limit the level of housing to be achieved or depending on the nature of any mitigation required prevent the site from being developed at all. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see	No	PDSP.042.163	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	ES33

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		materials etc could have a considerable impact on the scale of development.	para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The unknown impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites could limit the level of housing to be achieved or required mitigation could prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.164	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	ES34

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.165	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	ES36
Annex A: Site	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The site is	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.166	Hallam Land Management, Strata	ES38

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and is not deliverable until it passes an exception test. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. The requirement for	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a	No	PDSP.042.167	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and	ES39

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		open space increases costs and reduces the development area. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The unknown impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites could limit the level of housing to be achieved or required mitigation could prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs. The extent of land	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing	No	PDSP.042.168	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited	ES42

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Archaeological evaluation has the potential to prevent or restrict development.	requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			(Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Need to add buffer to Local Wildlife Site to be consistent with other site allocation conditions and with the policies. Include buffer to Sky Edge LWS in conditions on site allocation ES42.	No change needed as buffers already included in site conditions.	No	PDSP.127.025	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	ES42
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Site is within an area of Historic Parkland and would advise further assessment is required in line with NPPF 20 (d).	No change necessary. The site is not within a designated Historic Park. The site also has an existing planning permission and is being built out.	No	PDSP.006.044	Natural England	ES44

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.169	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	ES46
Annex A: Site	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. On site	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.170	Hallam Land Management, Strata	ES47

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Archaeological evaluation has the potential to prevent or restrict development.	Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. On site delivery of biodiversity net gain will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a	No	PDSP.042.171	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and	ES50

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		viability of the scheme. Archaeological evaluation has the potential to prevent or restrict development.	robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Displaying incorrect post code data. This is within an area of Historic Parkland and would advise further assessment is required in line with NPPF 20 (d).	Minor change necessary to update postcode information. The site is not within a designated Historic Park.	Yes	PDSP.006.045	Natural England	ES52
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Will not deliver a wide choice of high-quality housing and house prices will drop.	Not related to the proposed Site Allocation- no response needed.	No	PDSP.384.001	Sothall98	ES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Given the status of the rail scheme it is not proposed that site SES02 should be allocated as a Park and Ride site in the Sheffield Plan at this time; however, subject to the further progression of the scheme as part of the Restoring Your Railway programme we would welcome further discussion to establish whether part of this site, or other suitable sites in the area, could be utilised as a Park & Ride car park.	If park and ride use is proposed on the site in future, in principle this use fits with the general employment area designation of the site.	No	PDSP.015.016	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority	SES02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Remove Local Wildlife Site 285 from allocated site boundary SES02 to ensure protection in line with Local Wildlife Site policies. Add in condition for a Local Wildlife Site buffer.	No boundary change is proposed, however propose additional condition on development to ensure no development should take place within the Local Wildlife Site which is within a corridor of sites designated for nature conservation and possessing populations of Great Crested Newts.	Yes	PDSP.127.026	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	SES02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Remove Local Wildlife Site 285 from allocated site boundary SES02 to ensure protection in line with Local Wildlife Site policies. Add in condition for a Local Wildlife Site buffer.	No boundary change is proposed, however propose additional condition on development to ensure no development should take place within the Local Wildlife Site which is within a corridor of sites designated for	No	PDSP.131.007	Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum	SES02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			nature conservation and possessing populations of Great Crested Newts.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Notes some site allocations may have had their biodiversity/geodiversity value increased and site allocations affected should account for these. Would like to see site allocation boundaries (SES02, SES04, SES05, NWS29) reviewed to reflect developing local wildlife sites.	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.	Yes	PDSP.188.008	Boo	SES02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Appendix 1 gives a housing capacity for site SWS02 of 132. Annex 1 gives the same site a capacity of 369.	All figures will be checked, and a housing capacity amendment schedule provided to highlight any necessary changes. This will also take account of new planning permissions granted during 2022/23. Note that the total site capacity of SWS02 is 369 homes, of which 132 remain to be built.	No	PDSP.211.001	David in Dore	SES02
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Notes some site allocations may have had their biodiversity/geodiversity value increased and site allocations affected should account for these. Would like to see site allocation boundaries (SES02,	No change needed to site allocation boundaries as the Local Wildlife Sites can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using	Yes	PDSP.271.022	JimC	SES02

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		SES04, SES05, NWS29) reviewed to reflect developing local wildlife sites.	conditions or legal agreements. However, additional conditions on development are proposed that will ensure protection of Local Wildlife Sites.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Site SES03 includes provision for 12 Travelling Showpeople families and storage of fairground equipment. However how can the Council ensure the site does not expand over the years along with the number of rides they own? Concerns about the amount of traffic and subsequent air pollution in the local area as the Council continue to grant permission for more development in the area. The development of the SES03 site will significantly worsen health and safety issues, especially given its proximity to a well-established residential area. Local facilities are oversubscribed and adding a second traveller site in the area would place additional burdens on overstretched local facilities. These sites should be shared across the city. Also, there are concerns that good quality arable land is being used for development, adversely impacting upon the local ecological environment and wildlife pathways. What	Site SES03 is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required with respect to matters such as air quality. However, an additional/updated condition on development is proposed that will ensure an environmental buffer strip is provided between the development and neighbouring housing. Other adjustments to the conditions on development have been proposed for the purpose of clarity, or in response to relevant points raised. The main issues raised in the representations with respect to	Yes	PDSP.204.001	Clare Barnes	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		the travelling community want in all of this should be considered as well. The proposed SES03 site does not meet the Government criteria for locating sites. Consultation meetings on local planning not adequately publicised - concerns over the legality and soundness of the local plan. Suggests a detailed review of the additional proposed sites and why each one was not chosen.	<p>site SES03 are addressed further in the Strategy & Resources Committee Report (2nd August). Please refer to this report for detailed responses.</p> <p>Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Guidance provided on development near National Grid assets.	Additional conditions on development will ensure development should provide a strategy for responding to the National Grid Electricity Transmission overhead transmission lines and towers present within the site, which demonstrates how the National Grid Electricity Transmission Design Guide and Principles have been applied at the design stage and how the impact of the powerline has been reduced through good design.	Yes	PDSP.004.003	National Grid (Submitted by Avison Young)	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Natural England holds Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) data specific to this site and can confirm it is classified partly as grade 2 and mostly 3b.	It is recognised that a small part of site SES03 is grade 2 quality agricultural land. However, there is a pressing need to identify land for the allocated uses and the need for this outweighs the need to protect this small area of best and most versatile agricultural land. Given that the information on the agricultural land classification has been provided (and has been considered), the first condition on the conditions of development should be deleted.	Yes	PDSP.006.046	Natural England	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Concerns about the increased level of traffic in the area and the potential this has to impact on business operations.	The principal roads and junctions near this site allocation have all been assessed as part of the strategic transport modelling work to support the Plan. It is important to note that this work focuses on finding ways to mitigate impacts created by the growth rates set out in the Plan itself, rather than seeking to resolve existing issues on the network.	No	PDSP.087.001	UPS	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>In this context the relevant roads and junctions are not being flagged up as a major issue because the rate of change caused by the proposed development is not significant.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	<p>Traffic on Eckington Way is heavily congested and will be compounded by further development in the area. Concerns regarding the privacy of houses in close proximity to the site due to heightened elevation of the site.</p>	<p>The principal roads and junctions near this site allocation have all been assessed as part of the strategic transport modelling work to support the Plan. It is important to note that this work focuses on finding ways to mitigate impacts created by the growth rates set out in the Plan itself, rather than seeking to resolve existing issues on the network.</p> <p>In this context the relevant roads and junctions are not being flagged up as a major issue because the rate of change caused by the proposed development is not significant.</p> <p>A buffer strip will be provided between the existing houses and</p>	Yes	PDSP.152.001	Clive Betts MP	SESO 3

