

REPORT TO FULL COUNCIL 6TH SEPTEMBER 2023

APPENDIX 2a

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

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	Strategy will not deliver growth as the housing requirement is too low. Comment states that there is not enough consideration given to the provision of affordable housing. States that appropriate levels won't be delivered as sites are unviable.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Affordable housing provision has been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and set at an appropriate level.	No	PDSP.066.001	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	Comment states the foreword is misleading in terms of the local plan achieving carbon neutrality because there has not been consideration given to retrofitting of existing housing stock.	No change needed. The Plan plays an important role in relation to delivering the Council's net zero carbon ambitions, however it will not directly affect all aspects of achieving net zero, for example the need to retrofit the existing housing stock.	No	PDSP.102.001	Dore Village Society
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	Climate change should be introduced as a strategic policy in Part 1 alongside other thematic policies. The Plan will not contribute sufficiently to achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2030.	No change needed. Strategic policies for key themes are in Part 1, however the approach to climate change is cross-cutting as it relates to a number of topic areas. Responding to the Climate Emergency is one of the 8 Aims of the Plan. There is no need to duplicate content by	No	PDSP.140.001	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			drawing up an additional policy specifically on climate change.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	Objects to objectives relating to 15-minute neighbourhoods, climate emergency and net zero.	No change needed. The Plan aims to ensure that new development is located sustainably. It supports the Council's objective of being net zero by 2030.	No	PDSP.222.001	Dystopia247
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	Document not written in plain language.	No change needed. Comment relating to plain language is acknowledged but the Plan is a technical document and has to meet the needs of a number of different audiences. The Glossary and definitions explain technical terms that are used.	No	PDSP.241.001	Graycole
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	Concern about restrictive measures in the Plan.	No change needed as no specific issue identified.	No	PDSP.301.001	Laura
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	No comment.	No change needed. No comment made.	No	PDSP.360.001	RichardW
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Foreword	Rape victims would feel unsafe walking around neighbourhoods.	No change needed. The policies in the Plan aim to enable people to be able to make active travel choices and encourages	No	PDSP.378.001	Shez

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			neighbourhoods to be designed in a safe way.			

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	Bassetlaw District Council yet to receive SOCG/draft from Sheffield Council relevant to the cross-boundary issues in the Sheffield Plan.	A letter regarding the Sheffield Plan and the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) was sent to nearby local planning authorities, including Bassetlaw, in January 2023. A draft Statement of Common Ground is being prepared for the Sheffield Plan.	No	PDSP.009.001	Bassetlaw District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	The plan period should be extended to 2040 as adoption could be delayed.	The Local Development Scheme shows adoption of the Plan in 2024. There is no requirement in the NPPF or guidance to factor in potential delay.	No	PDSP.009.002	Bassetlaw District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	States that there is no comment to make in regard to the Local Plan and related evidence base.	Noted - no comment to make.	No	PDSP.010.001	City of Doncaster Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	In paragraph 1.27, the word 'waste' should be in bold.	Agree - correct typographical error.	Yes	PDSP.014.001	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	The Sheffield City Region boundary overlaps with SYMCA and is therefore unclear.	Agree - amend notation on Map 2.	Yes	PDSP.014.002	Rotherham Metropolitan

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations						Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	The spatial strategy does not set out sufficient change as it only allocates brownfield sites. The strategy will not provide enough specialist housing and will maintain an unfair housing market.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing requirement aligns with the jobs growth target for the city.	No	PDSP.042.001	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	States that plan is not in accordance with NPPF and so it is misleading to state so. States that plan cannot be sound as it does not use the Standard Method to calculate housing need.	The Plan does accord with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances	No	PDSP.042.002	Hallam Land Management, Strata 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
			exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	<p>The spatial strategy does not set out sufficient change as it only allocates brownfield sites. The strategy will not provide enough specialist housing and will maintain an unfair housing market.</p> <p>States that plan is not in accordance with NPPF and so it is misleading to state so. States that plan cannot be sound as it does not use the Standard Method to calculate housing need.</p>	<p>No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing requirement aligns with the jobs growth target for the city.</p> <p>The Plan does accord with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The</p>	No	PDSP.065.001	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	Comment is the online form submission of comment PDSP.066.018.	No change needed. This is the online form related to another comment.	No	PDSP.066.002	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	States that plan is not in accordance with NPPF and so it is misleading to state so. States that plan cannot be sound as it does not use the Standard Method to calculate housing need.	See the response to comment number PDSP.042.002 above.	No	PDSP.066.003	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations – Specific reference should be made in this section to	No change needed. The identified need for additional space for Muslim burials highlighted by the community is recognised and noted in the	No	PDSP.095.001	Baitulmukarram Ja'me Masjid

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		acknowledge the important role burial provisions plays for all communities, and the continued recognition of the special religious and pastoral requirements of the Muslim communities.	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.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	Repeats comment number PDSP.095.001 above.	See the response to comment number PDSP.095.001 above	No	PDSP.108.001	Guzar-E-Habib Education Centre
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	States there is a typographical error in the text of the policy.	Unable to find minor error made in response - no change.	No	PDSP.116.001	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	Notes support for creating a Local Plan and shows willingness to want to work to progress work forward.	Support welcomed and noted.	No	PDSP.134.001	Sheffield Property Association
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 1: Introduction	Disagrees with the concept of climate change and requests the removal to references such as net zero and climate emergency.	Climate change is based on widely accepted science and is referenced in the NPPF. The NPPF requires that local plans include appropriate policies relating to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change.	No	PDSP.222.002	Dystopia247

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The vision should include reference to the role of Sheffield's heritage assets in creating attractive places. The vision in paragraph 2.2 should reflect the vision in Figure 1.	Accept the proposed amendment ensuring that the vision set out as a diagram in Figure 1 is the same as the vision outlined in text in paragraph 2.2. The vision and aims which should be read together; Aim 8 'a well-designed city' refers to strong local identity and quality buildings, valuing heritage assets. This is further referenced in the objectives for a well-designed city.	Yes	PDSP.003.001	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Welcome Aim 8 with reference to buildings with heritage and/or archaeological value.	No change needed. Comment welcome.	No	PDSP.003.002	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The clear aim should be for the implementation of the plan to significantly and demonstrably improve the environment, including air and water quality and wildlife interests during the plan period. The Plan should include policies to facilitate and support the restoration and enhancement of Sheffield's wildlife.	No change needed. The vision, aims and objectives should be read together. Aim 2 clearly includes reference to a sustainable city that encompasses the natural environment, while the following objectives set out the targets on how it will be achieved including reducing air, water and soil pollution. In addition, Aim 7 'a green city' includes enhancement of biodiversity and green and blue infrastructure. Proposed amendments to Policy BG1	No	PDSP.006.001	Natural England

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			reference the protection and enhancement of blue and green infrastructure and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The restoration and enhancement of Sheffield's wildlife is further supported by policies GS5 Development and Biodiversity and GS6 Biodiversity Net Gain.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Support the objectives.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.007.001	Sport England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Vision and objectives do not align with spatial strategy.	No change needed. The spatial strategy in SP1 flows from the vision.	No	PDSP.009.003	Bassetlaw District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Comment supports vision and aims.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.013.001	North East Derbyshire District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Correction of a typographical error in one of the bullet points under 'Objectives for an environmentally sustainable city'.	Typographical error in the second bullet point should be corrected.	Yes	PDSP.014.003	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Suggest strengthening the recognition of population's health as a contributing factor to economic prosperity. Recognise	Accept proposed suggestion – amend the first objective under 'Objectives for a fair, inclusive and healthy city'.	Yes	PDSP.015.001	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		diversity as a positive factor also that should be encouraged.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Plan will not deliver the vision to provide a good quality housing offer meeting different household needs. Plan will not meet the needs of families living in less central locations such as Chapeltown. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need.	No change needed. Acknowledge the distribution of new homes will limit growth in some suburban areas but Green Belt release would be contrary to the spatial strategy which promotes sustainable patterns of development.	No	PDSP.019.001	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Comment suggests that housing requirement and supply is too low and will not deliver the necessary numbers. Also that current allocations will not deliver a mix of housing tenures and will not provide adequate levels of affordable housing. Suggests that the housing market won't be competitive with current and future provision.	No change needed. The Plan's aims and objectives are based on the vision for the city. New homes will be developed to meet a range of needs, with allocations consistent with the spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.019.002	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Carbon Zero plans are unrealistic.	No change needed. It is recognised that the Council's commitment to carbon net zero is challenging. The Local Plan plays only one part in the steps needed for the city to meet its target of being net zero by 2030.	No	PDSP.042.003	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
						by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Objective will not deliver a broad mix of housing types and tenures to meet a range of needs.	No change needed. The Plan allocates land to deliver new homes as part of a wider housing market including existing stock.	No	PDSP.042.004	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Plan will not meet the city's housing requirements.	No change needed. The housing requirement is based on evidence of the need for new homes in Sheffield, taking account of future jobs growth and Sheffield's role in the wider region, as well as constraints to development.	No	PDSP.042.005	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Allocations and policies will not meet the needs of specialist housing requirements such as for families or older people.	No change needed. The Plan objectives are to deliver a broad range of housing to meet different needs, including policies to support development of appropriate accommodation for older people.	No	PDSP.042.006	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The allocations in the Plan will not deliver sufficient affordable housing.	No change needed to the objective, which remains to increase the supply of affordable housing and to increase the level of affordable housing required on development sites, taking account of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.042.007	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Plan does not allocate land to deliver homes to meet the diverse needs of the people of Sheffield. Not enough housing for older people, young professionals or families.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A variety of new homes will be delivered making use of the opportunities available. In particular, there is policy support for affordable and older people's housing.	No	PDSP.042.008	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Comment supports the Vision and Aims but more specifically Aim 3 of the Local Plan.	The support welcomed.	No	PDSP.046.001	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Plan does not allocate land to deliver homes to meet the diverse needs of the people of Sheffield. Not enough housing for older	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green	No	PDSP.065.002	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		<p>people, young professionals or families.</p> <p>Carbon Zero plans are unrealistic particularly in relation to existing housing stock.</p> <p>Objective will not deliver a broad mix of housing types and tenures to meet a range of needs.</p> <p>The Plan will not meet the city's housing requirements.</p>	<p>Belt. A variety of new homes will be delivered making use of the opportunities available. In particular, there is policy support for affordable and older people's housing.</p> <p>No change needed. It is recognised that the Council's commitment to carbon net zero is challenging. The Local Plan plays only one part in the steps needed for the city to meet its target of being net zero by 2030.</p> <p>No change needed. The Plan allocates land to deliver new homes as part of a wider housing market including existing stock.</p> <p>No change needed. The housing requirement is based on evidence of the need for new homes in Sheffield, as well as taking account of its role in the wider region, and constraints to development.</p>			

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		The allocations in the Plan will not deliver sufficient affordable housing.	No change needed to the objective, which remains to increase the supply of affordable housing. The Plan seeks to increase the level of affordable housing required on development sites, taking account of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Carbon Zero plans are unrealistic particularly in relation to existing housing stock.	No change needed. It is recognised that the Council's commitment to carbon net zero is challenging. The Local Plan plays only one part in the steps needed for the city to meet its target of being net zero by 2030.	No	PDSP.066.004	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	There is not a justified requirement for the housing type and tenure mix that the Plan will deliver.	No change needed. The Plan allocates land to deliver new homes as part of a wider housing market including existing stock.	No	PDSP.066.005	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Housing requirement below the standard method will not ensure an adequate supply of housing.	No change needed. The housing requirement is based on evidence of the need for new homes in Sheffield, as well as taking account of its role in the wider region, and constraints to development.	No	PDSP.066.006	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 2: Vision,	There are not enough affordable housing allocations.	No change needed. The objective, remains to increase the supply of affordable housing, taking account	No	PDSP.066.007	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf

Commented [SV1]: Which comment does this duplicate?

Commented [ER2R1]: The reps wasn't split up well enough. It's the same submissions as PDSP.0042 so I've had to make a long comment

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Aims, and Objectives		of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.			Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Lack of opportunities in the Plan for family housing will result in less sustainable travel patterns as people move out of Sheffield and travel in for work.	No change needed to the objectives which informs the spatial strategy that utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.066.008	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Plan does not allocate land to deliver homes to meet the diverse needs of the people of Sheffield. Not enough housing for older people, young professionals or families.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A variety of new homes will be delivered making use of the opportunities available. In particular there is policy support for affordable and older people's housing.	No	PDSP.066.009	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Comment is the online form submission of comment PDSP.066.006-009.	No change needed. This is the online submission for comments that are dealt with under PDSP.066.006-009.	No	PDSP.066.010	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Support the vision for integrated public transport and better active travel options but active travel routes should be identified on the Policies Map. Highlight Stocksbridge, student areas to the SW of the City Centre and suburbs in the SE of the city as having little or no cycle infrastructure. Suggest inclusion of extensive network of active travel routes throughout the city.	Support noted. No change required. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and SYMCA Active Travel Implementation Plan. A network of cycle routes is shown on the Policies Map.	No	PDSP.100.001	Cycle Sheffield (Submitted by Sheffield CTC)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Suggests removing the word 'Objectives' from the title of Figure 1.	Accept suggestion.	Yes	PDSP.102.002	Dore Village Society
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Plan does not include a Green Network map or Nature Recovery Network.	Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.	Yes	PDSP.103.001	Friends of Parkwood Springs
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 2: Vision,	Suggests amendment to wording of first bullet point under objectives for a green city - to	Agree - amend objective as suggested.	Yes	PDSP.120.001	Owlthorpe Fields Action Group

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Aims, and Objectives	emphasise nature recovery and adaptation to climate change.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The objectives do not make provisions for sustainable development of local food infrastructure. It also does not plan to achieve sustainable development of local food infrastructure.	The plan protects allotments (Policy GS1) and gives significant weight to the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land (Policy GS4). However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1.	Yes	PDSP.121.001	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Suggest additional text is added to the introduction: 'The city's resilience to the effects of climate change, biodiversity loss and geopolitical instability negatively impacting the food system will be achieved by protecting land capable of producing food'.	The plan protects allotments (Policy GS1) and gives significant weight to the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land (Policy GS4). However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1.	Yes	PDSP.121.002	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Suggest an additional objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To safeguard land capable of producing food, in recognition of the local food system's fundamental role in both providing nutrition for a healthy population and as a cornerstone of a resilient economy - one that is less vulnerable to geopolitical and climatic instability - and where public procurement 	Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication.	Yes	PDSP.121.003	Regather

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		purchasing power is used to reward the most sustainable farming practices				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>Suggest an additional objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To position equitable access to healthy food at the heart of every community, by ensuring that land capable of producing food is identified and made available to the community, and that the development of related food infrastructure, e.g, local independent retail, is sufficiently supported.' 	Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication	Yes	PDSP.121.004	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>Suggest an additional objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'To prioritise land capable of producing food for agroecological food production, to not only ensure the resilience and sustainability of Sheffield's food supply but also mitigate against climate change; manage flood water; realise Biodiversity Net Gain; achieve net zero carbon by 2030, and reduce soil erosion and water contamination. 	Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication.	Yes	PDSP.121.005	Regather

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>Suggest additional objectives are added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide access to land for multipurpose use i.e. Agroecological food production linked with habitat improvements to increase biodiversity • Link agroecological food production with a culture and economy of outdoors-based learning around land based skills • Work with local partners to create diverse land-based businesses that promote health and wellbeing, and build nature-focused leisure opportunities 	Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication.	Yes	PDSP.121.006	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>An additional plan objective should be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect and create community gardens, allotments, urban and periurban farms, and edible landscaping within open spaces, all of which contribute to the livability of neighbourhoods and support 	Agree, but a single objective on food production under the objectives for a Green City would be appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplication	Yes	PDSP.121.007	Regather