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			the built development on the site.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Presence of a high-pressure gas pipe underneath the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns. Its proximity to residential areas. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. The site is not consistent with national policy as it fails to meet obligation to improve air quality and the DHCLG's planning policy for traveller sites by not giving proper consideration to the health and wellbeing of travellers.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.157.001	Councillors Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Bob McCann, Gail Smith and Kevin Oxley.	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.161.001	Petition submitted by Ian Horner - 270 signatories	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Increased traffic. Too close to existing residential properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.162.001	Petition submitted by Libby Cookland -	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
						654 signatories	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Object to the proposed industrial and travellers site at Beighton on the grounds of potential traffic impact; there is already a site nearby; and it should not be placed in the middle of a settled community.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.163.001	Petition submitted by Michael Chilton - 2823 signatories	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.164.001	Petition submitted by Michael Chilton - 635 signatories	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of versatile recreational agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.166.001	Adrian Hinson	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Industrial use adjacent to existing residential properties isn't suitable.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.167.001	Alan14	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Presence of a high pressure gas pipe and overhead cabling across the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns. Loss of versatile recreational agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.169.001	Alison Woodall	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Further development and an extra traveller site would add pressures to existing social infrastructure such as schools and healthcare. Concerns regarding its proximity to residential areas.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.171.001	aly1	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Added pressure on strained local services and healthcare. There is already a traveller site within the South East of	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.172.001	Alyson Fender	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		Sheffield. There are areas that are more suited.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. The site behind Springwell estate lies within the Green Belt boundary. Concerns regarding its proximity to residential areas.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.173.001	Amanda Ball	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Increase in traffic will have a detrimental effect on the health of existing residents. Concern over the potential noise impacts as a result the change in site use and maintenance of showpeople's business equipment. Concern over the loss of greenfield land and damage to wildlife. Concern about the pressure on local services as schools, dentists and doctors are already over subscribed.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.173.002	Amanda Ball	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. The site is within too close a proximity to existing residential areas. Concern over the elevated position of the site. Loss of versatile recreational	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.174.001	Amanda Lewin	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Concerns regarding its proximity to residential areas.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above	Yes	PDSP.178.001	AndyWragg1067	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.180.001	AngelaPamela	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Notes that there are already lots of new industrial/retail developments within the Southeast area.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.182.001	Anne	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The site is bordered on two sides by housing and so it is more appropriate for residential uses rather than industrial or traveller sites. There is already a traveller site in the Southeast of Sheffield, another within close proximity is inappropriate.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.184.001	Anonymous	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. More pressure on local infrastructure.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.186.001	Bigtop	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The increase in industrial sites, existing housing being overlooked by traveller and industrial sites will have a negative impact on house prices.	House prices are not a material planning consideration.	Yes	PDSP.187.001	Bonbon21	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic is heavily congested. S20 is already becoming too overdeveloped with existing industrial and traveller sites in the area. There are plenty of brownfield sites elsewhere in the city.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.192.001	Carol Moffatt	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Concern about the impacts on air quality as a result of stationary traffic and new developments within the area. Lack of awareness of the plans and communication from councillors. Concern about the impact on wildlife as the site is greenfield and is in close proximity to Shirebrook nature reserve. Concerns regarding its proximity to residential areas.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.199.001	Chris Jones	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Concern about the impacts on air quality as a result of stationary traffic and new developments within the area. Lack of awareness of the plans and communication from councillors. Concern	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.204.002	Clare Barnes	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		about the impact on wildlife as the site is greenfield and is in close proximity to Shirebrook nature reserve. Concerns regarding its proximity to residential areas.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. The proposed uses for the site are not compatible with the existing local character of the area. Noise pollution would have an adverse impact on existing neighbouring residents.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.206.001	Claudine West	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Concern regarding capacity within local infrastructure e.g. education and healthcare.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.207.001	Colin Huntington	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.209.001	Dale85	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The cost of developing greenfield land isn't justified when many existing brownfield sites are available. Allocating a traveller site within a housing area isn't suitable. Concerns regarding its proximity to residential areas.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.224.001	Finade	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Potential for hazardous installation due to the existing gas pipe, loss of privacy for neighbouring properties, have led to concerns about safety. The cost to provide infrastructure and access aren't justified.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.224.002	Finade	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Air and noise pollution would worsen due to the compounded impact of new developments within the area. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. The presence of a gas pipe running beneath the site would risk hazardous installation. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Concern the site is in too close proximity to an existing traveller site at Holbrook.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.225.001	Fiona and Adrian Hinson	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Air and noise pollution would worsen due to the compounded impact of new developments within the area. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. The presence of a gas pipe running beneath the site would risk hazardous installation. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Concern the site is in too close proximity to an existing traveller site at Holbrook.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.225.002	Fiona and Adrian Hinson	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Safety concerns expressed for children due to speeding and side streets being used due to traffic on main highways. Presence of a high-pressure gas pipe and overhead cabling across the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.225.003	Fiona and Adrian Hinson	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of versatile recreational agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Concern over the risk of crime increasing and further antisocial behaviour as a result of cultural tensions. Consultation meeting size and opportunity to engage wasn't sufficient.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.226.001	Fiona White	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Development within the Green Belt.	SES03 does not lie within the Green Belt, thus the site is compliant with the Council's spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.230.001	gbl47	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.230.002	gbl47	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Presence of a high pressure gas pipe and overhead cabling across the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.231.002	Georgia Milliard	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		existing neighbouring properties. Loss of versatile recreational agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Concern the site is in too close proximity to an existing traveller site at Holbrook. Little budget or funding to support new developments with infrastructure, and to make the site suitable for redevelopment due to topography. Concern about the high voltage powerlines on site.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.233.001	gillwhit5121	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Concern for the impact on wildlife as the site is greenfield. The topography of the site means that the development would be situated higher up than surrounding housing which may be overbearing on existing properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.234.001	Gina Berry	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Concerns about the impact of the Local Geological Site. Concern for the impact on wildlife as the site is greenfield and in proximity to a Local Wildlife Site. The topography of the site means that the development would be situated higher up than surrounding housing which may be overbearing on existing properties in terms of privacy and access to light. Concern about pressures on existing social infrastructure capacity such as schools and healthcare. Concern about findings in the traveller needs assessment and the suitability of provision in this particular area close to another site at Halfway which may cause tensions.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.234.002	Gina Berry	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Concern about the impacts on air quality as a result of stationary traffic and new developments within the area. Concern about the potential increase in anti-social	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.235.001	Glastogal	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		behaviour. Lack of consultation and awareness of the site allocation.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Concerned about allocation of SES03 and the traveller site allocation. Suggests site should be removed. Concerned with the site selection process of the site and believes that constraints such as traffic impact, loss of open space, noise and air pollution and loss of amenity have not been considered.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.237.001	Glynis Chapman	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Little justification to develop on arable land when other sites could be considered.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.240.001	Graham	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The area already exceeds the legal limit for air quality and further redevelopment would contribute to a further breach of this.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.240.002	Graham	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Increased traffic in an area of high congestion.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.243.001	Helen Griffiths	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Increase of traffic caused by the plan.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.244.001	Helen55	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Lack of consultation with residents and awareness made of the allocation.	Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.	Yes	PDSP.247.001	Hugh Lawson	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The site lies within Green Belt land and currently serves as agricultural land, the contradiction of both of these functions would harm the character of the area. Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Lack of public consultation regarding this specific site before the plan was published.	SES03 does not lie within the Green Belt, thus the site is compliant with the Council's spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.248.001	IAINT1	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.249.001	Ian13	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Within the current climate crisis, we should be protecting green spaces.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.253.001	Jacqueline Lowe	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Notes the presence of electricity pylons and an underground gas pipe.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.256.001	JADSHEFF	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		Concern about the negative impact as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Little justification to develop on arable land when other sites could be considered.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.257.001	James	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. The site is in too close of a proximity to existing residents. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Presence of a high-pressure gas pipe and overhead cabling across the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.259.001	James198	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	More pressure on local infrastructure as a result of new development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.262.001	Jane777	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Concerns about level of traffic.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 - PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.265.001	Jayne Clarry	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Site will add to existing congestion and have a negative impact on house prices.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above. Also, house prices are not a material planning consideration.	Yes	PDSP.266.001	Jb58	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Development of the site for industrial and traveller uses would affect house prices.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above. Also, house prices are not a material planning consideration.	No	PDSP.272.001	Jlnes	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	There is already a traveller site within the Southeast of Sheffield. Concerns about level of traffic.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.273.001	Joan Hollowood	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.274.001	Joanne Rose	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	No further information submitted.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.275.001	John	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. There is already a traveller site within the Southeast of Sheffield. This would result in overdevelopment. Green spaces need retaining.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.276.001	John and Sandra Carr	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Presence of a high-pressure gas pipe and overhead cabling across the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.277.001	John Ducey	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. The topography of the site would mean that the development would be overbearing on existing housing. The current use of the site as arable farming land would be lost. The site may not be viable as it may not be suitable for the	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.280.001	John29	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		anticipated needs of travelling showpeople.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Further development and an extra traveller site would add pressures to existing social infrastructure such as schools and healthcare. The site is within too much proximity to existing residential areas, causing a lack of privacy.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.288.001	Julie L	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Despite hedgerows being maintained there will still be a loss of wildlife. Adverse impact on neighbouring community hospital.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.289.001	Julie Skelton	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.292.001	kathleen	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Travellers site in close proximity to residential uses is unsuitable.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.293.001	Kathleen1992	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. There are existing empty industrial units so little justification to build further. The area is becoming overdeveloped.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.294.001	Kathryn Kelly	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.296.001	Kelly127	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Concern for the impact on wildlife as the site is greenfield. The topography of the site means that the development would be situated higher up than surrounding housing which may be overbearing on existing properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.297.001	Kevin Kelly	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. There is already a traveller site within the Southeast of Sheffield. There are areas that are more suited. Loss of	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.297.002	Kevin Kelly	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.300.001	L1969	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. There are already traveller and industrial sites within the area.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.302.001	Leslie Fairest	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to the proposed industrial and travellers site at Beighton on the grounds of the potential impact on the highway network.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.303.001	Leslie99	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.304.001	Linda Andrews	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Development of the site will negatively affect property prices neighbouring the proposed uses.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above. Also note that house prices are not a material planning consideration.	Yes	PDSP.307.001	Liz Kent	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Lack of consultation and awareness of the site allocation. There is already a traveller site within the Southeast of Sheffield.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.308.001	Liz Worrall	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.311.002	Margaret52	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.312.001	Marie21	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Due to the site being located next to a busy highway, light industrial uses, and electricity pylons there is concern about the impact of noise on potential future residents of the Gypsy and Traveller site, as well as safety for pedestrians. Due to the topography and slope of the site, as well as the existing gas pipe running	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.319.001	Matthew Franklin	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		through the site, there is concern about flooding and the scope to provide essential infrastructure to the site.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. The area is being overloaded with new buildings and traffic; the area cannot take more development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.321.001	Michael and Jane Tarron	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Congestion. Too close to existing retail units. Other sites are available.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.327.001	Mr Roger Brown, Mrs Carole Brown, Mr Carl Brown	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of green space in an established residential area.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.330.001	Neil Jackson	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.335.001	Pam	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.337.001	Paul and Patricia Fox	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		result. Safety concerns for existing neighbouring residents and the potential for an increase in crime. Concern about the high voltage powerlines on site.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of green space will take away opportunities for nature recovery, ecology, and recreational leisure activities. Development will further add to heavy congestion in the area.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.338.001	Paul Eastell	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Access to the site off Eckington Way will contribute to the existing congestion in the area. Existing wildlife will be forced off the site despite attempts to maintain habitat connectivity to Beighton Orchard Meadows Local Wildlife Site. Concerns about noise pollution on the site in addition to the existing electricity pylons.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.339.001	Paul916	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.340.001	Pauline McGuire	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.345.001	Peter1?	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.348.001	Phillip1889	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Details such as access to the site haven't been outlined within the plan.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.349.001	Philm	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. More pressure on local infrastructure as a result of new development.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.351.001	Ppaul	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.359.001	RichardL	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Presence of a	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.361.001	Robert	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		high-pressure gas pipe and overhead cabling across the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. More pressure on local infrastructure as a result of new development. Concern the site is in too close proximity to an existing traveller site at Holbrook.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Safety concerns expressed for children due to speeding and side streets being used due to traffic on main highways. There is already a traveller site within the South East of Sheffield.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.364.001	Ruth and Garry Shillito	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concerns over pedestrian safety due to people using residential roads as a cut through to avoid traffic jams.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.368.001	Ruth Shillito	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Presence of a high-pressure gas	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.372.001	Sarah Charlesworth	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		pipe and overhead cabling across the site poses a risk of hazardous installation and safety concerns. Loss of versatile recreational agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. The cost to install essential infrastructure on the site isn't justified in terms of cost.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.373.001	SarahF24	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic on Eckington Way caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.377.001	Sharrie	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.379.001	Simon Hurt	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. There is already a traveller site within the South East of Sheffield.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.380.001	Simon Voyse	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Development contradicts Local Plan as the site is within the Green Belt. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Little budget or funding to support new developments with infrastructure, and to make the site suitable for redevelopment due to topography. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties.	The site is not within the Green Belt and is consistent with the Plan’s spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.385.001	springres	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Development contradicts Local Plan as the site is within the Green Belt and Local Planning Authorities should make decisions about the local environment that protects landscape including geology and biodiversity. Lack of	The site is not within the Green Belt and is consistent with the Plan’s spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.386.001	Springwelldweller	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		awareness and consultation with local residents regarding the site allocation. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Little budget or funding to support new developments with infrastructure, and to make the site suitable for redevelopment due to topography. Potential for significant impact on neighbouring uses and residents, including patients at the nearby Becton Centre.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The site is close to breaching air pollution targets and the loss of arable land for the development of this site will worsen this position. The existing road network is highly congested and more development in the area will worsen this. Concern about the high voltage powerlines on site.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.387.001	SpringwellNick	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. More pressure on local infrastructure as a result of new development. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of	The site is not within the Green Belt and is consistent with the Plan’s spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.387.002	SpringwellNick	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Lack of consultation and awareness of the site allocation.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Loss of versatile recreational agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Doesn't comply with national policy and guidance on where traveller sites should be situated. There is already a traveller site within the South East of Sheffield. There are areas that are more suited. Concern about the high voltage powerlines on site.	The site is not within the Green Belt and is consistent with the Plan's spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.389.001	Steve Brough	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.390.001	Steven English	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		development on greenfield land. Lack of consultation and awareness of the site allocation.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Noise and pollution from the development of an industrial and traveller estate may adversely impact neighbouring housing estate. Local roads are heavily congested with traffic.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.391.001	SteveT101	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Lack of consultation and awareness of the site allocation.	Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. The consultation was carried out over a six-week period during January and February 2023, and members of the public were given the opportunity to engage with Council officers and local Councillors.	No	PDSP.392.001	Stuartx5	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Adding to the existing congestion on Eckington Way will worsen air quality and traffic issues in the area. Health and education services are at high capacity and can't accommodate extra provision.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.395.001	SueT	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.397.001	Susan Huntington	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		result. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Concern regarding capacity within local infrastructure e.g. education and healthcare.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.398.001	Tammy Kelly	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the impact on privacy as a result of the topography and elevation of the site on existing neighbouring properties. There is already a traveller site within the Southeast of Sheffield.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.398.002	Tammy Kelly	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Existing traveller sites in Sheffield are located away from existing residential areas but within close proximity to local services, these types of sites are	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.401.001	thollands	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		considered more suitable rather than a site which neighbours an existing residential area and main road. Concern about the impact on privacy and value of property. Concern about the high voltage powerlines on site.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to the development of the site as it lies within the Green Belt, serves multiple beneficial countryside uses and links other wildlife areas.	The site is not within the Green Belt and is therefore consistent with the spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.402.001	Tim Walker	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to the development of the site as it lies within the Green Belt, serves multiple beneficial countryside uses and links other wildlife areas.	The site is not within the Green Belt and is therefore consistent with the spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.402.002	Tim Walker	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. Development contradicts Local Plan as the site is within the Green Belt. Lack of awareness and consultation with local residents regarding the site	The site is not within the Green Belt and is therefore consistent with the spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	Yes	PDSP.402.003	Tim Walker	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		allocation. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Little budget or funding to support new developments with infrastructure, and to make the site suitable for redevelopment due to topography. Potential for significant impact on neighbouring uses and residents, including patients at the nearby Becton Centre.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to the development of the site as it lies within the Green Belt, serves multiple beneficial countryside uses and links other wildlife areas.	The site does not lie within the Green Belt and therefore complies with the Council's spatial strategy. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.402.004	Tim Walker	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to the development of the site as it lies within the Green Belt, serves multiple beneficial countryside uses and links other wildlife areas.	The site does not lie within the Green Belt and therefore complies with the Council's spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.402.005	Tim Walker	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Loss of versatile recreational agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land. The allocation contradicts the Local Plan's	Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.	No	PDSP.402.006	Tim Walker	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		vision to only develop on brownfield land, in addition this site was also scored as part of a parcel within the Green Belt review. Lack of awareness and meaningful consultation with local residents. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Concern about the adverse impact on local neighbouring Becton Centre.	The consultation was carried out over a six-week period during January and February 2023, and members of the public were given the opportunity to engage with Council officers and local Councillors. Also see responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing heavy traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution on Eckington Way and the surrounding areas caused by recent industrial developments would be compounded by further redevelopment. Concern for the impact on wildlife as the site is greenfield. The topography of the site means that the development would be situated higher up than surrounding housing which may be overbearing on existing properties.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.404.001	Tome	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Air and noise pollution would worsen due to the compounded impact of new developments within the area. Concern about the potential increase in anti-social behaviour, as well as pressure on existing	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.405.001	tony63	SES03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		infrastructure such as roads and healthcare. Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Existing traffic congestion would be compounded by further development, and air and noise pollution would worsen as a result. Integration with existing communities would be limited. The proximity of the site to an existing traveller site, pubs, and other areas of high crime would exacerbate anti-social behaviour. Loss of versatile agricultural land and wildlife as a result of development on greenfield land.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.407.001	TPW1991	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Concern the site is in too close proximity to an existing traveller site at Holbrook.	See responses to PDSP.204.001 – PDSP.006.046 & PDSP.152.001 above.	No	PDSP.409.001	Vincent Rigby	SES03
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Natural England objects to SES04, further information required. This allocation is within close proximity to Moss Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Without further detail Natural England’s is unable to comment on this allocation and its associated planning application, however there is potential for large non-residential developments to have an	An addendum to the Habitat Regulations Assessment Appropriate Assessment (HRAAA) is being prepared to assess whether there will be any Likely Significant Effects (LSEs) arising from any in combination effects with other Local Authorities development plans. If any LSE's	No	PDSP.006.047	Natural England	SES04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		impact on water supply mechanisms to SSSIs. Natural England advise further hydrological investigation is required to avoid significant harm to protected species/habitats in accordance with both national and local policy.	are evident then the addendum will identify how they can be avoided or mitigated. Functionally Linked Land, Water Quality and Water Resources & Supply will be included within the scope of the HRAAA.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The proposed Site Allocation SES04 includes a number of conditions for future development at the site. Some of these conditions (4, 6, 7) are unsound.	No change. The site condition refers to Ancient Woodland and Woodland, the latter which is on the site. The Holbrook area is an important ecological corridor and includes protected species e.g. Great Crested Newts. Initial work has been undertaken to identify and map the potential future Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)/Nature Recovery Network (NRN) in Sheffield as part of the wider South Yorkshire Strategy which will be completed in Spring 2025. The initial work has been carried out to inform site conditions as part of the Local Plan process and identify where sites are located in or adjacent to the future LNRS/NRN. Where this applies, Biodiversity Net Gain will	No	PDSP.032.001	DeVeer Prescient (No1) Limited (Submitted by Quod)	SES04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>be required to be delivered on site to ensure habitats are protected, enhanced and better connected as part of the LNRS/NRN. Regarding archaeology, it is noted that planning application 21/04446/OUT was withdrawn in April 2022; prior to that time, there was no indication provided to the applicant that an archaeological assessment would not be required; a final decision had not been made. Given that there is no evidence to suggest that an archaeological evaluation is not necessary for this site, there is also therefore no reason to amend the condition.</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Remove Local Wildlife Site 281 from allocated site boundary SES04 to ensure protection in line with Local Wildlife Site policies.	The LWS can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. An additional condition on development is proposed “No development should take place within the Local Wildlife Site which is within a corridor of sites	Yes	PDSP.127.027	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	SES04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			designated for nature conservation and possessing populations of Great Crested Newts”.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Remove LWS281 from Site Allocation SES04 to ensure protection in line with LWS policies. Support buffer wording and reference to ecological corridors/areas in conditions.	See response to comment PDSP.127.027.	Yes	PDSP.131.008	Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum	SES04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Notes some site allocations may have had their biodiversity/geodiversity value increased and allocations sites affected should account for these. Would like to see site allocation boundaries (SES02, SES04, SES05, NWS29) reviewed to reflect developing Local Wildlife Sites.	See response to comment PDSP.127.027.	Yes	PDSP.188.009	Boo	SES04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Notes some site allocations may have had their biodiversity/geodiversity value increased and allocations sites affected should account for these. Would like to see site allocation boundaries (SES02, SES04, SES05, NWS29) reviewed to reflect developing local wildlife sites.	See response to comment PDSP.127.027.	Yes	PDSP.271.023	JimC	SES04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Remove Local Wildlife Site 281 from allocated site boundary SES05 to ensure protection in line with Local Wildlife Site policies.	The LWS can be safeguarded through the layout of the development and by using conditions or legal agreements. An additional condition on	Yes	PDSP.127.028	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	SES05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			development is proposed “No development should take place within the Local Wildlife Site which is within a corridor of sites designated for nature conservation and possessing populations of Great Crested Newts”.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Remove Local Wildlife Site 281 from allocated site boundary SES05 to ensure protection in line with Local Wildlife Site policies.	See response to comment PDSP.127.028.	Yes	PDSP.131.009	Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum	SES05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Notes some site allocations may have had their biodiversity/geodiversity value increased and allocations sites affected should account for these. Would like to see site allocation boundaries (SES02, SES04, SES05, NWS29) reviewed to reflect developing Local Wildlife sites.	See response to comment PDSP.127.028.	Yes	PDSP.188.010	Boo	SES05
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Notes some site allocations may have had their biodiversity/geodiversity value increased and allocations sites affected should account for these. Would like to see site allocation boundaries (SES02, SES04, SES05, NWS29) reviewed to reflect developing local wildlife sites.	See response to comment PDSP.127.028.	Yes	PDSP.271.024	JimC	SES05