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		residents' physical health and mental wellbeing.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.004 	See response to PDSP.121.004	Yes	PDSP.121.008	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.003 	See response to PDSP.121.003	Yes	PDSP.121.009	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.005	See response to PDSP.121.005	Yes	PDSP.121.010	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.006	See response to PDSP.121.006	Yes	PDSP.121.011	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	This is a duplicate of comment PDSP.121.007	See response to PDSP.121.007	Yes	PDSP.121.012	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Plan not worded strongly enough to address Nature Emergency or role nature plays in combatting climate change. Suggest amends to text, see Response Modification.	Sustainability is at the heart of the Vision and Aim 7 refers to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and blue and green infrastructure.	No	PDSP.125.001	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Suggest vision objective to be worded more strongly to meet NPPF definition and aims of nature recovery.	Accept proposed amendments to the objectives for a Green City.	Yes	PDSP.127.001	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	There is a failure to recognise the heritage and value of waterways and biodiversity and the possibility of conflict between environmental policies and the protection of waterways. Areas of Special Character are not mentioned in the Local Plan. Would like to see the industrial past of Sheffield made clearer. There should be reference to sustainability of tall buildings and identification of tall building zones. Reference should be made	No change needed. It is unclear what change is required in relation to the potential conflict between policies in the Green City chapter and protection of waterways. Policy D1 specifically acknowledges the heritage value of buildings, structures and settlement forms associated with the city's water powered industries. Areas of Special Character were set out in the UDP with the intention of being assessed as potential Conservation Areas. Any review of	No	PDSP.129.001	Sheffield Conservation Advisory Group

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		to the Local Heritage List with associated policy statement.	<p>existing Conservation Areas or designation of new areas would be outside the Local Plan process. The ASCs have been reviewed in the past and potential new Conservation Areas identified. There is sufficiently robust wording within the Development Management policies in Part 2 to achieve good design within the city whether sites are within Conservation Areas or not.</p> <p>The same sustainable design requirements would apply to tall buildings as to other buildings.</p> <p>In relation to the Local List, work is ongoing to consider protection of assets at a South Yorkshire level. The Plan contains appropriate policy hooks to enable this.</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon. Suggest amendments in Chapter 2 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - refer to need to transition to a net zero emissions economy. 	<p>The Aims already refer to the Climate Emergency. The objectives make clear the ambition for the City to be net zero carbon by 2030.</p> <p>The objectives for a Connected City already refer to creating a</p>	No	PDSP.140.002	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the need reduce transport emissions. - to minimising embodied carbon and ongoing carbon emissions in meeting effects of climate change. 	<p>sustainable transport network that improves air quality.</p> <p>A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Policy ES1 in Part 2 strikes a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this level of requirement sooner would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The vision statement should make specific reference to mitigating and adapting to climate change. The plan does not appear to be compatible with the Council's policy of reducing carbon emissions to net zero by 2030.	The Vision Statement already refers to a "sustainable city" and specific reference to climate change is made in Aim 2. The Plan (Policy ES1) includes a requirement for new development that is granted permission from 1 January 2030 to be net zero carbon for both operational and embodied carbon. The Whole Plan Viability Appraisal does not support setting a requirement for developments granted permission before that date to be net zero carbon (when taking account of other policy objectives).	No	PDSP.140.003	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Would like to understand how much heritage assets and the historic environment contributes towards the economy of Sheffield.	The Plan supports protection and re-use of heritage assets which in turn allows for them to continue to play a role in the economy of the city. Policy D1 (in Part 1) and Policy DE9 (in Part 2) are particularly relevant.	No	PDSP.147.001	The Victorian Society
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Would like to see an overall Heritage Strategy that includes all heritage assets in Sheffield and considers how these would be better utilised. The Plan should reflect comments made by Joined Up Heritage Sheffield relating to better utilisation of heritage assets. Support for a range of Plan policies.	Support for referenced policies is welcomed. The Heritage Strategy as currently drafted is wider than simply matters relating to planning. The Local Plan would allow for future strategies. Having worked collaboratively with Historic England we are comfortable with the scope of the policies as drafted, subject to proposed minor amendments.	No	PDSP.147.002	The Victorian Society
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Delighted and relieved that environmental sustainability lies at the heart of the Vision as well as of Aims 2 and 7.	Support noted	No	PDSP.188.001	Boo
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Vision should specifically reference biodiversity.	No change needed. The vision and aims should be read together. Aim 7 'a green city' includes enhancement of biodiversity and green and blue infrastructure. Additional wording in policy BG1 references extending blue and green infrastructure.	No	PDSP.191.001	Carol Collins

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Biodiversity not given sufficient priority.	See the response to comment number PDSP.191.001 above.	No	PDSP.191.002	Carol Collins
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Plan should enhance and expand greenspaces as well as protecting existing spaces. Should include vision for linking green spaces together.	Proposed amendment to BG1 adds the word 'extended' to 'blue and green infrastructure' for the avoidance of doubt. We propose additional text after paragraph 5.24 to explain the role of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and associated mapping of connected green and blue infrastructure.	Yes	PDSP.193.001	Caroline Quincey
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Electric charging facilities at cycle parking provision at appropriate destinations. People will need to charge E-bikes at places other than just their home.	No change needed.	No	PDSP.194.001	Caroline88
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.201.001	Claire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.201.002	Claire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 2: Vision,	Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.201.003	Claire

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Aims, and Objectives					
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Would encourage adoption of higher target of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Need to ensure the City Council works with ecologists to measure site baselines.	<p>The minimum 10% BNG requirement was assessed as part of the policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of a higher percentage BNG requirement would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate.</p> <p>The Council employs ecologists who have provided input to the Sheffield Plan and who advise on planning applications.</p>	No	PDSP.210.001	Dave Applebaum
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>Reaching Net Zero and declaring Climate Emergency will damage economic prosperity.</p> <p>Population data in terms of household projections should be updated to the 2021 figures.</p> <p>The aim to substantially reduce car use is unreasonable and</p>	<p>Acknowledge that responding to the Climate Emergency is a challenge, however the spatial strategy seeks to deliver sustainable growth.</p> <p>The starting point for assessing housing need is based on the Government's standard method which uses 2014 based household projections. However, additional</p>	No	PDSP.214.001	DavidRS

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		undemocratic, especially at a time of declining public transport. Measures to reduce car use will lead to economic decline and hurt lower income groups.	<p>analysis has been carried out to consider different approaches to understanding Sheffield's likely growth over the Plan period and this is reflected in the housing requirement.</p> <p>The transport strategy in the Plan is needed in order to reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality and reduce congestion. The challenges in relation to public transport services are recognised but this is not something the Plan can directly influence. However, the Council is working with the Mayoral Combined Authority and public transport service providers to try and improve services.</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The policy of achieving 'Net Zero' carbon by 2030 is an example of the council going further than their remit as there is no legal requirement for this. 'Net Zero' will run contrary to other policies in the Local Plan such as 'reflecting the needs and aspirations of every person in the city, no matter who they are,	The aim for the City to be net carbon zero by 2030 is an established target for the city. The Plan clearly sets out how it should help the Council meet this target, how it can be achieved and how this will benefit the people of Sheffield. Viability work has determined that these policies will not put undue	No	PDSP.222.003	Dystopia247

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		where they live, or what stage they are at in their life' and affect housing, industrial and retail policies.	burdens on the economy and can be deliverable.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Council's own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon and Air Quality. Terminology is too ambiguous and needs to be strengthened.	A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this level of requirement sooner would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. Vehicle exhaust emissions affect levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and cause air pollution that impacts on health. We do not consider that there is any ambiguity in the plan in relation to this issue.	No	PDSP.223.001	emilyg
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Plan should consider the role of libraries.	Library services are delivered outside the Planning system, although recognise the important roles that they play economically and socially. New libraries, if required, would be an acceptable use in most Policy Zones in the city.	No	PDSP.236.001	Glyn Hawley

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>Broaden the vision to give more emphasis to sustainable city and the Outdoor City.</p> <p>The Plan should address the differing roles of the City Centre and Meadowhall given the impact that Meadowhall has had. It should promote better access to and experiences within the City Centre.</p> <p>City Centre car parking should be considered in the Plan, particularly in relation to opportunities for electric vehicle charging as part of public car parks not new developments.</p> <p>The Plan should consider ongoing maintenance of new developments and spaces.</p>	<p>The Vision already refers to sustainability and the Outdoor City.</p> <p>The Plan provides an appropriate framework for considering planning applications in the City Centre and Meadowhall. The City Centre is identified as a 'Town Centre' but Meadowhall is within a General Employment Zone – where town centre uses have to be justified through the sequential test.</p> <p>Policy CO2 and Annex B set out car parking requirements. Policies CO1 and CO2 seek to improve connectivity and promote the provision of electric vehicle infrastructure.</p> <p>Acknowledge that ongoing maintenance is important for place-making. This is often dealt with through management agreements or conditions on development but does not require a reference in the Plan.</p>	No	PDSP.236.004	Glyn Hawley

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		The use and function of libraries needs to be reviewed including the relationship to commercial business development.	Also agree that libraries are an important element of social infrastructure within the city, particularly in relation to inclusive economic growth. The provision and planning of library services does not fall within the scope of the Local Plan.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Duplicate of comment PDSP.236.004	See response to comment PDSP.236.004	No	PDSP.236.005	Glyn Hawley
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Plan should include a policy for ongoing maintenance of buildings and spaces.	Acknowledge that ongoing maintenance is critical to ensuring a positive impact of new development. However, a policy is not required within the Local Plan to ensure long term maintenance of new development. This would be either a landowner/organisational contract or part of the condition on development when planning permission is granted.	No	PDSP.236.006	Glyn Hawley
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Plan should include a section to what Sheffield City Centre's relationship is with Meadowhall and address and understand how Meadowhall and Sheffield city	The retail policies in the Plan support retail and leisure development in the City Centre by the creation of a Primary Shopping Area in the City Centre - policies that are not replicated for	No	PDSP.236.007	Glyn Hawley

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		<p>centre can coexist and offer differing experiences.</p> <p>The Plan needs to develop a better, improved transport structure to Sheffield City Centre - currently the Supertram only supports half of Sheffield.</p> <p>The City Centre needs areas for free parking (to compete with Meadowhall).</p> <p>A shift away from private car journeys towards more sustainable ways of travelling is not inclusive (not all people can walk great distances and need to use their private vehicle). As more people buy electric vehicles they will be more environmentally (in terms of clean air) - these need to be supported particularly for business development within the city centre. Electric charging points supported by electricity generated from solar power.</p>	<p>Meadowhall (which is designated as a General Employment Zone).</p> <p>The transport policies in the Plan such as T1, that seek to improve sustainable transport and create Mass Transit Corridors, will improve connectivity to the City Centre.</p> <p>Car parking charges are not an issue that can be covered in planning policies.</p> <p>Policies CO1 and CO2 seek to improve connectivity and promote the provision of electric vehicle infrastructure.</p>			

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	<p>The Plan and consultation process is not inclusive – failure to engage with students, documents are too long to read and not sufficiently publicised.</p> <p>Concerned that the global scale impacts of the plan will not create a net biodiversity gain, nor generate long term good quality livelihood.</p> <p>More health metrics should be used to measure the success of the Plan.</p> <p>The plan could consider the central issue of waste as a design opportunity within the systems and networks of the city and consider the implications of local</p>	<p>Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The plan includes a minimum 10% requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with national policy. The Plan as a whole should help to deliver good quality neighbourhoods – Policy NC1 in Part 2 of the Plan is particularly relevant.</p> <p>The Plan will deliver health benefits – e.g. active travel, access to open space, improved air quality. However, many other factors (over which the Local Plan has no control) also affect health so it is not considered necessary to include specific metrics.</p> <p>A separate Joint South Yorkshire Waste Management Plan is to be prepared.</p>	No	PDSP.255.001	JadeClarke11

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		resource flows much more globally and ecologically.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Strongly supports the Vision in relation to transport but suggests addition of wording to make the sub-objective regarding rail connections more comprehensive – so, including references to rail connections to Nottingham & Birmingham, as well as improvements to railway infrastructure between Dore and Meadowhall	No changes needed. The wording of the objective reflects the most recent Transport Strategy.	No	PDSP.268.001	Jim Bamford
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Supports the policy but consider it could be enhanced to include the protection of green heritage.	The Plan already provides strong protection for blue and green infrastructure. However, amendments to Policy BG1 are proposed to highlight the need to extend the network of blue and green infrastructure as part of new development.	Yes	PDSP.271.001	JimC
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Support environmental sustainability in the vision.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.285.001	Jonathan789
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Disagrees with the Council's vision and suggests alternative investment priorities - investment in roads, not cycle lanes, to take	No change needed. The Vision reflects Council priorities and is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.	No	PDSP.286.001	Jonnygazza

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		back control of public services from third parties, plant more trees, cut back on student accommodation to further incentivise South Yorkshire residents to go to University here; to celebrate our steel heritage; celebrate that football was born here, to invest in public spaces in all areas; Investment into Green Belt protection is needed, not 'strategic housing'.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Agree with the objections made by the Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust that the Plan does not include Green Network map or Nature Recovery Network.	Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.	Yes	PDSP.331.001	Neil99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Supports de-culverting of the River Sheaf and the increased provision of green and blue infrastructure. But questions why Council isn't doing more.	No change needed in response to this comment. Policy GS9 in Part 2 supports development that enables the removal of any existing culverts and structures over watercourses wherever practicable. Changes are also proposed to Policy BG1 to make it clear that the objective is to extend the network of blue and green infrastructure as well as protecting and enhancing it. Changes also proposed to Policies	No	PDSP.332.001	Nickyleaf

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			SA1-SA8 to make it clear that public access to one bank of main rivers will be supported where there is no conflict with biodiversity or heritage objectives.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The Vision and Objectives do not place strong enough emphasis on the declared Climate Emergency and does not make provisions for Nature restoration and recovery. Suggest amendments to 3 of the Objectives for a Green City	Accept proposed amendments to enhance the objectives for a Green City.	Yes	PDSP.333.001	NicolaDempsey99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Support inclusion of environmental sustainability in the aims.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.341.001	PaulMaddox1960
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Vagueness of sustainability aims/language makes it difficult to enforce and monitor. Needs closer alignment with national guidance. Parkwood Springs LWS is incorrectly displayed on the Policies Map.	Part 2 of the Plan includes a number of indicators that monitor the economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainability. The Local Wildlife Site is incorporated within the site allocation for Parkwood Springs (Site NWS29) but not within the developable area.	Yes	PDSP.343.001	penny71
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 2: Vision,	Comment says, they align with all objections made by Sheffield and	Accept the reference to proposed amendments from the Wildlife Trust	Yes	PDSP.344.001	PeteB1951

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Aims, and Objectives	Rotherham Wildlife Trust comments.	to enhance the objectives for a Green City.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	No comment made.	No change needed. No comment made.	No	PDSP.360.002	RichardW
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	No comments made but has not objected.	No change needed.	No	PDSP.363.001	Robin
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	Support the vision and aims that incorporate environmental sustainability.	Support noted	No	PDSP.375.001	Sean Ashton
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	The plan should include a much clearer spatial analysis of the existing green-blue network highlighting gaps, opportunities and exemplars and contain a much more proactive vision tying into policies on climate change, biodiversity recovery and active travel. It should spell out current and proposed initiatives by both the council and private and third sector partners to extend the G-B network on the policy maps and priority site frameworks. The	Accept in part. Policy BG1 should be refer to the need to extend the Green Network as well as protecting and enhancing it. Although natural capital mapping has been completed for South Yorkshire, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/ Network has not yet been produced. Further references to the LNRS/LNRN should be added to the Plan but the Network (including habitat recovery areas) will need to be set out in a supplementary planning document. It would cause unacceptable delay to the Local Plan	Yes	PDSP.382.001	Simono

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		Natural Capital Maps referred to as the basis of interventions at a site level should be released for comment and consultation as part of the local plan process, not after it has been submitted.	if the Council waits for that work to be completed.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objectives	No comment made.	No change needed.	No	PDSP.411.001	Wendy40

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Ensure increased densities do not harm/ negatively impact heritage assets.	No change needed. Policy NC9 allows for development outside density ranges to take account of conservation areas and heritage assets.	No	PDSP.003.003	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The scope of the Vision should reflect the ecological emergency by committing to actively seek opportunities for the delivery of large-scale enhancements of the natural environment.	The Vision, Aims and Objectives should be read together. Aim 7 'a green city' clearly refers to enhancement of biodiversity and green and blue infrastructure. In addition, amendments are proposed to Policy BG1 that clarifies requirements to extend blue and	Yes	PDSP.006.002	Natural England

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			green infrastructure as well as protecting and enhancing it. An additional paragraph is proposed after paragraph 5.24 in part 1 that highlights the role of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and opportunities to improve connectivity between habitats. The protection and enhancement of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy is covered further in Policies GS5 Development and Biodiversity and GS6 Biodiversity Net Gain.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Support the approach to centres as the focus for 20 minute neighbourhoods.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.007.002	Sport England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The Plan should set out what the housing requirement would be based on the Government's standard method.	The policy approach proposed is different to the standard method. The proposed housing requirement aligns with the level of jobs growth proposed in the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan. It also reflects environmental constraints. A topic paper will give more detail on the justification for the housing requirement differing from the local	No	PDSP.011.001	Derbyshire County Council

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			housing need figure derived from the Standard Method.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Typographical in the paragraph 3.5, 4 th bullet point.	Correct typographical error	Yes	PDSP.014.004	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Support policy approach to density. Potential to increase densities around tram/rail stations to support usage.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.015.002	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The housing requirement is significantly below the figure identified by the standard method and is not justified. The Icen Demographic Modelling study fails to take proper account of the need for people to live near to the area they work in or deal with the rationale behind the 'urban centres uplift'. The Plan does not respond to the Government's intentions in relation to the urban centres uplift. Delivery of affordable housing is not considered within the Icen Demographic	The Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an 'asset of particular importance' and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow	No	PDSP.019.003	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		<p>Modelling. The scale of Sheffield’s affordable housing need identified in the 2019 SHMA represents a significant portion of the proposed housing requirement. Based on the Whole Plan Viability Assessment delivery assumptions, the Plan is unlikely to deliver the number of affordable homes needed. The Council has not identified the exceptional circumstances for deviating from the standard method for determining local housing need. The housing requirement of 2,090 dpa is not justified by the supporting evidence.</p> <p>The Duty to Cooperate has not been met. Unmet housing need is not addressed.</p>	<p>development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.</p> <p>The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery and the Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region.</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The spatial strategy is not sound and effective and housing distribution is unequal and relies too much on the Central Sub Area. Not enough affordable housing will be delivered with the strategy. Green Belt land	The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application	No	PDSP.029.001	Commercial Estates Group (CEG) (Submitted by Lichfields)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		should be released and a site at Oughtibridge allocated. Housing need is not being met.	of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an 'asset of particular importance' and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Would like to see more recognition of how intimately connected new housing is with retail and office activity, especially in the City Centre. There is a concern on the reliance of nighttime industries to bolster the City Centre economy. There is little focus towards accommodating the daytime population (office	No change needed. Accept the point that increasing daytime footfall in the City Centre is critical to success. The Plan proposes a number of priority office locations to ensure delivery of suitable new office accommodation to support an increasing workforce. The Primary Shopping Area seeks to consolidate and support retail uses as a key City Centre role, alongside the cultural	No	PDSP.030.001	Commercial Property Partners (Submitted by Urbana)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		workers, retailers and visitors). Sheffield is not attracting enough people into the City Centre during the day. Increasing the daytime population should be a key priority of the Local Plan.	and food and drink offer, although the Plan does not specifically promote nighttime uses.			
	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify housing requirement figures, so not enough housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth.	The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in	No	PDSP.042.009	Hallam Land Management, Strata 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
			existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The Central Sub-Area is not the most accessible location in the city and the statement is misleading.	The Central Area is a key location for employment and the nucleus of many transport routes in the city. It constitutes a highly accessible location.	No	PDSP.042.010	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The Plan does not meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method. No special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the housing requirement figure. Not enough land for housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth. Green Belt release should be considered in order to	The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and	No	PDSP.042.011	Hallam Land Management, Strata 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
		meet housing need. The IIA explored options for Green Belt release and the Green Belt Review indicates some land performs less strongly.	the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The spatial strategy is not justified or viable. Not releasing Green Belt sites is not justified and the restriction on green field release is not based on evidence and is unsound. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that development will not be viable in most parts of the urban area.	The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the urban area including the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality. In particular, it notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre	No	PDSP.042.012	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	As the Plan does not propose to fully meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method then the Council should have engaged in the Duty to Cooperate regarding meeting needs elsewhere. The Duty to Cooperate has not been met.	The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery. The Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region.	No	PDSP.042.013	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	No exceptional circumstances are given for the Plan not setting the housing requirement based on the level of housing need as calculated using the Standard Method.	The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the	No	PDSP.042.014	Hallam Land Management, Strata 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
			plan area. The Green Belt is an 'asset of particular importance' and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The spatial approach does not fully meet the city's housing needs figure. The proposed housing requirement based on urban capacity is not justified. No evidence is demonstrated to justify exceptional circumstances for not meeting local housing need as calculated using the standard method.	The Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an 'asset of particular importance' and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to	No	PDSP.046.002	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Planning for the housing needs of older people should be given greater priority. Policy should be amended to reference minimum provision of new homes for older people.	Whilst we recognise that there is a high level of need for accommodation from the older population, which is likely to increase over the Plan period, Policy SP2 indicates the scale of delivery of all new homes which would include older people's accommodation.	No	PDSP.056.001	McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify the housing requirement figures. Not enough housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth and is not the most accessible location in the city and the statement is misleading.	The Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the	No	PDSP.065.003	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		<p>The spatial strategy is not justified or viable. Justification for not releasing Green Belt sites is not justified and the restriction on green field release is not based on evidence and is unsound. Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that development will not be viable in most parts of the urban area.</p> <p>The Plan does not meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method. Green Belt release should be considered in order to meet housing need. The IIA explored options for Green Belt release and the Green Belt Review indicates some land performs less strongly.</p> <p>As the Plan does not propose to fully meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method then the Council should have engaged in the Duty to Cooperate regarding meeting needs elsewhere. The</p>	<p>plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth.</p> <p>The Central Area is a key location for employment and the nucleus of many transport routes in the city. It constitutes a highly accessible location.</p> <p>The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the urban area including the Central</p>			

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		Duty to Cooperate has not been met.	<p>Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality. In particular, it notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery. The Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region.</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 3: Growth	Special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify	The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing	No	PDSP.066.011	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Plan and Spatial Strategy	housing requirement figures. Not enough housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth.	need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for accommodating future housing growth.			Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	The Central Sub-Area is not the most accessible location in the	The Central Area is a key location for employment and the nucleus of many transport routes in the city. It	No	PDSP.066.012	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	city and the statement is misleading.	constitutes a highly accessible location.			Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The Plan does not meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method. No special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the housing requirement figure. Not enough land for housing is being allocated, and what is being allocated is unviable and not deliverable. The Central Sub Area is not an optimal location for growth. Green Belt release should be considered in order to meet housing need. The IIA explored options for Green Belt release and the Green Belt Review indicates some land performs less strongly.	The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for	No	PDSP.066.013	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			accommodating future housing growth.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The spatial strategy is not justified or viable. Justification for not releasing Green Belt sites is not justified and the restriction on green field release is not based on evidence and is unsound. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that development will not be viable in most parts of the urban area.	The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the urban area including the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality. In particular, it notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure.	No	PDSP.066.014	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	As the Plan does not propose to fully meet the housing requirement as calculated using the standard method then the Council should have engaged in the Duty to Cooperate regarding meeting needs elsewhere. The	The Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to	No	PDSP.066.015	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		Duty to Cooperate has not been met.	housing delivery. The Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	No exceptional circumstances are given for the Plan not setting the housing requirement based on the level of housing need as calculated using the Standard Method.	The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the <i>starting point</i> for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an ‘asset of particular importance’ and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater	No	PDSP.066.016	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Comment is the online form submission of comment PDSP.066.001-016.	No change needed. This is the online submission for comments that are dealt with under PDSP.066.001 – 016.	No	PDSP.066.017	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	There is not enough employment land allocated to meet the need of the Sheffield Plan. New employment sites should be identified to meet the employment need including safeguarded land for longer term development. The J35 Sheffield Gateway site at Hesley Wood tip should be allocated for employment purposes.	The level of employment land identified within the Plan is sufficient and appropriate. The promoted site is in the Green Belt and release would be contrary to the spatial strategy. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach.	No	PDSP.071.001	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Support the spatial strategy. Compact sustainable city will protect green spaces. Support capacity led approach to housing. Support focus on City Centre delivery.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.099.001	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Promote re-opening of the Don Valley Railway line. Propose locations for new rail stations at	Policies SP1(j), T1, and SA8(f) provide support for improved rail links at both national and regional level.	Yes	PDSP.101.001	Don Valley Railway

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Deepcar, Oughtibridge, Wadsley Bridge, Kelham Island, Victoria Station, Nunnery.	Minor amendments are proposed for consistency across the Plan, including additional reference in policy SA2, to clarify support for future re-opening of the Don Valley line.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Tighten up the wording of paragraph 3.4 by removing the word 'largely'.	No change needed. Less than 1% of proposed new homes are on land currently within the Green Belt so the wording 'largely' is appropriate.	No	PDSP.102.003	Dore Village Society
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Inconsistency between legend/icons between sub area maps and overview maps.	The main purpose of Map 3 is to show the Settlement hierarchy and hierarchy of centres. It is felt that the colours and symbols used on this map convey those purposes clearly. Consistency with other maps was considered less important in this instance as it would reduce the clarity of the map for its main purpose. Differing legends for the different areas of the Policies Map were not considered appropriate, as the Policies map covers the local planning authority area as a whole and should therefore only have one legend associated with it. It is acknowledged that the map could become confusing in some instances	No	PDSP.102.004	Dore Village Society

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			where multiple layers intersect. An online version of the map has also been developed and made available to the public, to aid reading of the map and identification of specific layers.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Designation of Sheffield Hallam University's Collegiate Crescent as student accommodation is incompatible with the Conservation Area. The Campus is currently a teaching campus. Redesignation to allow Purpose Built Student Accommodation would impact the conservation area.	No change needed. The impacts of any future Purpose-Built Student Accommodation scheme would be assessed against the proposed development management policies within the Plan. It is considered that these policies will provide sufficient protection/consideration of the Conservation Area and adjacent Urban Green Space Zone designations.	No	PDSP.106.001	Groves Community Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	References to the Green Network and green infrastructure need to be strengthened and references made to the Nature Recovery Network. Policy should reference enhancement and protection of green and blue infrastructure with more vigorous measures to protect local habitat and wildlife.	Agree in part. A number of changes are proposed to part (l) of SP1 to reflect the changes suggested by the respondent, and to ensure consistency with proposed changes to policy BG1 which make it clear that the network of blue and green infrastructure will be <i>extended</i> as well as protected and enhanced. Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire	Yes	PDSP.127.002	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The level of ambition in the Plan is incompatible with Councils own targets for meeting Net Zero Carbon. Suggests amendment to paragraph 3.1 - amend to refer to need for a Growth Plan that leads to a reduction in Carbon Emissions. A definition of 'Sustainable Growth' should be added to the Glossary.	A range of carbon reduction standards were assessed as policy options in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Policies within the Draft Plan strike a balance between its various aims whilst maintaining overall plan viability. Inclusion of this level of requirement sooner would therefore render the Plan unviable, unless other policies were amended to compensate. However, paragraph 3.1 should be amended to make clear that sustainable growth means supporting economic, social and environmental objectives and, in particular reducing carbon emissions.	Yes	PDSP.140.004	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Support policy approach to housing growth on urban brownfield sites. Support policy	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.191.003	Carol Collins

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
	Spatial Strategy	approach to encouraging sustainable travel.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	The South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Plan doesn't look to be incorporated into the Plan. Why is there no reference to the 'Building with Nature Standards' in the draft Plan? The South Yorkshire Access to Nature maps aren't referenced. Map 17 Blue & Green Infrastructure Map - the map doesn't include the Nature Recovery Network.	<p>Agree in part.</p> <p>Work on a new South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the LNRS) is being led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority but, at the time of drafting the Sheffield Plan, had not been completed. Additional wording is proposed after paragraph 5.24 of Part 1 to clarify progress of work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.</p> <p>A reference to Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework (which incorporates Building with Nature Standards)' should be added to Policy BG1.</p> <p>The title of Map 17 will be amended to make it clear that it only shows the existing network of blue and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Other proposed changes to policy BG1 which make it clear that the network of blue and green</p>	Yes	PDSP.193.002	Caroline Quincey

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			infrastructure will be <i>extended</i> as well as protected and enhanced.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	New development in the city centre to contribute and deliver new open space proportionate to new development.	No change needed. Developers of new residential schemes are required to contribute towards provision of open space. The Sub-area policies for the Central Area include proposals for a significant number of new green spaces and public spaces.	No	PDSP.195.001	Cathy203
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Support focus on brownfield sites and exclusion of Green Belt. Support Local Green Space designations. Allocation sites should exclude areas within Local Wildlife Site boundaries.	Support welcome. Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be made to make in clear that the Local Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site.	Yes	PDSP.201.004	Claire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	The policy of achieving 'Net Zero' carbon by 2030 is an example of the council going	The climate emergency is accepted as an issue by the Council and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment	No	PDSP.222.004	Dystopia247

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	further than their remit as there is no legal requirement for this. 'Net Zero' will run contrary to other policies in the Local Plan such as 'reflecting the needs and aspirations of every person in the city, no matter who they are, where they live, or what stage they are at in their life' and affect housing, industrial and retail policies.	shows that these policies will not put undue burdens on the economy and can be deliverable.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Plan is sound, legal compliant and meets the duty to cooperate.	Support noted.	No	PDSP.269.001	Jim M
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Site allocations that incorporate Local Wildlife Sites should be redrawn to exclude these from their boundary.	Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be made to make in clear that the Local	Yes	PDSP.285.002	Jonathan789

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Plan has not been adequately publicised.	Consultation on the Plan was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.	No	PDSP.287.001	Julie
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Support focus on brownfield sites and exclusion of Green Belt. Support Local Green Space designations. Allocation sites should exclude areas within Local Wildlife Site boundaries.	Support welcome. Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be made to make in clear that the Local Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site.	Yes	PDSP.341.002	PaulMaddox1960
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Support protecting the Green Belt and utilising brownfield sites.	Support noted.	No	PDSP.350.001	Polly Blacker

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		<p>The word 'enhance' is used many times with no reference to monitoring or specifics.</p> <p>There is a lack of accessible children's spaces in the City Centre and on public transport. The old John Lewis building could be utilised to provide this.</p> <p>Cycling infrastructure is currently not properly segregated or joined up meaning people don't feel safe enough to use it.</p>	<p>An appropriate and proportionate monitoring programme is set out in Part 2 of the Plan.</p> <p>The sub-area policies for the Central Area include proposals for a significant number of new green spaces and public spaces.</p> <p>The Plan includes a significant number of policies and proposals which aim to improve cycling infrastructure</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Supportive of local green space allocations and the spatial strategy. The boundaries of allocations sites SES02, SES04, SES05 and NWS29 should be revised to exclude existing Local wildlife Sites.	Support welcome. Where Local Wildlife Sites overlap with allocation site boundaries there is no need for these to be amended as there is continued protection for the designation as part of the non-developable areas of sites. Areas covered by LWS designations within site allocations also provide the potential opportunity for Biodiversity Net Gain. Amendments to the conditions on development of the Site Allocations should, however, be	Yes	PDSP.375.002	Sean Ashton

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			made to make in clear that the Local Wildlife Site is not part of the developable area of the site.			