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.172	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES08
Annex A: Site	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.173	Hallam Land Management, Strata	SES10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should be undertaken prior to the site being allocated.	Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Supports site allocation SES10.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.072.005	Sanctuary Housing Association	SES10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Why are building contractors not looking at Scowerdons, Weakland and Newstead where houses were already built and demolished?	Land at Scowerdons, Weakland and Newstead has been developed for housing over a considerable period of time and there remain significant areas of land that are allocated for further housing, notably at Newstead and at Scowerdons.	No	PDSP.181.001	Ann Bradbury	SES10
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to SES10 (Moor Valley) as a housing site allocation.	<p>There are no overriding constraints that mean development of the site would be inappropriate and the Council considers that the land is appropriately allocated for housing to cater for housing needs in the area.</p> <p>The site is not in the Green Belt and not all the city’s development needs can be accommodated on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The site is not a designated wildlife site and any development would be required to demonstrate at least 10% BNG at the planning application stage. The adjoining Local Wildlife Site</p>	No	PDSP.258.001	James and Jacqueline Grieve	SES10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			can be safeguarded through the requirement to provide an environmental buffer and maintain connective ecological corridors as part of the layout of the site. These are already conditions attached to the site allocation in the Draft Plan.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Object to housing site allocation SES10 (Moor Valley) being set aside for housing, resulting in the loss of grassland, hedgerows and wildlife habitat and to its knock-on effect to adjacent sites including the Ochre Dyke.	See response to comment PDSP.258.001	No	PDSP.278.002	John Mellor	SES10
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to SES10 (Moor Valley) as a housing site allocation.	See response to comment PDSP.258.001	No	PDSP.367.001	Ruth Shaw	SES10
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to SES10 (Moor Valley) as a housing site allocation.	See response to comment PDSP.258.001	No	PDSP.413.001	Chris and Alison Digman, Gavin Moore	SES10
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to SES10 (Moor Valley) as a housing site allocation.	See response to comment PDSP.258.001	No	PDSP.414.001	William and Susan Sutherland	SES10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown, and this could limit the level of housing to be achieved or depending on the nature of any mitigation required prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.174	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		should be undertaken prior to the site being allocated.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown, and this could limit the level of housing to be achieved or depending on the nature of any mitigation required prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.175	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES12