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Amend part (m) of Policy SP1 to include reference to non-designated heritage assets.	Accept suggested amendment.	Yes	PDSP.003.004	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The local plan needs to be mindful of the potential wildlife and recreational value of some brownfield sites.	No change needed. The wildlife and recreational value of the Site Allocations has been considered as part of the site selection process. Where an issue has been identified, conditions have been attached to the Site Allocations. The proposed development management policies provide sufficient protection for sites of ecological and recreational importance.	No	PDSP.006.003	Natural England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	Supports policy SP1 part (l).	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.007.003	Sport England

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan					
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The approach to logistics is not justified as the Plan is silent on the need for large scale logistics. Agree with the Sheffield Logistics Study which identifies ‘a reluctance [by Sheffield Council] to promote logistics as an investment of choice against industrial development and particularly advanced manufacturing’. This contrasts with economic objective 2 of the Sheffield Plan.	No change is proposed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for logistics is considered sound and supported by the Logistics Study. There is a sufficient supply of land for larger scale warehousing within the wider property market area (covering South Yorkshire, North East Derbyshire, Bassetlaw, Chesterfield and Bolsover). Whilst the study concludes there is strong demand for logistics sites in Sheffield, the need is wider than local and potential occupiers for large warehouse units tend to have a wider area of search. The long-term need for land can be reassessed when the Plan is reviewed after 5 years, so it is unnecessary to identify a full 15-year supply.	No	PDSP.009.004	Bassetlaw District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Question long term demand for higher density housing. Note that there are a number of allocated residential sites in urban areas are currently in active uses, some would also involve a step change from a	No change needed. Site allocations reflect the spatial strategy. The continuation of a policy zone approach, from the current UDP policy areas approach enables residential development to come forward in many areas of the city, including within existing residential areas and	No	PDSP.014.005	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			mix of uses and require substantial resources to achieve the locally derived target to meet housing needs in the City.	transitioning areas. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing land supply. Sheffield is also part of a wider housing market area that extends into neighbouring districts (where a higher proportion of lower density housing is likely to be built).			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The Plan does not fully meet housing needs, or employment needs. Therefore, it does not meet growth aspirations, meet the needs for affordable housing or present a positively prepared strategy. No exceptional circumstances are demonstrated for planning for lower housing growth than the standard method. The evidence shows shortfalls in deliverable housing land supply in relation to the 5 year housing land supply evidence base.	No change needed. Release of greenfield sites from the Green Belt would be contrary to the spatial strategy. The evidence base supports the approach taken to the Plan's housing requirement and employment land supply.	No	PDSP.016.001	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	The housing requirement proposed is significantly lower than the local housing	No change needed. There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. The	No	PDSP.019.004	Avant Homes Yorkshire

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan	need. No exceptional circumstances or justification evidenced for lower requirement. Demographic evidence base does not account for the high level of affordable need. The Duty to Cooperate has not been met as unmet housing need is not addressed.	Council has demonstrated a Duty to Cooperate throughout the Plan making process as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Position Statement (December 2022). Discussions and correspondence have taken place with all local authorities in the sub-area relating to housing delivery and the Council expects to sign a Statement of Common Ground with the other local authorities in Sheffield City Region.			(Submitted by Pegasus Group)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. No justification or exceptional circumstances demonstrated for lower housing requirement. Green Belt constraint alone is not an exceptional circumstance. Strategy will result in less affordable housing and more small homes. Does not consider the full range of housing needs. The 35% urban uplift should be met in Sheffield not through headroom in other authorities. Consider	The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring	No	PDSP.020.001	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			allocating sustainably located Green Belt sites.	local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. No justification or exceptional circumstances demonstrated for lower housing requirement. Green Belt constraint alone is not an exceptional circumstance. Strategy will result in less affordable housing and more small homes. Does not consider the full range of housing needs. The 35% urban uplift should be met in Sheffield not through headroom in other authorities. Consider allocating sustainably located Green Belt sites.	See the response to comment number PDSP.020.001 above	No	PDSP.020.002	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Housing growth is not aligned with economic growth.	The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.	No	PDSP.026.001	CEG (Submitted by Lichfields)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 3: Growth	Policy SP1:	The proposed level of housing in the Sheffield Plan	The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology	No	PDSP.027.001	Chatsworth Settlement

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Plan and Spatial Strategy	Overall Growth Plan	is well below the standard method and should be increased taking this into account and the requirement of 2,323 dpa to provide the required labour supply based on an economic led approach. There is a pressing and significant need for affordable housing in Sheffield. There is therefore much uncertainty as to whether there will be improvements in economic activity rates.	for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.			Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the	The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing	No	PDSP.030.002	Commercial Property Partners

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan	Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre.	requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new housing.			(Submitted by Urbana)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	Based on the Employment Land Review the Plan should have a higher level of	The Employment Land Review provides a robust evidence base to support the approach taken in the Plan.	No	PDSP.030.003	Commercial Property Partners

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan	ambition for planning for employment land.				(Submitted by Urbana)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Plan does not meet local housing need or provide sufficient employment land. A tram extension along Meadowhall- Chapeltown line should be considered.	See the responses to comment numbers PDSP.034.002 to PDSP.034.005 below.	No	PDSP.034.001	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Plan does not meet local housing need.	The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.	No	PDSP.034.002	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Plan does not provide sufficient employment land. Additional sites should be allocated for B Class employment uses.	The level of employment land identified within the Plan is considered to be sound. We consider that the Employment Land Review provides a robust evidence base to support the approach taken in the Plan.	No	PDSP.034.003	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Plan does not provide sufficient employment land – Green Belt land should be released for development	The level of employment land identified within the Plan is considered to be sound. We consider that the Employment Land Review provides a robust evidence base to support the	No	PDSP.034.004	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations				approach taken in the Plan. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites.			Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Tram extension along Meadowhall- Chapeltown line should be considered.	Policy T1 provides strategic support to the priority of securing the future of the tram and expansion in future where viable. There is insufficient evidence to show an extension to Chapeltown would be economically viable.	No	PDSP.034.005	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.035.001	Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.037.001	Gladman Developments Ltd

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.038.001	Gladman Retirement Living Ltd
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Evidence and justification as to how the housing requirement was established is required.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.040.001	Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.041.001	Hallam Land Management (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.042.015	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations							Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Fails to address the employment land needs of Sheffield.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The level of employment land identified within the Plan is considered to be sound.	No	PDSP.042.016	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.042.017	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developmen

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
							ts Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Broad locations are not identified on the Proposals Map or Key Diagram, in line with the NPPF. Reliance on this non designated area and the assumed housing delivery associated with these locations are unsound and both should be deleted from the plan policies.	Broad locations for growth are identified in sub-area policies SA2 (Northwest sub-area), SA3 (Northeast sub-area), SA4 (East sub-area), SA5 (Southeast sub-area), SA6 (South sub-area) and SA8 (Stocksbridge/Deepcar sub-area). The sub-area policies clearly identify the areas and policy zones in which we see a transition to residential over the longer term. The evidence base for housing delivery from these areas is built on this basis. Acknowledge that the zones should be identified on the key diagram in order to reflect paragraph 23 of the NPPF.	Yes	PDSP.042.018	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Release of the Norton Aerodrome Green Belt site only is considered unsound.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Norton Aerodrome site is the only sustainably located brownfield site identified within the Green Belt. Allocation of this site	No	PDSP.042.019	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				therefore meets the aims of the spatial strategy.			(Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Assessed Housing need is not being met. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.043.001	Hartwood Estates (Submitted by Urbana)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. Evidence required to justify exceptional circumstances for not using need as calculated via the standard method.	The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that	No	PDSP.046.003	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Evidence and justification as to how the housing requirement was established is required. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.046.004	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Evidence required to justify exceptional circumstances as not need calculated via standard method.	The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for	No	PDSP.046.005	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new development.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Allocate land specifically to meet the needs of older people. Proposes allocation of a site currently the subject of a live planning application.	No change needed. The site referred to lies within the Green Belt and allocation would not be consistent with the spatial strategy. The Plan does not allocate specific sites to meet the needs of older people as this could reduce developability of those sites if a scheme doesn't come forwards. However, policies within the Plan are supportive of development of accommodation to	No	PDSP.048.001	Inspired Villages (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				meet the needs of older people, in appropriate locations.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.052.001	Lime Developments (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.054.001	Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.054.002	Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			meet housing need calculated under the standard method.				(Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Planning for the housing needs of older people should be given greater priority. Policy should be amended to reference minimum provision of new homes for older people.	Whilst we recognise that there is a high level of need for accommodation from the older population, which is likely to increase over the Plan period, policy SP2 indicates the scale of delivery of all new homes which would include older people's accommodation.	No	PDSP.056.002	McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Release of Green Belt Sites should be considered. Consultation process is unsound as there has only been one consultation.	There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. The Council has undertaken Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultations in line with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.	No	PDSP.064.001	Mr Lalley and Miss Knight (Submitted by Townsend Planning Consultants)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the	The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability	No	PDSP.065.004	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			standard method. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop.	Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method.	The Plan accords with the NPPF. The Government’s standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield’s housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans	No	PDSP.065.005	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The City Centre is a highly sustainable location for new development.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure.	No	PDSP.065.006	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have	No	PDSP.065.007	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations			Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield.	already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Release of the Norton Aerodrome Green Belt site only is considered unsound.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Norton Aerodrome site is the only sustainably located brownfield site identified within the Green Belt. Allocation of this site therefore meets the aims of the spatial strategy. A 5-year supply based on this level of development is set out in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.	No	PDSP.066.018	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect	No	PDSP.066.019	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan	by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop.	the Green Belt. A 5-year supply based on this level of development is set out in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.			Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. A 5-year supply based on this level of development is set out in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City	No	PDSP.066.020	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Release of the Norton Aerodrome site only is considered unsound.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Norton Aerodrome site is the only sustainably located brownfield site identified within the Green Belt. Allocation of this site therefore meets the aims of the spatial strategy	No	PDSP.066.021	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. Development along improved transport corridors would increase the prospects of creating key pieces of infrastructure that would be more viability as a	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Focussing growth in the Central Area is the most sustainable option in terms of reducing the need to travel and reducing carbon emissions.	No	PDSP.067.001	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			result of increasing the population and businesses in the catchment areas of the proposed new station.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method. Development along these improved transport corridors would increase the prospects of creating key pieces of infrastructure that would be more viability as a result of increasing the population and businesses in the catchment areas of the proposed new station at Handsworth.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.067.002	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	The employment land requirement is too low. And the Employment Land	No change needed. The Employment Land Review Update 2021 represents an up-to-date position of the employment	No	PDSP.068.001	Norfolk Estates

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan	Review methodology is flawed.	land supply in the city. It is considered this is consistent with the NPPF that requires the preparation of Plans to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date, proportionate evidence, that focuses on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and takes into account relevant market signals. The employment evidence base represents an up-to-date position of the employment land supply and the economic market in the city. Employment land has been proposed for allocation on the basis of this.			(Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The housing requirement is lower than that derived through the standard method. Consider allocating sustainably located Green Belt sites.	Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering	No	PDSP.069.001	OBO Quinta Developments (Submitted by Urbana)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	include reference to the Sheffield Innovation Spine as a priority location for economic growth.	The development management policies, Policy Zones and Sub Area policies support the Sheffield Innovation Spine, so there is no need to provide further wording within this policy. However, it is proposed that the Innovation Spine is referenced in Policy SA1 and in the supporting text for Policy CA3.	Yes	PDSP.074.001	Sheffield Hallam University (Submitted by Urbana)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Assessed Housing need is not being met. More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre.	No change needed. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy utilises the land	No	PDSP.074.002	Sheffield Hallam University (Submitted by Urbana)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations				available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. More Green Belt sites for houses should be released.	Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and	No	PDSP.075.001	Sheffield Hospital Charity (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				housing growth in the Plan are aligned.. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Include a reference to the Sheffield Innovation Spine as a priority location for economic growth.	The development management policies, Policy Zones and Sub Area policies support the Sheffield Innovation Spine, so there is no need to provide further wording within this policy. However, it is proposed that the Innovation Spine is referenced in Policy SA1 and in the supporting text for Policy CA3.	Yes	PDSP.076.001	Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The Employment Land Requirement should be increased to upper end of scenarios modelled in ELR.	No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the ELR.	No	PDSP.078.001	St Pauls Developments plc and Smithywood Business Parks Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	Employment Land Requirement should be	No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for	No	PDSP.078.002	St Pauls Developments plc and

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan	increased to upper end of scenarios modelled in ELR.	employment is considered sound and supported by the ELR.			Smithywood Business Parks Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The Plan does not fully meet housing needs under the standard method. Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method.	Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is	No	PDSP.079.001	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned.. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Additional sites should be considered along the proposed Don Valley Line.	No change needed. The site allocations reflect the spatial strategy. The potential to reopen the Don Valley Line is at an early (Strategic Outline Business Case) stage. Some significant Housing Sites in the Upper Don Valley already have planning permission.	No	PDSP.084.001	Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The Plan is sound and based on robust evidence.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.099.002	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The Plan is sound and based on robust evidence.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.099.003	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Tables 1 and 2 are inconsistent with figures in Policy SP1.	Acknowledge that housing capacity figures should be consistent throughout the document. A schedule will be produced to highlight any changes arising in site and overall capacity. This will also take account of new planning permissions during 2022/23 and any proposed allocations that have been completed during 2022/23.	Yes	PDSP.102.005	Dore Village Society
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The housing requirement falls below that calculated using the Government's standard method. The proposed housing requirement will not meet affordable housing need.	Government's standard methodology for assessing housing need provides the starting point for setting the housing requirement. The NPPF states that plans should provide for the objectively assessed housing need unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area. The Green Belt is an asset of particular importance and the Council does not consider that exceptional	No	PDSP.112.001	Home Builders Federation

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				circumstances exist to justify altering the boundary to allow development on greenfield sites. Although neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they are unable to meet any of Sheffield's housing need, there is headroom in existing adopted plans that can cater for migration from other parts of the UK and from abroad. The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Amend policy and supporting text to reference non-designated heritage assets.	Accept. Propose adding a reference to non-designated heritage assets in Part (m) of Policy SP1.	Yes	PDSP.116.002	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Include amended reference to non-designated heritage sites and assets and industrial/cultural significance.	Accept. Propose adding a reference to non-designated heritage assets in Part (m) of Policy SP1.	Yes	PDSP.116.003	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Suggested wording to reference creation of new blue and green assets and link to the Local Nature Recovery Network.	Agree in part. A change is proposed to part (l) of SP1 to reflect the changes suggested by the respondent, and to ensure consistency with proposed changes to policy BG1. Changes include extension of green and blue infrastructure sites and assets with a focus on the Local Nature Recovery Network.	Yes	PDSP.120.002	Owlthorpe Fields Action Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	SP1 (l) - Policy needs to reflect National (Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework) & Local Strategies. Lack of an up-to-date Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy. Amendments suggested to Policy BG1. Map 17 does not represent the Green Network and needs renaming. Blue Infrastructure needs to be made clearer and habitat opportunity areas need adding. BG1 - suggest new paragraph added referring to Ecological Networks.	A reference to Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' should be added to Policy BG1. Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats – amendments to Policy BG1 are proposed. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview but the detail is provided on the Policies Map.	No	PDSP.122.001	Rivelin Valley Conservation Group

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The plan does not establish a green network, merely focuses on the existing green infrastructure.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats – amendments to Policy BG1 are proposed. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview but the detail is provided on the Policies Map.	Yes	PDSP.125.002	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Support the creation of ‘20-minute neighbourhoods’ where everyday needs can be met within a short walk or cycle ride. There is an absence of strategy around connections and cycle routes across the city. Fully support the first two aims of transport strategy relating to public transport and active travel. Strongly supports the	Support noted and welcomed. No change proposed as Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and SYMCA Active Travel Implementation plan.	No	PDSP.130.001	Sheffield CTC and Cycle Sheffield

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			objectives for a connected city.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	There needs to be more emphasis on nature recovery and on extending the Green Network. Rewording of part (l) of Policy SP1 suggested.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Agree the suggested change should be made to Policy SP1.	Yes	PDSP.131.001	Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The wording around climate change and reducing carbon emissions and building a resilient city should be strengthened.	No change needed. The Policy sets out the spatial strategy for development within the city, which in turn reflects the balance between the need to reduce carbon emissions and respond to the climate emergency, whilst ensuring that the Plan is viable and deliverable.	No	PDSP.140.005	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Housing and population projections should be based on 2021 census, not 2014 growth projections.	No change needed. The Government's standard methods stipulates the 2014 household projections must be used as the baseline.	No	PDSP.208.001	D Smith

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	5 minute cities are imposing on freedoms.	The plan incorporates guidance on '20 minute neighbourhoods', which aims to ensure new developments are within a 20 minute walk or cycle ride of essential services and public transport connections. It doesn't involve imposing restrictions on existing communities.	No	PDSP.215.001	debasana
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Net Zero approach will have a negative impact on all aspects of life and goes beyond the Council's remit.	No change needed. Policies in the Plan will contribute towards the Council's carbon net zero aspirations.	No	PDSP.222.005	Dystopia247
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Support the policy approach.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.260.001	Jan Symington
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Supports protection of Green Belt.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.267.001	Jill17
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP1: Overall	Support policy approach in particular priority locations for economic growth, focus for retail and leisure uses	Support welcome. Policies SP1(j), T1, and SA8(f) provide support for improved rail links at both national and regional level. Minor amendments are	Yes	PDSP.268.002	Jim Bamford

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	Growth Plan	and sustainable travel. Strengthen part (j) to support improvement to all rail lines through Sheffield and require new road infrastructure to enable active travel and not increase emissions.	proposed for consistency across the Plan, including additional reference in policy SA2, to clarify support for future re-opening of the Barrow Hill line and Don Valley line. The South Yorkshire Active Travel Implementation Plan acknowledges that space will need to be created to develop active travel infrastructure, and that this may require road space to be re-allocated. Policy T1 makes provision to support the re-allocation of existing road space to more sustainable modes to reduce private car use. There is also provision to safeguard land which may be required to enable the delivery of the city's transport programme, including active travel schemes			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Policy should reference to non-designated heritage assets.	Accept. A reference to non-designated heritage assets should be added in part (m) of the Policy.	Yes	PDSP.270.001	Jim McNeil
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	The plan does not establish a green network, it merely focuses on existing green infrastructure.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work	Yes	PDSP.271.002	JimC

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations				on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Policy BG1 should provide better sign-posting to relevant policies in Part 2 of the Plan.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Supports the Plan in general but asks several questions relating to housing demolition, population growth and the implications for education and health facilities.	The requirement for new homes in the plan does not include any significant areas for demolition and is based on modelled population growth over the Plan period. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been produced that identifies the need for infrastructure that is needed to support the growth proposed in the Plan.	No	PDSP.279.001	John Wilkins
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	No comment made.	No change needed, no comment made, support welcome.	No	PDSP.282.001	john73
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Plan should support strategic rail investment; local rail upgrades; strategic highway improvements; new active travel infrastructure;	No change needed. Support for transport schemes are contained in other sub area and development management policies. Support for schemes will also be delivered outside	No	PDSP.316.001	maspiers

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations			extension of the South Yorkshire Supertram network.	the Local Plan through the Transport Strategy. The Plan supports the need to secure the future of the tram and expansion in future where viable.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	There is not enough future provision or protection for the existing green and blue infrastructure/ local nature network. Would like to see more provision as well as strengthening of Local Plan priorities to provide more green spaces.	No change needed. The plan provides a robust framework for considering planning applications that affect greenspace and the local nature network.	No	PDSP.333.002	Nicola Dempsey99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan	Policy does not set out a clear strategy for the protection, enhancement and extension of blue and green infrastructure. References to other strategies - South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. A reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework is proposed to be added to Policy BG1.	Yes	PDSP.393.001	Sue22

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Agree with the focus on developing previously developed sites, which can include sensitive reuse and adaptation of heritage assets.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.003.005	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Support spatial strategy.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.013.002	North East Derbyshire District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.016.002	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method. Fails to address the housing needs of	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into	No	PDSP.018.001	Aldene Developments (Submitted by Urbana)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			different areas of Sheffield. Plan does not meet housing need calculated under the standard method.	assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.019.005	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Approach restricts development in Principal Town of Chapeltown/ High Green. Propose limited Green Belt release in Chapeltown/High Green to meet housing needs.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.019.006	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	The policy approach is not deliverable. Disproportionate emphasis on the Central sub area for new housing delivery which is undeliverable and unsustainable. Emphasis on the Central Area will limit the type of housing delivered.	No change needed. The distribution of allocations is consistent with the spatial strategy. The Central Area is the most sustainable location for new development in terms of reducing the need to travel/ supporting sustainable modes of transport.	No	PDSP.020.003	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	The policy approach is not deliverable. Disproportionate emphasis on the Central sub area for new housing delivery which is undeliverable and unsustainable. Emphasis on the Central Area will	No change needed. The distribution of allocations is consistent with the spatial strategy. The Central Area is the most sustainable location for new development in terms of reducing the need to travel/ supporting sustainable modes of transport.	No	PDSP.020.004	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			limit the type of housing delivered.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.026.002	CEG (Submitted by Lichfields)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Policy should include the Mass Transit Corridors as a spatial focus for future development.	No change needed. The site allocations reflect the overall growth strategy of maintaining development to the existing urban areas, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.027.002	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Allocate additional employment land in the North East of the City (Warren Lane).	No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the Employment Land Review, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.034.006	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development	No	PDSP.038.002	Gladman Retirement Living Ltd

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy		of Sheffield. The Plan does not adequately plan for provision of older persons housing.	and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Plan supports delivery of accommodation for older people in appropriate locations.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.039.001	Gleeson Homes
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Use of space standards needs to be factored into dwelling estimates.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Space standards and housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.039.002	Gleeson Homes
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Use of space standards needs to be factored into dwelling estimates.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Space standards and housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.039.003	Gleeson Homes

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.039.004	Gleeson Homes
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. many of the allocations fall within flood zones 2 or 3, or are on possibly contaminated land, or will lead to impact on heritage assets.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing mix have already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Impacts of sites by flood risk, land contamination and heritage have been assessed via the Site Selection Methodology and supporting documents (e.g. SFRA, HIA)	No	PDSP.040.002	Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that many of the allocated sites would be unviable to develop.	No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.	No	PDSP.042.020	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that affordable housing will not be viable on many of the proposed allocated sites. The Plan will therefore not provide enough affordable homes.	No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure. Affordable homes will also be provided through the Council's stock increase programme and through the capital programmes of Registered Affordable Housing Providers.	No	PDSP.042.021	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	The Plan will result in an under delivery of family homes and specialist accommodation.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.042.022	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
							DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	The Plan will result in an under delivery of family homes and specialist accommodation.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.042.023	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	The Plan will result in an under delivery of specialist older persons accommodation. Policy SP2 should be amended to enable this shortfall to be addressed.	No change needed. Policy SP2 reflects the Council's agreed spatial strategy which does not include release of any greenfield land from the Green Belt. The strategy supports urban renewal and delivery of new homes in sustainable locations. Provision of specialist housing for older people is addressed in policy NC4.	No	PDSP.042.024	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	More sites for houses should be released, particularly outside the City Centre. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Reference is made to	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing	No	PDSP.046.006	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			contributions to additional infrastructure including education and healthcare provision in some of the sub areas but no sites have been allocated or a clear strategy identified to ensure sustainable delivery to support growth.	mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Infrastructure requirements are set out within Policies IN1, DC1 and the accompanying IDP			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.052.002	Lime Developments (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield.	No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate to make some financial contributions towards affordable housing and infrastructure. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed	No	PDSP.065.008	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield.	No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience, in reality, and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable and appropriate. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.065.009	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5-year supply. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience, in reality, and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many	No	PDSP.066.022	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	There are sites of a size and location which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates would be unviable to develop. Additional sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement as set by the Standard Method and provide a 5 year supply. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable. The housing mix has already been factored into assumed site densities and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.066.023	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Allocate additional employment land in the Southeast of the City (Orgreave Park).	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development	No	PDSP.068.002	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy			and protect the Green Belt. The site is greenfield land within the Green Belt so its inclusion as a site allocation would not align with the Spatial Strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Hesley Wood tip site should have been considered as a sustainable brownfield site within the Green Belt.	No change needed. Acknowledge the opportunity for renewal in this location. However, the land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach.	No	PDSP.071.002	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Allocate additional employment land in the Northeast of the City (Smithywood).	No change needed. The approach taken to the need and supply of land for employment is considered sound and supported by the Employment Land Review, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.078.003	St Pauls Developments plc and Smithywood Business Parks Development LLP (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Additional Green Belt sites are required to be allocated to meet the minimum housing requirement.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.079.002	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Additional sites should be considered along the proposed Don Valley Line.	No change needed. The site allocations reflect the spatial strategy. The potential to reopen the Don Valley Line is at an early (Strategic Outline Business Case) stage. Some significant Housing Sites in the Upper Don Valley already have planning permission.	No	PDSP.084.002	Trustees of the Bernard, 16th Duke of Norfolk 1958 Settlement Reserve Fund (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Support the spatial strategy and commitment to deliver growth on previously developed sites.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.088.001	Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	There is a need to demonstrate that the approach will be deliverable and meet housing need. The '20 minute neighbourhood' element of the Policy should include flexibility to allow for delivery of sustainable development and not prevent development on the basis of access to existing facilities.	No change needed. The 20 minute neighbourhood concept is intended to ensure people have good access to a range of services and facilities not to prevent development - the role of larger developments in supporting services and infrastructure is acknowledged.	No	PDSP.112.002	Home Builders Federation
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Remove all references to '20 Minute Neighbourhoods'.	No change needed. The Plan supports sustainable patterns of development	No	PDSP.222.006	Dystopia247

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Support the policy approach to 20 minute neighbourhoods.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.268.003	Jim Bamford
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy	Object to the site allocation SES3 Traveller site. There has not been proper public consultation on the proposal.	The site selection methodology shows that site allocation SES03 is suitable for Industrial and Gypsy/Traveller uses. Public consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. Issues raised by the public will be considered by the Inspector as part of the public examination on the Sheffield Plan.	No	PDSP.283.001	JohnBarbie

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres	The spatial strategy and housing requirement does not meet objectively assessed needs and is not deliverable. Without Green Belt release the spatial strategy will not deliver enough housing to meet	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.059.001	MHH Contracting (Submitted by Urbana)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			housing needs in terms of numbers or types. Propose allocation of promoted Green Belt site to meet needs. The SHMA indicates strong demand for houses whilst delivery is predominantly apartments and student accommodation.	The Council's demographic analysis shows that proposed employment growth and housing growth in the Plan are aligned. The spatial strategy takes account of how the land available can be utilised, taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. In considering how the local housing need should be met the spatial strategy takes into account the importance of prioritising urban and other under-utilised urban sites and optimising density in these locations to make the most efficient use of land.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres	The Queens Road Retail Park should be designated as a District Centre (another similar retail park at Heeley has been designated as a District Centre).	No change needed. Heeley Retail Park is part of a wider area that includes smaller shops and is therefore appropriately allocated as a District Centre. The Queens Road Retail Park is a stand alone retail park divorced from other shops and uses that a District Centre contains. It is therefore designated as a Flexible Use Zone rather than a District Centre.	No	PDSP.070.001	Orchard Street Investment Management (Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and	Policy SP3: The Hierarchy	The policy zone approach does not allow enough flexibility on the range of uses that may develop	No change needed. The policy zone approach incorporates a wide variety of uses, and with regard the specific site referenced at West Bar reflects	No	PDSP.088.002	Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Spatial Strategy	of Centres	over the Plan period on key regeneration sites such as West Bar.	the range of City Centre uses that could come forward on this site that is already under construction. The site falls within a City Centre Office Zone which does not preclude the current mixed-use development from going ahead. The Office Zones contain a significant amount of flexibility, given that 40% of the floorspace can be non-office use. Some requirement for office uses is necessary in order to deliver the spatial strategy of the Plan to meet the City's need for office space.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres	20 minute neighbourhoods are part of a wider agenda seeking to control residents.	No change needed. The concept of 20 minute neighbourhoods is about people having good access to services and facilities near their homes, rather than restricting movement.	No	PDSP.222.007	Dystopia247
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy	Policy SP3: The Hierarchy of Centres	Support the role of Local Centres in providing facilities that will help support 20 minute neighbourhoods.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.268.004	Jim Bamford

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		AMID proposals potentially impact on playing fields at Don Valley Bowl.	No change needed. Don Valley Bowl is proposed to be within an Urban Greenspace Zone.	No	PDSP.007.004	Sport England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Promotes additional site allocation. Site selection process is not sound as not all reasonable alternatives have not been considered.	No change needed. Proposed site allocation is within the Green Belt and would not be consistent with the spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.049.001	Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Duplicate comment.	No change needed. PDSP.076.002 is the only the online submission relating to comments PDSP.049.001-007 and responses are made in relation to individual comments.	No	PDSP.076.002	Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Include a greater level of information relating to each site allocation including heritage designations and historic character.	No change needed. The proposed amendment to include a list of all heritage assets near sites would add too much detail to the site allocations. However, the supporting evidence base including Site Selection Methodology and Heritage Impact Assessment incorporates this detail. These heritage assets would also be taken into account through application of policy DE9 at the planning application stage.	No	PDSP.116.004	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support policy approach that does not allocate Green Belt sites for development. Support Local Green Space designations.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.193.003	Caroline Quincey
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support policy approach that does not allocate Green Belt sites for development. Support Local Green Space designations.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.213.001	Caroline Quincey
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support for Local Greenspace designation for Bolehill Woods.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.221.001	ds_77

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Chesterfield Road (through Woodseats) should not be designated as a Strategic HGV route. Chesterfield Road is narrow in some sections through Woodseats District centre and should be a no through road for heavy vehicles. It shouldn't be a Mass Transit Corridor.	No change required. HGV routes are an existing designation approved by Sheffield City Council and no changes are proposed in Local Plan. The purpose of the Mass Transit Corridors is to enhance public transport services and active travel infrastructure. This is appropriate for a route to and through a district centre.	No	PDSP.227.001	firstname99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		No comment.	No change needed. No comment made.	No	PDSP.242.001	Gwen 54/56
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support proposed greenspace designation for Bolehill Woods, Woodseats.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.261.001	Janaspi
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support Local Green Space designation for Bole Hill Woods	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.299.001	kittiwake
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		No comment. Support.	No change needed. No comment made.	No	PDSP.305.001	Linda10

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support the designation of the Bolehill Wood as Local Green Space.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.318.001	mattfalcon
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support the designation of the Bolehill Wood as Local Green Space.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.328.001	Msdmc
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support protection of sites through Green Belt, Urban Greenspace and Local Green Space designations.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.333.003	NicolaDempsey99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support the designation of the Bolehill Wood as Local Green Space.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.334.001	Nuthatch22
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Inferred support for Local Greenspace designation at Bole Hill Woods.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.374.001	Savegreenspace!!
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Support proposed greenspace designation for Bolehill Woods, Woodseats.	No change needed. Support welcome.	No	PDSP.383.001	Snoop103

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		The Plan will not meet objectively assessed needs. The Plan is not deliverable. Additional land should be identified. Propose release of site from the Green Belt to deliver housing.	No change needed. Allocation of the proposed site would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.044.001	Heritage Estates Yorkshire (Submitted by Urbana)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Sheffield's Sub-Area Strategy		Inconsistent approach to referencing heritage between Central Area and other sub-areas. Site allocations do not consistently reference Conservation Areas / heritage assets. Heritage Impact Assessments identify non-designated heritage assets but sites without HIAs do not.	No change needed. The proposed amendment to include a list of all heritage assets near sites would add too much detail to the sub-area policies. However, the supporting evidence base including Site Selection Methodology and Heritage Impact Assessment incorporates this detail for relevant site allocations. These heritage assets would also be taken into account through application of policy DE9 at the planning application stage for any sites coming forwards within those sub-areas.	No	PDSP.116.005	Joined up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		Comment suggests the map of Sub Central Area is too busy.	Noted. On the interactive Policies Maps online all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension.	No	PDSP.014.006	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		Correct typo in footnote.	No change is needed. The document referenced is titled the Sheffield City Centre Strategic Vision.	No	PDSP.014.007	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		It is our understanding that the Main Employment Zone on Map 6 is a combination of the City Centre Office Zone, General Employment Zone, Industrial Zone, Primary Shopping area and Cultural Zones shown on the Policies Map however, this is not explained clearly within Part 1 of the Sheffield Plan.	No change needed. The Map is for illustration and does not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it.	No	PDSP.055.001	Marks and Spencer (Submitted by JLL)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		Add the following wording:- "Allow for new Purpose-Built Student Accommodation in identified parts of the area but only where evidence demonstrates the demand for further supply in these locations (see Policy NC5 and Policy NC6).".	No change needed. Suggested alternative wording is effectively the same as the wording in Policy NC6. There is no need to repeat the wording in Policy SA1.	No	PDSP.085.001	Unite Group Plc (Submitted by ROK Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text.	No change needed. The Central Sub-Area does include Kelham Island. Map 4 depicts the City Centre and	No	PDSP.116.006	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations				the City Centre Primary Shopping Area.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		On Map 6, page 36, correct the spelling of neighbourhood name to "Cathedral".	Please see amended Map 6 to correct the typographical error.	Yes	PDSP.116.007	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. Add that part of the Character Area lies within the Kelham Island Conservation Area. This is mentioned for the Priority Location and Catalyst Site, but for consistency with other sections should be mentioned for the area as a whole	Noted. On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document also includes more in-depth maps of the proposed neighbourhoods. Amendments to supporting text and policy criteria are proposed to address the comment and provide consistency and clarity.	Yes	PDSP.116.008	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text. Character Area 3 includes the City Centre Conservation Area and a small part of Hanover Conservation Area in addition to Furnace Hill and Well Meadow	Noted. On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document also includes more in-depth maps of the proposed neighbourhoods. Please see amendments to supporting text and policy criteria to address the	Yes	PDSP.116.009	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				comment and provide consistency and clarity.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area		Part 1 • P58: Map top left: add outlines of Priority Locations and Catalyst Sites, for consistency with other areas; Map top right: enlarge, currently too small to be usefully legible.	Noted. The Map is for illustration and does not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Council also produced PDF Policies Maps for the areas to help with accessibility.	No	PDSP.116.010	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Sufficient evidence should be provided through the sustainability appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected. Supportive of approach for Broad Locations	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Habitat Regulations Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified development needs. The proposed development management policies will	Yes	PDSP.006.004	Natural England