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Natural England objects to SES13, further information required. This policy must meet the requirements of GS5 once amended. Where local sites would be lost, or permanently reduced in extent or quality, then compensation will require the provision and safeguarding of replacement alternative sites suitable for the creation of habitats of a similar character and quality and of sufficient size.	The site is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required. The Council considers that this site can be delivered. There are no overriding constraints to its development. Ecological corridors, habitat connectivity and the need for and type of replacement open space will be assessed in detail as part of any planning application.	No	PDSP.006.048	Natural England	SES13
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Any development of this site needs to consider any prejudicial impact on the use of the site to the north as a playing field. It also needs to consider if there is any need for any ball stop mitigation to prevent balls leaving a playing field and landing in the development site. The site is open space it clearly may provide an opportunity for the council to meet some of its needs identified in the recently adopted Playing Pitch Strategy as additional pitch space for sports.	Agree to add wording to paragraph 4.52 to demonstrate that risk of ball strike or other potential prejudicial impact either by and towards adjacent development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.	Yes	PDSP.007.021	Sport England	SES13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.176	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES13
Annex A: Site	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Supports site allocation SES13.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.072.006	Sanctuary Housing Association	SES13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations							
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Natural England objects to SES28, does not meet requirements of NPPF 174 and does not provide enough evidence to meet the requirements of Policy GS4. Natural England notes this allocation will lead to a loss of best and most versatile agricultural land Class 2 and 3a. The information provided with the allocation does not demonstrate that the exceptions tests within GS4 have been met.	The site is considered suitable for the allocated uses and has been subject to a site selection methodology. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage if required. The Council considers that this site can be delivered. There are no overriding constraints to its development. Ecological corridors, habitat connectivity and the need for and type of replacement open space will be assessed in detail as part of any planning application.	No	PDSP.006.049	Natural England	SES15
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The site lies adjacent to the Prince Edward Primary School playing fields and the development would need to ensure that it does not prejudice the use of the playing field (paragraph 187 NPPF) development of site needs to consider the need for any ball stop fencing to protect balls from leaving the playing fields on the Prince	Agree to add wording to paragraph 4.52 to demonstrate that risk of ball strike or other potential prejudicial impact either by and towards adjacent development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.	Yes	PDSP.007.022	Sport England	SES15