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			for Growth. However, more adjustments are needed to policy criteria to ensure policy is compliant with NPPF and recreational/heritage value of sites is retained.	provide protection for sites of ecological and recreational importance within the Broad Locations for Growth (as well as all other areas of the city) but some minor amendments to Policy GS5 are proposed to clarify the need to protect designated sites and priority habitats.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Sites SV07, HC15, SV08, SV09, SU06, HC04 and SV10 are all not deliverable and there is lack of evidence for availability and viability, so we suggest the removal of these. There is insufficient housing supply so the 'Starbuck Farm, Beighton' site should be added.	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need.	No	PDSP.016.003	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Disagree with the spatial strategy approach of concentrating majority of housing growth in Central Sub Area. This will not achieve a diverse housing and tenure mix for the overall provision.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Therefore, it is considered the policy requirements within the Local Plan are robust and appropriate	No	PDSP.020.005	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				to justify the approach taken to the housing requirement and the spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Disagree with the spatial strategy approach of concentrating majority of housing growth in Central Sub Area. This will not achieve a diverse housing and tenure mix for the overall provision.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Therefore, it is considered the policy requirements within the Local Plan are robust and appropriate to justify the approach taken to the housing requirement and the spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.020.006	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	There is not enough provision for older people's housing in Central Sub Area.	Provision of specialist housing for older people is addressed in policy NC4 and is a policy that applies to all areas of Sheffield where a need is identified. Older persons accommodation is acceptable on any of the allocated housing sites where it complies with Policy NC4.	No	PDSP.038.003	Gladman Retirement Living Ltd
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Central	Policy SA1: Central	The need for Industrial and Logistics land identified by logistics study is not met.	The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites	No	PDSP.071.003	Rula Developments

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Sub-Area	Sub-Area	Disagree that there is enough logistics supply. Our site at the former Hesley Wood tip should be added as an allocation.	specifically in the centre of the City. Hesley Wood is not within the Central sub-area. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach.			(Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Sites SV07, HC15, SV08, SV09, SU06, HC04 and SV10 are all not deliverable and there is lack of evidence for availability and viability, so these sites should be removed. We disagree that there is enough housing supply. Our sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and 'Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield should be added as allocations.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Therefore, it is	No	PDSP.079.003	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				considered the policy requirements within the Local Plan are robust and appropriate to justify the approach taken to the housing requirement and the spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	There seems to be an inconsistent approach to site allocations and zoning, where a site can be allocated as strategic mixed use site but also Office Zone.	The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework in making effective use of land. The Central Sub Area is intended to aid in delivering future housing and retail growth as well as commercial activity to ensure long-term viability to the city centre.	No	PDSP.088.003	Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text.	An amendment has been proposed to correct the spelling of Cathedral on Map 6.	Yes	PDSP.116.011	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Typo to correct in the policy, maps or supporting text.	No change needed. The Central Sub-Area does include Kelham Island. Map 4 depicts the City Centre and the City Centre Primary Shopping Area.	No	PDSP.116.012	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	We wish to see a consistent approach applied to the provision of green spaces and the requirement for street tree planting across the Central Sub-	No change needed. Policy GS7 promotes the provision and retention of street trees in all locations.	No	PDSP.135.001	Sheffield Street Tree Partnership (SSTP)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			Area. The requirement for street tree planting should be reinforced across all Central Sub Areas in order to meet the requirements of NPPF para 131. This would strengthen and accord with Local Plan Part 2 Policy GS7: Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	We question the inclusion of site SU30 as an allocation due to its scheduled monument designation and heritage value. The site may not be available.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocation site SU30 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. The site has been assessed in the HIA to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are provided for all impacted heritage assets. In response to comments from Historic England, a	No	PDSP.142.001	South Yorkshire Industrial History Society CIO

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				further condition relating to the impact on a heritage asset has been added.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Remove criteria h) which required the Clean Air Zone as this could have detrimental impact on businesses within the city centre.	The Sheffield Clean Air Zone has been in effect since February 2022. The Zone is one of the essential measures that are needed to address the climate emergency and achieving net zero carbon by 2030 as per the Council's commitment.	No	PDSP.222.008	Dystopia247
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area	Policy SA1: Central Sub-Area	Request for more provision of open and green space within the Central Sub area to be proportionate with housing growth targets.	Please see policy amendments to BG1, SA1, CA1-CA6 to address concerns raised.	No	PDSP.366.001	Ruth Morgan

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character		Historic England supports and welcomes the role the Neepsend Priority Location	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.003.006	Historic England

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Policies and Site Allocations	Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	plays in ensuring the protection of heritage assets.				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Page 132

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	It may be beneficial to make it clearer what is meant as proactively manage flood risk and functional flood plain.	In order to clarify the policy approach as suggested, 'flood plain' and 'proactive manage flood risk' have been added to the Glossary.	Yes	PDSP.002.001	Environment Agency
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already included under Policy CA4.	Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provides further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites and assets as detailed by Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	No	PDSP.003.007	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend,	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend,	None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and	No	PDSP.042.025	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Philadelphia, Woodside)	Philadelphia, Woodside	first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory.	Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.			Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend,	There is a lack of clarity in terms of where employment is projected to come forward in the	The Employment Land Review represents an up-to-date position of the employment land supply in the city. It is considered this is	No	PDSP.060.001	Mr A Spurr (Submitted by Spring Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Philadelphia, Woodside	area as there are currently only two allocations for employment.	consistent with the NPPF that requires the preparation of Plans to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date, proportionate evidence, that focuses on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and takes into account relevant market signals.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Include 'The Spine' proposal within the policy and make references to this.	Reference to the 'Innovation Spine' would not be appropriate in this policy. The proposed amendment to Policy SA1 sufficiently addresses the issue of support for the Spine proposal.	No	PDSP.086.001	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	The Clifton Works site, west of the KN01 should be a future flexible use site rather than general employment.	The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework in regard to making effective use of land. The General Employment Zones provide opportunity and flexibility for a wide range of business to expand, locate and relocate. Other sensitive residential uses are not appropriate in these areas, therefore the General	No	PDSP.089.001	Various Clients (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				Employment Zone boundary is considered to be appropriate.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Add that part of the Character Area lies within the Kelham Island Conservation Area. This is mentioned for the Priority Location and Catalyst Site, but for consistency with other sections should be mentioned for the area as a whole..	An amendment is proposed to paragraph 4.10 - adding a reference the Kelham Island Conservation Area.	Yes	PDSP.116.013	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Make reference to the Upper Don Trail in relevant character areas. Also to incorporate this in proposals.	Amendments are proposed to Policies BG1, SA1, CA1-CA6 to address concerns raised.	Yes	PDSP.151.001	Upper Don Trail Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	Plan for more active travel routes and prioritise cycling and walking provision. Provide more accessible connectivity across the river and railway lines. Highlight Corporation Street leading to	Part d of Policy CA1 already refers to improved access and connectivity. The suggested amendments are overly detailed.	No	PDSP.176.001	AndrewR

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			Bridgehouses roundabout.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside	The Policies Map does not match with the policy in terms of the development expected to take place. More open space provision including blue and green infrastructure should be planned for in Policy CA1.	New open space provision is covered in Policy NC15. A number of new parks and public spaces are already referred to in the policies for the Central Area.	No	PDSP.366.002	Ruth Morgan
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend	Suggest criterion (i) is amended to include reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets to ensure importance is placed on them.	To aid the implementation effectiveness of Policy CA1A, criteria i) has been amended to reflect the points raised in the representation.	Yes	PDSP.003.008	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend	Include land north of Parkwood Road in the Neepsend priority area, which would support the Flexible Use Zone.	The Sustainability Appraisal, Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement. Please see the site's assessment in the updated HELAA for suitability.	No	PDSP.063.001	Mr J Hartley, Arthur's Skips (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend	Include land north of Parkwood Road in the Neepsend priority area, which would support the Flexible Use Zone.	The Sustainability Appraisal, Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement. Please see the site's assessment in the updated HELAA for suitability.	No	PDSP.063.002	Mr J Hartley, Arthur's Skips (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1A: Priority Location in Neepsend	The site shown at number 8 in the diagram on page 23 of the Plan should be designated for mixed uses instead of only housing due to surrounding uses. Change the boundary of the priority neighbourhood to exclude House Skate Park and uses to the Western side of the site.	The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework to make effective use of land. The Central Sub Area will contribute to delivering future housing and retail growth as well as commercial activity to ensure long-term viability to the city centre. Flexible Use Zones allow for a wide variety of uses and are not considered restrictive to future development. They do not prevent current operational uses; any future proposals will be dealt with at application stage.	No	PDSP.083.001	The House Skatepark

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1B: Catalyst Site Between Penistone Road, the River Don and Rutland Road	Sites included in CA1B should have an overall masterplan as to how they will come forward. KN21 should also be referenced in this. As policy stands currently, it is explicit enough to protect heritage assets sufficiently.	To aid the implementation effectiveness of Policy CA1B, an amendment is proposed referencing the emerging Kelham Island and Neepsend Masterplan.	Yes	PDSP.003.009	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1B: Catalyst Site Between Penistone Road, the River Don and Rutland Road	Part 1 - P41 Cannon Brewery is not a Listed Building, so Policy CA1B(c) should read “and nearby heritage assets including Cornish Works, Globe Works and Cannon Brewery”.	Agree – correction proposed.	Yes	PDSP.116.014	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area One (Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia, Woodside)	Policy CA1B: Catalyst Site Between Penistone Road, the River Don and Rutland Road	Repeats comment PDSP.116.14	See response to PDSP.116.114.	Yes	PDSP.116.015	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)		In paragraph 4.19, reference should be to freight line rather than redundant railway.	Accept proposed change.	Yes	PDSP.015.003	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)		The area is dominated by busy roads” does not apply to all the items listed; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Castlegate is now pedestrianised, so it is not clear what is meant by “Castlegate to the north, which restricts movement towards the Wicker Arches”; ▪ “Wicker high street” should be just “Wicker” (its official name) or “the Wicker” (how it is referred to locally); The railway line is in active use, so omit “redundant”. 	Castlegate is part of the Council's Grey to Green scheme, Castlegate to the North means ‘the Wicker’ which is a busy road. The reference in paragraph 4.19 should be to freight line rather than redundant railway	Yes	PDSP.116.016	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate,	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The	More explicit reference to greater connectivity between the City Centre and the Canal towpath	Agree. In order to clarify the approach taken and strengthen the application of the policy, the following amendment is proposed to	Yes	PDSP.001.001	Canal & River Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Wicker, and Victoria	should be provided. No reference in part e) to opportunity to improve environments along the Canal as well as the river.	Policy CA2 criteria e): Enhance pedestrian and cycle environments along main routes and improve the relationship with the river and canal side spaces - creating new riverside routes, supported by active building frontages, and proposals that positively interact with the river and canal side spaces .			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already included under Policy CA4.	Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provide further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites and assets.	No	PDSP.003.010	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Historic England supports and welcomes role Wicker Riverside Priority Location plays in ensuring the protection of heritage assets.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.003.012	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate,	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The	None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land	No	PDSP.042.026	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Wicker, and Victoria	allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory.	Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.			Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The	Policy CA2: Castlegate, The Wicker,	Include 'The Spine' proposal within the policy and make references to this.	Reference to the 'Innovation Spine' would not be appropriate in this policy. The proposed amendment to Policy SA1 sufficiently addresses support for the Spine proposal.	No	PDSP.086.002	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations	Wicker, and Victoria)	and Victoria					
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	There is an inconsistent approach to site allocations for mixed use site and an Office Zone. Policy seems to be too prescriptive for the city centre. CW03 unclear what the site allocation designation means. Capacity at West Bar for housing only reflects Phase 1 and should be 525 units.	The Office Zones contain a significant amount of flexibility, given that 40% of the floorspace can be non-office use. Some requirement for office uses is necessary in order to deliver the spatial strategy of the Plan to meet the City's need for office space. The policy approach is consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework in regard to making effective use of land. The Central Sub Area is intended to aid in delivering future housing and retail growth as well as commercial activity to ensure long-term viability to the city centre. Flexible Use Zones allow for a wide variety of uses and are not considered restrictive to future development.	No	PDSP.088.004	Urbo (Submitted by Asteer Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker,	Repeats comment PDSP.116.016	See response to PDSP116.016	No	PDSP.116.017	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Site Allocations	Wicker, and Victoria)	and Victoria					
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Policy CA2: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria	Policy supported but no comments provided	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.176.002	AndrewR
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Policy CA2A: Priority Location in Castlegate	Welcomes protection of heritage assets, proposal to new public square and new greenspace.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.003.011	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Policy CA2A: Priority Location in Castlegate	Delete criteria c) as there is no clear of evidence of how the Innovation district will be delivered/ no masterplan. Suggest reference be added in for Sheffield Innovation Spine.	Criteria c) of the policy reflects the ambitions to deliver innovation led regeneration in Castlegate as part of strengthening the Spine within the City Centre. This is detailed in the City Centre Strategic Vision as well as the Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks. Reference to the 'Innovation Spine' would not be appropriate in this policy. It is considered that Policy	No	PDSP.076.003	Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				SA1 sufficiently addresses support to the Spine proposal.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Two (Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, and Victoria)	Policy CA2A: Priority Location in Castlegate	Welcomes protection of heritage assets, proposal to new public square and new greenspace. Welcomes the Grey to Green scheme.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.125.003	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield)	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to	No	PDSP.042.027	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Development s Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield)	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	A reference should be added in for Sheffield Innovation Spine to ensure consistency.	A reference to the Spine is proposed in an amendment to paragraph 4.28. Support for the Spine proposal is also covered under changes proposed to Policy SA1	Yes	PDSP.076.004	Sheffield Technology Parks Ltd (Submitted by nineteen47)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and	Include 'The Spine' proposal within the policy and make references to this. Suggest the CA3 boundary should reach further up Tenter Street and Broad Lane to	A reference to the Spine is proposed in an amendment to paragraph 4.28. Support for the Spine proposal is also covered under changes proposed to Policy SA1. However, we consider that the Flexible Use	Yes	PDSP.086.003	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	University of Sheffield)	University of Sheffield	touch the University of Sheffield Diamond Building to create a city centre Innovation Spine that could eventually house between two and four large, flagship Innovation buildings This could be achieved by reassigning some of the "Flexible Use" area surrounding CA3 into a city Innovation Spine.	Zone remains appropriate in dealing with future development proposals in the Spine area. Please see amended Policies Map for the new boundary of the area covered by Policy CA3.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield)	Policy CA3: St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield	The area includes the City Centre Conservation Area and a small part of Hanover Conservation Area in addition to Furnace Hill and Well Meadow.	An amendment is proposed to include references to the City Centre and Hanover Conservation Areas in paragraph 4.26.	Yes	PDSP.116.018	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield)	Policy CA3A: Priority Location in Furnace Hill	Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already. included under Policy CA4.	Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provides further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites and assets.	No	PDSP.003.013	Historic England

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield)	Policy CA3A: Priority Location in Furnace Hill	Supports criteria d) and the approach taken.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.003.014	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Three (St Vincent’s, Cathedral, St George’s and University of Sheffield)	Policy CA3B: Catalyst Site at the Gateway between Scotland Street, Smithfield, and Snow Lane	Supports criteria b) and the approach taken.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.003.015	Historic England

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
---------------	---------	--------	-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

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

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Supports criteria g) and the approach taken.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.003.016	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural	None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report,	No	PDSP.042.028	Hallam Land Management, Strata

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory.	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability			Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	o 4.35 Park Hill Flats are Grade II*; o Add that part of the area lies within the Cultural Industries Quarter Conservation Area.	The Maps are for illustration they do not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. Please see proposed amendments to paragraph 4.36.	Yes	PDSP.116.020	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival,	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries	Reference to be made to Porter Brook Trail in CA4. Include further opportunities to	Requirements relating to deculverting are covered in Policy GS9 – there is no need to repeat those	No	PDSP.125.004	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Quarter, Sheaf Valley	deculvert, admit daylight and re-naturalise the River Sheaf and Porter Brook.	requirements in this policy. Conditions relating to deculverting are included in relevant site allocations in Annex A of the Plan.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, re-naturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.177.001	Andy Buck
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, re-naturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.220.001	DJGShef
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for de-culverting,	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of	No	PDSP.229.001	Gaffer

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	re-naturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.232.001	Gill
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.245.001	Hilary
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival,	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and	No	PDSP.267.002	Jill17

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Quarter, Sheaf Valley		will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.281.001	John59
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.284.001	JoM
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.306.001	LisaG

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations	Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Sheaf Valley	renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.329.001	nahtalix
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Policy CA4: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley	There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.346.001	PeterB
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area – Character Area Four (City Arrival, Cultural Industries	Policy CA4A: Part of Priority Location and Catalyst	Suggests text in section c) in CA4A to be moved to Policy CA4 above as deems that more appropriate to mention de-culverting priorities.	It is considered that criteria c) is more appropriately located in Policy CA4A. No modification is required. Deculverting is also	No	PDSP.125.005	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Site Allocations	Quarter, Sheaf Valley)	Site at Moorfoot - Land between Eyre Street, St Mary's Road, and Jessop Street		expected more generally (where practicable) under Policy GS9.			

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

Site Allocations	Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)					
------------------	--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	Character area policies should include a statement regarding the expected treatment of heritage assets similar to that already included under Policy CA4.	Policy SP1 criteria m) and Policy D1 provide further details to the Local Plan's commitment to the protection, management and enhancement of heritage sites.	No	PDSP.003.018	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area	No	PDSP.042.029	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.			Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	HC03 is deemed as not available, suitable, achievable (including viable) or deliverable as envisaged by the proposed site allocation. The ownership is questioned and there is a substation on site as well. Recommendation to remove HC03 as a site allocation.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocation HC03 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area and be delivered as part of the emerging Moorfoot Masterplan, thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear	No	PDSP.051.001	Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Moorfoot is a priority location and public sector financial support will be sought if necessary to tackle any abnormal development costs. Therefore, it is considered that HC03 remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street	P56, paragraph 4.41 and P57 4.44 should refer to “Winter Garden” rather than “Gardens”. The former is its official name.	Please see policy amended to correct the typo.	Yes	PDSP.116.021	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, The	Policy CA5: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street,	Add a Map showing the neighbourhoods.	On the interactive Policies Maps all layers can be viewed in isolation which should help with comprehension. The Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document	No	PDSP.116.022	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Springfield, Hanover Street		also includes more in-depth maps of the proposed neighbourhoods.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5A: Priority Location in Moorfoot	HC03 is deemed as not available, suitable, achievable (including viable) or deliverable as envisaged by the proposed site allocation. Remove reference to HC03 in all of CA5A in criteria a) f) h). Recommendation to remove HC03 as a site allocation. New community proposals should focus on allocation sites HC08, HC11, HC20.	See response to PDSP.051.001.	No	PDSP.051.002	Lidl GB (Submitted by ID Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5A: Priority Location in Moorfoot	Suggests text in section f) in CA5A to be moved to Policy CA5 above as deems that more appropriate to mention de-culverting priorities. Add more text about the Porter Brook Park proposals.	It is considered that criteria f) is more appropriately located in Policy CA5A. No modification is required. Deculverting is also expected more generally (where practicable) under Policy GS9.	No	PDSP.125.006	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area	Policy CA5B: Catalyst Site at the	HC03 is deemed as not available, suitable, achievable (including viable) or	See response to PDSP.051.001.	No	PDSP.051.003	Lidl GB (Submitted

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Junction between St Mary's Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road	deliverable as envisaged by the proposed site allocation. Remove reference to HC03 in all of CA5A in criteria a). Recommendation to remove HC03 as a site allocation and as part of a Catalyst site.				by ID Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5B: Catalyst Site at the Junction between St Mary's Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road	P61: Describe Catalyst Site as "Moorfoot". The current description "Junction between St. Mary's Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road" is incorrect. There is no succinct description using street names.	The title for the Catalyst site comes from the Sheffield City Centre Priority Neighbourhood Frameworks document. We consider this is an accurate description of the location which is also shown on the Policies Map.	No	PDSP.116.024	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Five (Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street)	Policy CA5B: Catalyst Site at the Junction between St. Mary's Gateway, The Moor Street, and London Road	Repeats comment PDSP.116.024	See response to PDSP.116.024.	No	PDSP.116.023	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

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

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen's Road)	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen's Road	It may be beneficial to make it clearer what is meant as proactively manage flood risk here. Functional flood plain.	In order to clarify the policy approach as suggested, 'flood plain' and 'proactive manage flood risk' have been added to the Glossary.	Yes	PDSP.002.002	Environment Agency
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character	Policy CA6: London Road and	None of the allocation sites in the Local plan are viable and therefore are not deliverable. Move all allocation sites out of	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report and	No	PDSP.042.030	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes,

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Area Six (London Road and Queen's Road)	Queen's Road	the first 5 years of the Housing Trajectory.	Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified housing requirement in the city of Sheffield over the plan period. The proposed allocations in Policies CA1 to CA6 will contribute to meeting housing need in the Central Sub Area thereby supporting local services provision. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. Therefore, it is considered that City Centre development remains viable, deliverable and appropriate.			Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen's Road)	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen's Road	P63: o Add map showing neighbourhoods; o Add the part of the Character Area lies within the John Street Conservation Area. This is mentioned in	The Maps are for illustration they do not constitute part of the policy or Policies Map, so there is no reason to change it. No change needed as the John Street Conservation Area is mentioned in the policy.	Yes	PDSP.116.0 26	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			the policy, but for consistency with other sections should be mentioned in the supporting text.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Central Sub-Area - Character Area Six (London Road and Queen's Road)	Policy CA6: London Road and Queen's Road	The reference to the Porter Brook in paragraph (d) is incorrect. This should refer to the River Sheaf	Please see proposed amendment to part (d) of the policy	Yes	PDSP.125.007	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust

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

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	In terms of the Sub Area Strategy. The SA and HRA should provide sufficient evidence to justify the site selection process and that sites of least environmental value are selected.	It is considered the Integrated Impact Assessment Report, Habitat Regulations Assessment, and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified development needs. The proposed development management policies will provide protection for sites of ecological and recreational importance within the Broad Locations for Growth (as well as all other areas of the city) but some minor amendments to Policy G55 are proposed to clarify the need to protect designated sites and priority habitats.	No	PDSP.006.005	Natural England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA2 includes 1,015 new homes. There is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. The strategy for meeting the identified need should not prevent the delivery of other sustainable sites or sustainable developments.	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in Northwest Sheffield and is in the Green Belt; and there are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green	No	PDSP.016.004	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			To address soundness matters, the Spatial Strategy should be updated to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site.	Belt to meet housing need. Allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Plan only aims to deliver 1,015 homes in the Northwest Sheffield (60 per Annum). This level of development is significantly less than what is necessary. It should be noted that 480 homes are delivered across two sites, NWS09 and NWS10 at a density of 67 dwellings per hectare. Removing these from the list results in all other sites being developed at a density of 40 dwellings per hectare, however many of these are significantly higher, including NWS11, 21 and 22 all broadly 150 dph. It is clear a broad range of homes are required, and in order to achieve this increased and/or alternative housing allocations are required.	No change needed. The spatial strategy uses available land efficiently while prioritising sustainable development and protection of the Green Belt. There is no valid reason to alter the strategy, density policy NC9, or the specified land use densities. The densities reflect the relative accessibility of the sites in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	No	PDSP.020.007	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 4: Northwest	Policy SA2:	The Plan only aims to deliver 1,015 homes in the North West Sheffield (60 per Annum). This level of	No change needed. The spatial strategy uses available land efficiently while prioritising	No	PDSP.040.003	Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area	Northwest Sheffield	development is significantly less than what is necessary. It should be noted that 480 homes are delivered across two sites, NWS09 and NWS10 at a density of 67 dwellings per hectare. Removing these from the list results in all other sites being developed at a density of 40 dwellings per hectare, however many of these are significantly higher, including NWS11, 21 and 22 all broadly 150 dph. It is clear a broad range of homes are required, and in order to achieve this increased and/or alternative housing allocations are required.	sustainable development and protection of the Green Belt. There's no valid reason to alter our strategy, density policy NC9, or the specified land use densities.			Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in policies CA1 to CA6 and SA 3,4, 5, 8 AND 9 as being unviable. While each site will of course have its own circumstances and for these allocations to be sound the council will need to demonstrate that they are capable of being delivered, if they are to be included in the five year land supply from the date of adoption or at least deliverable	No change needed. While the WPVA may indicate sites in certain locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocation is viable and deliverable.	No	PDSP.042.031	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			within the plan period. At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA2 is that they are unviable and not deliverable and as such it would be unsound to include these sites within the plan.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. The Sub-Area policy aims to deliver approximately 1015 homes in the named larger villages. SA2 b) talks of delivering several Site Allocations, identified by number, could these also be named here in the text?	No change proposed. The Sites allocated in the North West Sub Area are listed in Appendix 1.	No	PDSP.260.003	Jan Symington
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Policy SA2 seeks to deliver approximately 1,015 new homes (2.8% of the proposed housing requirement). This level of growth is too low to support this area of the city and Green Belt land needs to be released. As such, a selected number of well-planned urban extension sites around the built up area of Sheffield, relating to the existing hierarchy of settlements,	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.067.003	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			and not unduly harming the purposes of Green Belt, would make an important contribution to achieving this objective.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. policy SA2 includes 28.3ha of existing permissions and site allocations for employment land. This includes sites NWS02, NWS04, NWS05, and NWS06 are allocated for industrial; and Sites NWS01, NWS03 and NWS07 are allocated for General Employment. None of these sites will satisfy the need for Industrial and Logistics land as identified by Savills or the Council's own Logistics Study. None of the sites are of strategic size or in a strategic location close to the Strategic Road Network or a motorway junction. To address soundness matters, Rula Developments Ltd propose the Council: reviews the Spatial Strategy and identifies sites to meet the need for Industrial and Logistics; and allocates Rula's site	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach.	No	PDSP.071.004	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA2 includes 1,015 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability or availability of the sites allocated. To address soundness, the Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.079.004	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Supports Policy SA2 definition of the sites for housing in the Northwest Sub-Area, which are mainly located in the Upper Don Valley, benefitting from long established centres of population and strong sustainable transport links. Strongly supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt. Supports sustainable	Welcome support for Policy SA2 and the decision to not allocate Hepworth's site. Agree that the Local Plan should clarify that biodiversity should usually take precedence where there is a conflict with recreational objectives; an amendment to paragraph 5.25 is proposed to make this clear. The local plan's development management policies already proportionally prioritise protecting and	Yes	PDSP.104.001	Friends of the Loxley Valley

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			outdoor recreation opportunities but would welcome explicit recognition in the Local Plan that the interests of biodiversity should hold sway over inappropriate recreational pressures.	enhancing biodiversity over harmful development, especially Policies GS5, GS6 and GS7.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Despite the welcome emphasis on developing brownfield sites, some may have developed into valuable wildlife habitats. In particular, Site Allocation NWS29 incorporates part of a Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) within its boundary. The boundary of site allocation NWS29 should be reviewed to exclude the Local Wildlife Site.	Suggest minor amendment; add a condition to all allocations that include a Local Wildlife site within the red line boundary. The condition makes it clear that the developable area does not include the Local Wildlife Site (and their buffers). This potentially makes it easier to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain onsite.	Yes	PDSP.104.002	Friends of the Loxley Valley
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The description of Wardsend Cemetery Heritage Park in paragraph 4.56 does justice to its unique character and location. Wardsend Cemetery Heritage Park should be designated as a Local Nature Reserve. The Upper Don Trail should be named in the Local Plan with a commitment to its development and completion.	The plan acknowledges the significance of Wardsend Cemetery in Paragraph 4.55 as a heritage asset. The Policies Map shows the Cemetery's location is within a Local Wildlife Site and a Biological SSSI. Designation of Wardsend cemetery as a Local Nature Reserve is not a planning matter and cannot be done by the Local Plan. However, this can be pursued through a separate	No	PDSP.105.001	Friends of Wardsend Cemetery

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				<p>process involving Natural England.</p> <p>An amendment is proposed to Policy SA2 to include an additional criterion relating to enhancing active travel routes along one bank of the Main Rivers (this would cover the Upper Don Trail).</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Typographical error. Part 1 P65, policy SA2: Correct spelling to "Worrall", from "Worral".	Agreed, this is a typographic error	Yes	PDSP.116.027	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Support the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt.	Support for the decision to not allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane in the Green Belt for development is welcomed.	No	PDSP.120.003	Owlthorpe Fields Action Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Paragraph 4.56 should be amended to add reference to the importance of nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage for both Rivelin and Loxley Valleys.	Minor change is proposed to paragraph 4.46. The importance of our River Valleys as part of the city's blue and green infrastructure for nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage	Yes	PDSP.122.002	Rivelin Valley Conservation Group

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				should be acknowledged in the justification for the policy			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Respondent supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt.	Support for the decision not to allocate the Former Hepworth's site is welcomed	No	PDSP.127.003	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt.	Support for the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site is welcomed.	No	PDSP.139.001	South Yorkshire Bat Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Support the decision to designate land adjacent to 137 Main Road, Wharnccliffe Side as Urban Green Space. We question why the site had not been designated as Green Belt, which is more appropriate than an Urban Green Space.	Changing the site's designation to Green Belt is contrary to our Spatial Strategy. However, support for the decision to designate the site as Urban Green Space Zone is welcomed.	No	PDSP.139.002	South Yorkshire Bat Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Support the 2 bullet points in g), i.e., Deliver sustainable transport improvements, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active travel improvements, including projects proposed by Connecting Sheffield; and • Mass Transit Corridors at: (i) City Centre to the Upper Don Valley; 	Support for the policy is welcomed. The main purpose of the Mass Transit Routes is to improve public transport and active travel infrastructure along those routes. The junction improvements at Shalesmoor are being undertaken partly to	No	PDSP.268.005	Jim Bamford

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			and (ii) City Centre to Chapeltown and High Green. Strongly objects to delivery of the "A61 highway junction improvements and links to Penistone Road", Shalesmoor (in point g); as the proposed changes to the Shalesmoor junction will worsen bus journeys into the City Centre (routes 81&82) and worsen the position of cyclists relative to cars – all of which is completely contrary to the thrust and specific policies elsewhere in this Spatial Strategy.	improve journey times on the tram. The needs of bus users and cyclists have been taken into account in designing the junction improvements.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Policy SA2 recognises that Hillsborough is prone to congestion without providing a solution. Respondent suggests: - Make the A6101 a strategic Route (), and - Add an additional item to Policy SA2 condition g) Deliver sustainable transport improvements, including: "- Make improvements to highway, tram routes and junctions on the A6101 (Rivelin Vally Road), including Malin Bridge, Holme Lane and Bradfield road (together with links to	These matters need to be considered as part of a new Transport Strategy which is due to be produced in 2024.	No	PDSP.271.003	JimC

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			Penistone Road and Middlewood Road) to improve traffic flows and hence reduce congestion and the resultant pollution."				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Support the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt.	Support for the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site is welcomed.	No	PDSP.271.004	JimC
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	The Plan does not appear to contain any policies supporting an extension to the South Yorkshire Supertram network beyond some vague words in Policy T1 - Policies SP1, SA2 and T1 should be rewritten to include extension of the South Yorkshire Supertram network to serve Stocksbridge, existing settlements and proposed developments along the A6102 Mass Transit Corridor. There is no reference to the reopening of the Sheffield – Stocksbridge railway to passengers. I suggest that the relevant parts of policies SP1, SA2 and T1 are rewritten to include the above.	No change needed. Support for transport schemes is contained in other sub area and strategic policies. Support for schemes will also be delivered outside the Local Plan through the Transport Strategy. Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional references to reopening of the Upper Don Railway Line are proposed in Policies SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8.	No	PDSP.316.002	maspiers

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA2: Northwest Sheffield	Paragraph 4.56 should be amended to add reference to the importance of nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage for both Rivelin and Loxley Valleys.	Minor change is proposed to paragraph 4.46. The importance of our River Valleys as part of the city's blue and green infrastructure for nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage should be acknowledged in the justification for the policy	Yes	PDSP.393.002	Sue22