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		Edward Primary School and landing in the development site.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown, and this could limit the level of housing to be achieved or depending on the nature of any mitigation required prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.177	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES15

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		should be undertaken prior to the site being allocated.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown, and this could limit the level of housing to be achieved or depending on the nature of any mitigation required prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.178	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES16

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.179	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES17
Annex A: Site	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The impact	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability	No	PDSP.042.180	Hallam Land Management, Strata	SES19

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown, and this could limit the level of housing to be achieved or depending on the nature of any mitigation required prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should be undertaken prior to the site being allocated.	Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The site is close to three Grade II Listed Buildings associated with the adjacent Woodhouse Cemetery, the lodge, gateway and railings, and chapel. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or	Yes	PDSP.003.128	Historic England	SES21

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		significance of these heritage assets.	other suitable mitigation measures.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of materials etc which could have a considerable impact on the scale of development.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.181	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES2 1

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.182	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES2 2
Annex A: Site	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The site represents a logical and deliverable opportunity for residential development within the emerging Local	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.025.008	Camstead Ltd (Submitted	SES2 3

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		Plan. We therefore support the continued allocation of the site within the Local Plan.				by Astrum Planning)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.183	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES23

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.184	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES24
Annex A: Site	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Sport England object to the site allocation. Site is part of a sports club where the loss could affect the sports club and prejudice	The site already has planning permission. Agree to add the following Condition on	Yes	PDSP.007.023	Sport England	SES27

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		its use. Development site lies adjacent to sports pitches where assessment of a proposal needs to consider the sports club and sports pitches as adjoining site uses, also needs to consider any risk of ball strike and the need for ball strike mitigation as part of a development proposal. Any development of the site needs to consider the impact of the proposal in respective paragraph 99 of the NPPF and paragraph 187.	development: "Development must not prejudice the use of the adjacent playing field and the Council must retain the access through the site to service the playing field" and delete "None". Agree to add wording to paragraph 4.52 to demonstrate that risk of ball strike or other potential prejudicial impact either by and towards adjacent development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown, and this could limit the level of housing to be achieved or depending on the nature of any mitigation required prevent the site from being developed at all due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.185	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SES28

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should be undertaken prior to the site being allocated.	proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Supports site allocation SES28.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.072.007	Sanctuary Housing Association	SES28
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	For site SES28 add in conditions about Local Wildlife Site buffer (as adjacent to LWS277) and the paragraph about ecological corridors that is used in some of the other site allocations.	Add the following condition on development: "A buffer is required to the Local Wildlife Site (s). Grassland requires a 6 metre buffer, Ancient Woodland/ woodland requires a 15 metre buffer (measured from the edge of the canopy), Watercourses (rivers and streams) require a 10 metre buffer." Add the following condition on development: 'Connective ecological corridors/areas (including buffers) shown on the	Yes	PDSP.127.029	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	SES28

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Local Nature Recovery Strategy and combined natural capital opportunity maps are to be maintained on site and removed from the developable area. Biodiversity Net Gain should be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area.'				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Objects to the amount of housing proposed in Woodhouse on the grounds that the infrastructure, including the road network, would not be able to cope.	No change needed. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers infrastructure needs arising from new development in all areas of the city, including transport mitigation where highways congestion is likely to result from new development.	No	PDSP.239.001	Gracelily	SES28
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The site (Woodhouse East) should be split between Urban Green Space Zone and University/College Zone. The site could be enlarged to include an area of land to the south of site SES28, the entrance to Linleybank, as a university/college zone for a vocational college/ training centre for land skills and environmental technologies. The site could still include	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to release land from the Green Belt for development with the exception of the former Norton Aerodrome site.	No	PDSP.357.001	Richard Pearson	SES28

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		housing for people employed on the site and students.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Recognise and allocate land for the creation of burial provision to meet the needs of Muslim communities residing in Sharrow, Nether Edge and Millhouses; Spital Hill, Burngreave, Firth Park/Fir Vale and Tinsley/Darnall.	The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. No change is needed as the Local Plan does not allocate land for new cemeteries; however, planning applications brought forward to meet this need will be considered under existing national planning policy.	No	PDSP.133.001	Sheffield Islamic Centre Madina Masjid Trust	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Object to the site allocation which relates to the former school site with playing field – school demolished between 2002 and 2007. Playing field has protection under paragraph 99 of the NPPF, and Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy Exception E4, and should not be built on unless replaced.	Provision for open space was considered through the Site Selection process. Future planning applications on the site would be considered in relation to Policy NC15 and further discussions with Sport England.	Yes	PDSP.007.024	Sport England	SS01
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Supports site allocation SS01.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.072.008	Sanctuary Housing Association	SS01
Annex A: Site	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Label needs adding to Policies Map (pdf) for site SS01.	Add the reference to SS01, as suggested.	Yes	PDSP.127.030	Sheffield and Rotherham	SS01

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations						Wildlife Trust	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	he site allocation should be deleted. It is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.186	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SS04

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Supports site allocation SS04.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.072.009	Sanctuary Housing Association	SS04
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Development of this site needs to consider the risk of ball strike from golf balls from the golf course. Any development proposal must ensure but there is no prejudicial impact of the development on the sports facility. If required, the developer needs to provide mitigation to prevent balls leaving the golf course and landing in the development site.	Agree to add wording to paragraph 4.52 to demonstrate that risk of ball strike or other potential prejudicial impact either by or towards adjacent development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.	Yes	PDSP.007.025	Sport England	SS06
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The site allocation should be deleted. It is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The	No	PDSP.042.187	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SS09

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			<p>proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p> <p>The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).</p>				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	<p>Delete site allocation. This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should be undertaken prior to the site</p>	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need.</p>	No	PDSP.042.188	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SS13

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		being allocated. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of materials etc which could have a considerable impact on the scale of development.	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Further information required; the proposed allocation is in close proximity to Moss Valley Meadows Site of Scientific Interest. Further assessment is required to ensure this development does not negatively impact the notified features.	It is recognised that the site of the former Norton Aerodrome is in close proximity to Moss Valley Meadows SSSI. Full account of this will be taken through masterplanning the site and via any future planning application process to ensure that the SSSI - which lies outside the site boundary - is not adversely affected.	No	PDSP.006.050	Natural England	SS17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	For site SS17 (former Norton Aerodrome) replace bullet 4 as follows: A minimum 15 metre buffer should be provided to the Stoneley and Charnock Woods – a Local Wildlife Site, that borders the site and extends into North East Derbyshire; (measured from the edge of the canopy); Replace Bullet 7 as follows: The site is identified as impacting on the Moss Valley Conservation Area - a	No change needed. Conditions on development already reference the required buffer to the Local Wildlife Site. The condition on development relating to heritage assets has been amended to require development proposals to implement recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact	No	PDSP.013.007	North East Derbyshire District Council	SS17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		designated Heritage Asset. The majority of the conservation area is within the jurisdiction of North East Derbyshire District Council and due consideration should be given to the impact of any proposal on the significance and setting of the designated heritage asset, including views into and out of the conservation area, at the planning application stage.	Assessment. The HIA identifies the site as impacting the Moss Valley Conservation Area and sets out mitigation.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	A new critical mass of residents could provide an opportunity to improve the tram service on the Purple Route which terminates at Herdings Park by integrating the tram network into the development. It would be helpful to reference the potential (subject to further investigation) to extend the Herdings tram branch into or closer to the site and to ensure that any development provides appropriate pedestrian links to the tram stop.	The Council is aware of the work that South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority are undertaking to secure the future of the tram network, and this is supported by policy T1. It will be important to ensure that new residential development in this area is well connected to the existing tram route; this would be a consideration of policy CO1 which seeks to maximise public transport access to new development, as well as safe cycle and pedestrian routes.	No	PDSP.015.017	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority	SS17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Delete site allocation. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection	No	PDSP.042.189	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes,	SS17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should really be undertaken prior to the site being allocated. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of materials etc which could have a considerable impact on the scale of development.	Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Supports site allocation SS17.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.072.010	Sanctuary Housing Association	SS17
Annex A: Site	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Recommends that an evidence-based capacity study is undertaken for the Norton Aerodrome site to determine the	The capacity stated is an estimated figure only and the appropriate number of new	No	PDSP.081.001	Tangent Properties	SS17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		most suitable density for the site, which is considered currently to be too low. Considers that the site should be put forward for "mixed use" rather than just for housing, to create a more sustainable development and leads to better place making.	homes and the density of the development will be informed by a detailed masterplanning exercise. The masterplanning will also include consideration not only of new housing and open space/recreation areas but also other appropriate uses that may support residential development.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Support the release of the former Norton Aerodrome site (SS17) for development.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.099.010	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire	SS17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The site contains a demolished school with former playing field, school demolished between 2002 and 2005. As a playing field the site has protection under paragraph 99 of the NPPF and under Sport England's playing fields policy. The playing field should not be built on unless it is replaced in accordance with those policies, replacement provided prior to the loss. The pitch is still marked with goal posts, therefore consultation with Sport England would be on a statutory basis at the planning application stage.	The site has planning permission for housing, retaining the playing field, and is proposed as a housing and open space site allocation. Additional conditions on development are proposed that would apply if further or amended developments are proposed on the site, including: "The playing field in the eastern part of the site is to be retained or replaced elsewhere".	Yes	PDSP.007.026	Sport England	SS18

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Supports site allocation SS18.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.072.011	Sanctuary Housing Association	SS18
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The Woodland Trust is concerned about the potentially adverse impacts that site allocation (SS18) will have in relation to areas of ancient woodland. Ancient woodland should not be included in areas that are allocated for development, whether for residential, leisure or community purposes as this leaves them open to the impacts of development. The Trust objects to the inclusion of this allocation as it is likely to cause damage and/or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to its boundary. For this reason, this site is unsound and should not be taken forward. Secondary woodland should also be retained to ensure that ecological networks are maintained and enhanced.	Protection will be given through an additional condition on development: Ancient Woodland to be excluded from development and protected by a 15 metre buffer measured from the edge of the canopy.	Yes	PDSP.148.006	The Woodland Trust	SS18
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The Elms, Old Hay Lane, Dore is suitable for removal from the Green Belt and allocation for housing to meeting housing need in Dore.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to	No	PDSP.046.010	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)	HELA A Site Ref S03069

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			alter the Green Belt boundary (with the exception of Norton Aerodrome).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	We note that these sites are adjacent to the Porter Brook and there is no mention of previous planning commitments to deliver the relevant section of the Porter Brook Trail.	Added additional condition regarding ecological corridors and biodiversity net gain in case of any further or amended developments were proposed on the site. An amendment has also been proposed to Policy SA7 which states that development should 'Extend and enhance active travel routes along one bank of the Main Rivers (River Sheaf and Porter Brook), wherever practicable and where it is consistent with biodiversity and heritage objectives.'	Yes	PDSP.125.019	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust	SWSO 2
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Delete site allocation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The Council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing	No	PDSP.042.190	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited	SWSO 1

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should really be undertaken prior to the site being allocated.	requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			(Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	We note that these sites are adjacent to the Porter Brook and there is no mention of previous planning commitments to deliver the relevant section of the Porter Brook Trail.	Added additional condition regarding ecological corridors and biodiversity net gain in case of any further or amended developments were proposed on the site. An amendment has also been proposed to Policy SA7 which states that development should 'Extend and enhance active travel routes along one bank of the Main Rivers (River Sheaf and	Yes	PDSP.125.020	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust	SWSO 5

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			Porter Brook), wherever practicable and where it is consistent with biodiversity and heritage objectives.’				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The site is within John Street Conservation Area and close to Portland Works, a Grade II* Listed Building, to the west of the site along Randall Street. The Grade II Listed Stag Works is also close to the sites north-west corner. The John Street Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the Cricketers Arms public house adjacent to the sites north-east corner as being a building which makes a positive contribution to the area. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment or other suitable mitigation measures.	Yes	PDSP.003.129	Historic England	SWSO 6
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Delete site allocation. This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. The extent of land contamination is unknown as is the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan	No	PDSP.042.191	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted	SWSO 6

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should really be undertaken prior to the site being allocated. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of materials etc which could in turn have a considerable impact on the scale of development.	period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	There is broad support for this site allocation.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.086.068	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SWS08
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The site lies adjacent to school playing fields and Carter Knowle Park. There is the potential for allocation of this site to have a prejudicial impact on the playing field. Potential allocation of the site needs	Agree to add wording to paragraph 4.52 to demonstrate that risk of ball strike or other potential prejudicial impact either by and towards adjacent	Yes	PDSP.007.027	Sport England	SWS10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		to be considered in respect of the adjoining playing field to ensure that there is no risk of prejudicial development from development site on the playing field.	development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Delete site allocation. This site is of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see	No	PDSP.042.192	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SWS10

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Sport England object to the site allocation. Loss of tennis courts and lies adjacent playing pitches. Loss of a sports facility, including part of a playing field and tennis courts. Playing field and courts have protection under paragraph 99 of the NPPF, and Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy Exception E4, and should not be built on unless replaced prior to the loss occurring. Potential for development of the site to prejudice the use of the adjoining sports club, paragraph 187 of the NPPF applies.	<p>Planning permission was granted in February 2018 (17/04282/FUL) for the erection of 14 dwellings including ancillary parking, landscaping and access works.</p> <p>As part of that planning application, Sport England agreed that the principle of the loss of the courts had already been established by the 2007 planning permission. On that basis, Sport England no longer sustain an objection.</p>	No	PDSP.007.028	Sport England	SWS11
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	No information has been provided regarding the existing biodiversity interests on site. In order to ensure the requirement for avoiding harm to priority species and habitats is fully met an ecological assessment of the site should be completed prior to its allocation. The allocation should also set out the requirement to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain.	Site has existing planning permission and any ecological requirements would have been agreed at the planning application stage. An additional condition should be added regarding ecological corridors and biodiversity net gain in case of any further or amended developments were proposed on the site. The same amendment is	No	PDSP.006.051	Natural England	SWS14

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
			proposed to adjoining site SWS08.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The site contains two Grade II Listed and boundary wall which is also Grade II Listed. A further Grade II asset associated with the hall, an ice house, is present within the parkland to the south of the hall. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets. Concerned about use of the term 'enabling development' in the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). Enabling development is development that is not otherwise be in accordance with planning policies and should always be a choice of last resort. We consider that it is not appropriate for the council's high-level HIA to suggest this as a possible approach before all other options.	Accept change. The heritage condition has been amended to state that development proposals should implement the recommendations set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) or other suitable mitigation measures. An addendum to the HIA will clarify and remove references to enabling development.	No	PDSP.003.130	Historic England	SWS17
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The policy should recognise the constraints on the site and note that affordable housing might not be delivered on this allocation. Biodiversity Net Gain is required to be delivered on site within the connective ecological corridor/area. On site delivery will reduce the land available	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the	No	PDSP.042.193	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime	SWS17

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		for development which may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The council consider it necessary to have staged archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. This clearly has the potential to prevent any development or indeed severely restrict development. If such work is required pre application, it should be undertaken prior to the site being allocated. This site is identified as impacting on a Heritage Asset which may well impact on the cost of development in terms of the nature of materials etc which could in turn have a considerable impact on the scale of development.	most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepear	Requires a buffer to be consistent with other site conditions and policies. Include 10m natural buffer to watercourse in site conditions on allocation SD01.	No change needed. A condition on development ensures that valuable ecological corridors or areas (including their Buffers) are removed from the site's developable area.	No	PDSP.127.031	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	SD01
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepear	Allocation SD03 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection	No	PDSP.042.194	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes,	SD03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		waste permit sites is unknown and could limit the delivery of housing dependent on mitigation measures required, prevent the site from being developed due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. Requiring an archaeological evaluation and/or building appraisal prior to a planning application submission, has the potential to prevent or severely restrict development. Such work should be undertaken prior to allocation. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepear	The principle of the overall strategy is largely accepted. The provision of a riverside open space as a condition on development of site SD03 may not be practical or appropriate. The condition should be amended to ensure open space	Support for the site allocation is welcomed. The site allocation's condition relating to provision of riverside open space should be amended to ensure the required open space is provided on site, as	Yes	PDSP.077.002	Speciality Steel UK (Submitted by JLL)	SD03

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		is provided but that the detail would be demonstrated as part of the future application. Although improved public transport provision may be required, providing bus stops/laybys and re-routing bus services through the site SD03 may not be practical or necessary – a more flexible public transport condition should be imposed. Recommend removing reference to the Local Nature Strategy in the penultimate condition as the document has not been published. This does not prevent the connectivity of ecological corridors and areas. Indeed, biodiversity net gain will be achieved but flexibility should be allowed to explore on site or off-site net gain when preparing a proposal.	it is recognised that riverside open space may not be practical due to the permission granted for engineering works needed to create a noise attenuation bund (13/02694/FUL). Also, a Local Wildlife Site designation covers the urban greenspace adjacent to the River Little Don. Sustainable residential development will require bus penetration through the site with provision of public transport improvements.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepcar	Allocation SD07 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The impact of nearby Environment Agency waste permit sites is unknown and could limit the delivery of housing dependent on mitigation measures required, prevent the site from being developed due to costs of mitigation especially when combined with other as yet unknown costs. The extent of	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan	No	PDSP.042.195	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted	SD07

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		land contamination is unknown as are the nature and costs of any mitigation and/or remediation. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).			by DLP Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepear	Allocation SD08 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. The site is not deliverable until it passes an exception test. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of	No	PDSP.042.196	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SD08

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepear	Site SD09 is allocated for Housing and has extant planning permission for Residential development. It is also identified by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority as a potential location for the car park for the proposed Stocksbridge station as part of the Don Valley Line re-opening programme. The Strategic Outline Business Case was submitted to Government in September 2022. Subject to the further progression of the scheme as part of the Restoring Your Railway programme we would welcome further discussion to establish if there is potential to allow for station parking and access at this site or within the wider area.	No change needed. A previous planning permission for the Fox Valley development reserved land close to the entrance to Fox Valley from the rest of Stocksbridge District Centre for a rail halt. That site is to be landscaped as an interim measure pending a decision on whether the passenger railway line should be reinstated. Further discussion of potential alternative options is welcomed.	No	PDSP.015.018	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority	SD09

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepear	Allocation SD10 is of a size and location, that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates it would be unviable to develop. Delivering the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on site will reduce the land available for development and may adversely impact on the viability of the scheme. The unknown impact of the above constraints mean that the site cannot presently be considered deliverable and as such is not a sound allocation at the present time on the evidence available. The site allocation should therefore be deleted.	The Integrated Impact Assessment, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement over the plan period. The proposed conditions on development in Annex A ensure an enhanced quality of development and are deemed necessary and reasonable. The proposed allocation will contribute to meeting housing need. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment considers the viability of site typologies rather than individual sites. This is an approach advocated in PPG (see para 2.22 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment).	No	PDSP.042.197	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)	SD10
Annex A: Site	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge/Deepear	Development of Site SD11 must not prejudice the use of the adjoining Sports	Add a condition to the site allocation requiring a sports and urban green space impact	Yes	PDSP.007.029	Sport England	SD11

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
Allocations		facilities and should be consistent with NPPF paragraphs 99 and 187.	assessment to identifying any detrimental impacts either to sports activities or to the development is properly assessed and mitigated, as appropriate.				
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green	Propose removal of land from the Green Belt at Thorncliffe Road, Warren Lane and White Lane (A6135), Chapeltown S35 2YA (HELAA ref S03113) for development. Land makes no material contribution to the purposes of Green Belt. If the Council chose not to identify the site for either employment or housing purposes, then it should be released from Green Belt and be designated as Safeguarded Land to continue to reflect a sustainable pattern of development beyond the plan period.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to alter the Green Belt boundary (with the exception of Norton Aerodrome).	No	PDSP.034.012	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)	HELA A Site Ref S03112
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green	Propose removal of land from the Green Belt at Thorncliffe Road, Warren Lane and White Lane (A6135), Chapeltown S35 2YA (HELAA ref S03112) for development. Land makes no material contribution to the purposes of Green Belt. If the Council chose not to identify the site for either employment or housing purposes, then it should be released from Green Belt and be designated as Safeguarded Land to	See response to comment PDSP.034.012	No	PDSP.034.013	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)	HELA A Site Ref S03112

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		continue to reflect a sustainable pattern of development beyond the plan period.					
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green	Propose removal of land from the Green Belt at Thorncliffe Road, Warren Lane and White Lane (A6135), Chapeltown S35 2YA (HELAA ref S03312) for development. Land makes no material contribution to the purposes of Green Belt. If the Council chose not to identify the site for either employment or housing purposes, then it should be released from Green Belt and be designated as Safeguarded Land to continue to reflect a sustainable pattern of development beyond the plan period.	See response to comment PDSP.034.012	No	PDSP.034.014	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)	HELA A Site Ref S03312
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green	Propose removal of land from the Green Belt. The original application for the bungalow acknowledges that the land makes little positive contribution to the principle of Green Belt. Suggests the release of this site from the Green Belt. and allowing one additional dwelling.	No change needed. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify the suggested amendment to the Green Belt Boundary.	No	PDSP.080.001	Susan Housley (Submitted by Visionary Planning UK)	HELA A Site Ref S03312
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green	Propose removal of land from the Green Belt. HELAA site S04101 extends to 35 hectares of agricultural land and woodland immediately South of Smithywood business park. This area of the site would be appropriate for commercial/business	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to	No	PDSP.078.005	St Pauls Developments plc and Smithywood Business Parks	HELA A Site ref S04101

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name	Site Ref
		related uses. Land makes no material contribution to the Green Belt and the revised Green Belt boundary would provide a strong defensible boundary in accordance with the NPPF. This new development opportunity would be informed by the technical work undertaken on the previous Motorway Service Area application. The site is both suitable and available. There is also the possibility of a future rail or tram train connection to the site via the Chapeltown to Meadowhall line and this should be included in the Plan as infrastructure for upgrading/reinstatement.	alter the Green Belt boundary (with the exception of Norton Aerodrome).			Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)	
Annex A: Site Allocations	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green	Propose a Housing site allocation at Green Lane, Ecclesfield. The site is in the Green Belt although the Green Belt serves limited purpose in this location. We have explored the option of a mixed tenure 75 home scheme with the site owners. The proposal includes upgrading the pitch to the east into a 5G playing pitch and providing new club facilities. Existing facilities are poor. The site is within a mile of Shiregreen where we have 2,500 homes and associated infrastructure to manage and maintain the properties and estate.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to alter the Green Belt boundary (with the exception of Norton Aerodrome).	No	PDSP.072.012	Sanctuary Housing Association	HELA A Site ref S04108