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Support Policy.	Support for the policy is welcomed.	No	PDSP.012.001	Ecclesfield Parish Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, the Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in	No	PDSP.016.005	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site.	Northeast Sheffield and is in the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Support the decision to Allocate Site NES19 Buzz Bingo, Kilner Way Retail Park (access from Halifax Road) for future residential development as site allocation NES19. Suggest change the total site capacity from 24 to 50 homes. This amendment would provide a more substantive contribution to the Council's housing requirements, recognising the challenge imposed by the Government's ambition to secure the 35% uplift.	Support for the site allocation is welcomed, however, there is no reasonable justification for increasing the expected yield to a density range outside what is specified in Policy NC9. Neither is there any justification for changes to policy NC9. This does not prevent an applicant making an application for a higher density as the policy does allow densities outside of the specified ranges in certain circumstances.	No	PDSP.031.001	Derwent Development Management Ltd (DDML) (Submitted by Aylward Town Planning Ltd)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 4: Northeast	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in policy SA3 as being unviable. While each site will have its own circumstances, the council will	No change needed. While the Whole Plan Viability Assessment may indicate sites in	No	PDSP.042.032	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area		need to demonstrate they are deliverable within the plan period for these allocations to be sound and included within the plan. At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA3 is that they are unviable and not deliverable. As such it would be unsound to include these site allocations within the plan.	certain locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocation is viable and deliverable.			Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Policy SA3 proposes delivery of approximately 970 new homes (2.7% of the overall housing requirement), which is too low a proportion of growth to support Northeast Sub Area and so the amount of new housing should be increased. The Council can increase the delivery of housing by adopting the alternative spatial strategy of releasing a number of suitable unconstrained Green Belt sites, as a selected number of well planned urban extensions around the built up area of Sheffield. They would relate to the existing hierarchy of settlements and would not unduly harm the purposes of Green Belt. This alternative spatial approach would provide an opportunity to deliver sites such as on land south of Whitley Lane, Grenoside that would provide convenient access to employment areas outside the city centre.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land south of Whitley Lane is in the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify altering the Green Belt boundary.	No	PDSP.054.003	Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Policy SA3 proposes delivery of approximately 970 new homes (2.7% of the overall housing requirement), which is too low a proportion of growth to support Northeast Sub Area and so the amount of new housing should be increased. The Holme Lane Farm site whilst falling within the Northeast Sub Area, lies within Northwest Sheffield Housing Market Area which has a shortage of Affordable Housing Units exacerbated by a tight Green Belt. The Council can increase the delivery of housing by adopting the alternative spatial strategy of; releasing a selected number of suitable unconstrained Green Belt sites, as a selected number of well planned urban extensions around the built up area of Sheffield, relating to the existing hierarchy of settlements that would not unduly harm the purposes of Green Belt.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify altering the Green Belt boundary.	No	PDSP.067.004	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Allocate Rula's site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Hesley Wood does not meet	No	PDSP.071.005	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				the definition of previously developed land in the National Planning Policy Framework and development of the site would therefore not accord with the overall spatial approach.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. The Plan's introduction to the housing chapter acknowledges difficulties with the housing supply over the Plan period. It states: there is insufficient evidence of delivery before 2029; that public intervention will be needed to enable transition of employment land to sustainable residential areas; that many allocated development sites have multiple owners; and that financial support will be needed from the Government. Many of the proposed allocations have significant deliverability concerns and therefore are unlikely to deliver the required housing to meet the needs of the City. To address soundness matters, the Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Starbuck Farm is not in Northeast Sheffield and is in the Green Belt; and there are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need. Allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.071.006	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	The Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA3 includes 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, Strata Homes propose the Council Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use.	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Townend Lane is not in Northeast Sheffield and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.079.005	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA3: Northeast Sheffield	Fully Support Decision not to allocate the site adjacent to J33 (on the west) of the M1 known as Smithy Wood for development.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.120.004	Owlthorpe Fields Action Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 4: Northeast	Policy SA3:	Support the decision not to allocate the site adjacent to J33 (on the west) of the M1 known as Smithy Wood for development.	The support is noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.127.004	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area	Northeast Sheffield	Supports the decision to designate 'Land Adjacent 137 Main Road Wharnccliffe Side Sheffield' (see application: 22/00865/FUL) as Urban Green Space Zone rather than be allocating it for development. Supports the decision not to allocate the Hepworths' site, Storrs Lane (AKA, 'East Works', or the 'Former Loxley Works' Site) as a Development Site in the Green Belt.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area		The AMID boundary on Map 8 is not clear, as part of it outside the area are faded.	The AMID (now Innovation District) boundary is only partially in the Northeast Sub Area (Map 8). The larger southern section is within the East Sub area (Map 9). The Interactive Online Map can be used to view the entire boundary.	No	PDSP.014.008	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	The policy fails to signpost the River Don and Sheffield and Tinsley Canal corridors and the opportunities presented by improvements to waterway corridors. Include a priority to deliver improvements to access to the River Don and Sheffield and Tinsley canal corridors through the Lower Don Valley.	Policy BG1 states that very significant weight will be given to the protection and enhancement of Sheffield's blue and green infrastructure, specifically referencing the main river corridors, including the River Don. An amendment is proposed to include a reference to the Sheffield & Tinsley Canal. Amendments are also proposed to Policies SA1 to SA8 that refer to extending and enhancing active travel routes along one bank of the Main Rivers.	Yes	PDSP.001.002	Canal & River Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	We do not consider that any change is required to the Local Plan to address the road proposals. However, we do advise that the above comments should be taken into account.	No change needed.	No	PDSP.001.003	Canal & River Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	The Sub-Area includes 2,945 homes but there is little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Site ES25 is in open space use and unlikely to come forward in the short term. There is no planning permission in place, a deficiency of open space in the area and lack of evidence of	No change is needed. The Sheffield Plan has identified sufficient deliverable sites to meet the City's Housing needs within the Plan period and there is no local requirement to identify sites in the East area of the City. Starbuck Farm is not within the	No	PDSP.016.006	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			consultation with Sport England. Site ES27 is a cleared site that requires intervention and unlikely to come forward in the short term. Starbuck Farm should be allocated for housing to address this significant shortfall in housing.	East Sub-Area and has not been included in the supply of sites to meet the City's Housing needs as it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	The proposed site allocation is close to an existing BOC industrial site which includes operations that produce noise pollution. Noise emissions from operations could impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers. The proposed conditions on allocations ES25 and ES32 make no reference to noise mitigation measures.	No change is necessary. Policy NC14 requires appropriate mitigation for noise sensitive uses within areas with significant background noise including adjoining Trunk Roads/Strategic Roads and those near to industrial areas.	No	PDSP.022.001	BOC Ltd (Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	The proposed site allocation is close to an existing BOC industrial site which includes operations that produce noise pollution. Noise emissions from operations could impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers. The proposed conditions on allocations ES25 and ES32 make no reference to noise mitigation measures.	No change is necessary. Policy NC14 requires appropriate mitigation for noise sensitive uses within areas with significant background noise including adjoining Trunk Roads/Strategic Roads and those near to industrial areas.	No	PDSP.022.002	BOC Ltd (Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 4: East Sheffield	Policy SA4:	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in	No change needed. While the Whole Plan Viability Assessment may indicate sites in certain	No	PDSP.042.033	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes,

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations	Sub-Area	East Sheffield	policies CA1 to CA6 and SA3,4, 5, 8 and 9 as being unviable.	locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocation is viable and deliverable.			Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Bessemer Park (ES06) Phase 1 is complete and fully let; Phase 2 is under construction and therefore the site is only available to meet near-term demand and cannot be relied upon to deliver additional floorspace until 2039. The Alsing Road (ES02) site has very limited capacity for strategic logistics and can hardly be considered strategic. Hesley Wood could address the shortage of employment land for large scale logistics. There is insufficient capacity in Sheffield or the wider area to meet the need for employment land.	The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the southeast of the city. Hesley Wood is not within the Southeast sub-area. The site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation.	No	PDSP.071.007	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Site ES25 is currently in open space use with insufficient green space identified in the local area. Site ES27 is a cleared site that requires intervention to come forward and will therefore take time.	No change is needed. The site selection process has considered existing open space provision. Not all allocated sites in the Sheffield Plan are deliverable immediately (or within the first 5 years of the Plan) but our	No	PDSP.079.006	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				conclusion is that there is a reasonable prospect that all the sites can be delivered by 2039. It is recognised that some sites will require public sector intervention and we are working with Homes England and other partners to support delivery.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA4: East Sheffield	Policy SA4 makes no reference to developing or enhancing green spaces despite acknowledging that there is less green space than in the rest of the city. The plan should aim to create and enhance accessible green spaces.	No change needed. New open space will need to be provided as part of new development in accordance with Policies BG1 and NC15 as appropriate.	No	PDSP.205.001	ClareW
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: East Sheffield Sub-Area		The AMID boundary is unclear as part of it outside the subareas are faded.	No change needed. Map 9 shows the Innovation District boundary within the East sub-area. The Interactive Online Map can be used to view the entire boundary.	No	PDSP.014.009	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Object to a number of site allocations within the Southeast sub-area, to which policy SA5 relates.	No change needed. The ecological value of the proposed allocations has been carefully assessed as part of the site selection process. Several of the allocations listed in detail in Annex C include conditions which require the protection of ecological corridors/site and/or assessment of the agricultural land value (where the allocation is on agricultural land).	No	PDSP.006.006	Natural England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the overall approach to the sub-area in Policy SA5 and in particular the support given to the re-opening of the Barrow Hill Line to passengers.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.013.003	North East Derbyshire District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Under 'support for re-opening the Barrow Hill Line' reference should be made to Killamarsh in the list of stations, as the station site is expected to be within the SCC boundary.	Agree that an amendment be made to include Killamarsh in the list of stations in policy SA5 part g.	Yes	PDSP.015.004	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use.	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is a greenfield site in the Green Belt. There	No	PDSP.016.007	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				are no exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt to meet housing need.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use.	See response to comment PDSP.016.007	No	PDSP.016.008	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need. Seeks the allocation of land at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing. Also refers to sites SES10, SES11 and SES12 as presumably not being able to contribute towards supply.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. Starbuck Farm is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.016.009	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Consider that the amount of new homes proposed for the South East sub area is insufficient.	The Council considers that the amount of new housing allocations in the Southeast sub-area of the city is appropriate and justified and that there is no need to release further land for development in this sub-area.	No	PDSP.020.008	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 4: Southeast	Policy SA5:	Supports the ethos of this policy but notes that greenfield land that occupies a sustainable	Support noted. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure	No	PDSP.025.001	Camstead Ltd (Submitted by

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area	Southeast Sheffield	location should not be discounted.	sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Some greenfield land that is not in the Green Belt is proposed for development.			Astrum Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Would like further investigation of the traffic impact of the proposed industrial and travellers site prior to development taking place.	<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 developments is not significant. So, from a Local Plan point of view, there is not sufficient evidence to suggest there is a need to deliver mitigation with respect to transport impacts.</p> <p>However, the modelling work does show that there are existing issues on the network in this area with respect to</p>	No	PDSP.033.001	Ergo Real Estate

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				certain junctions operating 'over capacity'. Whilst it is not the role of the Local Plan to resolve existing problems, these matters do need to be reviewed and solutions put forward. As such, there is a commitment to review these matters as part of the updated Transport Strategy for the city, which is expected to be produced by mid-2024.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA5 is that they are unviable and not deliverable and as such it would be unsound to include these sites within the plan.	The Council considers that all sites can be delivered and are therefore appropriately identified as housing site allocations in the Draft Plan.	No	PDSP.042.034	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Seeks the allocation of a large area of land ("Orgreave Park" to the east of Handsworth for employment (logistics) purposes.	The site is greenfield land within the Green Belt so its inclusion as a site allocation would not align with the Spatial Strategy.	No	PDSP.068.003	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	The Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics so further sites should be identified. Allocate Rula's site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes.	The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the southeast of the city. Hesley Wood is not within the Southeast sub-area. However, the site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation.	No	PDSP.071.008	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. All sites have been assessed using the site selection methodology. The sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield are not in the Southeast Sub-Area and are greenfield sites in the Green Belt; allocation of the sites would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.079.007	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Southeast	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Object to the designation of SES03 as a traveller site.	The site selection process concludes that site SES03 is suitable for Industrial and Gypsy/Traveller uses as a result of the site selection methodology that	No	PDSP.120.005	Owlthorpe Fields Action Group

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area			was undertaken. Further planning conditions will be given consideration at a detailed planning application stage which will address the planning related issues raised and outline mitigation and conditions on development if required.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Supports the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.120.006	Owlthorpe Fields Action Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Supports the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.127.005	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Supports the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.196.001	CATHY99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	If SES10 (Moor Valley) this land has to be developed, it should absolutely be a last resort, with all other sites developed first.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development	No	PDSP.202.001	Claire Baker

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area		We should be protecting green fields as much as possible from development and regenerating other brownfield areas first.	and protect the Green Belt. However, not all the city's development needs to 2039 can be met on brownfield sites. The allocation of this site indicates that it is suitable for housing as a result of the site selection methodology that was undertaken.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.203.001	Clare 32
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Object to the proposed Local Green Space designation of land at Bolehill Wood.	The land is considered to meet the criteria set out in the NPPF for the designation of this land as a Local Green Space. It is an important and valued greenspace which is also a Local Wildlife Site and merits the Local Green Space protection.	No	PDSP.217.001	Deborah and Bob Anderson
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.238.001	Gordon22
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 4: Southeast	Policy SA5:	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.246.001	Howard61

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area	Southeast Sheffield					
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.254.001	Jade
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.264.001	jayetea
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support designation of Local Green Space at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.267.003	Jill17
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.290.001	Julianne99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 4:	Policy SA5:	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.291.001	Karl99

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Southeast Sheffield					
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.310.001	Marco Conte
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.311.001	Margaret52
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.320.001	Mich
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.323.001	Mick1956

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.326.001	MORGAN99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.347.001	philj715
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.353.001	Ragione
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.362.001	Robert21
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.370.001	Sandra

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.371.001	Sandra140923
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.396.001	Summer99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.400.001	Terry
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA5: Southeast Sheffield	Support the Local Green Space designation at Owlthorpe Fields.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.410.001	wendy21

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Support the site allocation at the former Norton Aerodrome subject to strengthening of the conditions on the development (as set out in Annex A of the Draft Plan), to more fully reflect the potential cross boundary impacts of the development, as well as the impact on the Conservation Area.	An additional condition has been proposed in response to comments from Historic England that requires consideration of the impact on a Heritage Asset. Following discussions through Duty to Cooperate with North East Derbyshire District Council, a Statement of Common Ground will be drafted that will clarify the limited impact that development of the former aerodrome site will have on adjacent areas of North East Derbyshire.	No	PDSP.013.004	North East Derbyshire District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The South Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need. Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use (this is in the Southeast sub area).	No change is needed. The Sheffield Plan has identified sufficient deliverable sites to meet the City's Housing needs within the Plan period and there is no local requirement to identify sites in the East area of the City. Starbuck Farm is not within the South sub-area and has not been included in the supply of sites to meet the City's Housing needs as it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.016.010	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: South	Policy SA6:	Objects to the exclusion of land at Hillfoot Road and Penny Lane,	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available	No	PDSP.062.001	Mr Charles Rhodes and

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Sheffield Sub-Area	South Sheffield	Totley as a site allocation (Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment site ref S03070).	taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.			Star Pubs (Submitted by JLL)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The South Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. This Sub-Area does not include the provision of any employment land. Review the Spatial Strategy and identify sites to meet the need for Industrial and Logistics. Allocate Rula's site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes.	The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the south of the City. Hesley Wood is not within the South Sheffield sub-area. The site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation.	No	PDSP.071.009	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	This Sub-Area includes 765 new homes. However, as highlighted earlier there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. The sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield are not in the South Sub-Area and are greenfield sites in the Green Belt; allocation of the sites would be	No	PDSP.079.008	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space is supported.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.120.007	Owlthorpe Fields Action Group
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space is supported. The definitions box states that the definition of 'Local Green Space' can be found in the Glossary but it is actually missing from the glossary.	Notes and welcome the support. Agree that a definition of Local Green Space should be included in the Glossary.	Yes	PDSP.127.006	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	There is no mention of improving the active travel provision in terms of cycle parking in policy SA6 except where there is a "development". The comments relate to Woodseats. If there was cycle parking more people might be prepared to ride, so reducing the congestion. For all the people who are walking, there is a lot that could be done to improve the street. A few trees would make a lot of difference. A couple of parklets in place of a few parking spaces would make a huge	Whilst policy CO1 supports the delivery of active travel infrastructure associated with new development, Policy T1 supports the broader delivery of active travel infrastructure across the city, aligned with the priorities set out in the Transport Strategies of both Sheffield City Council and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority. Policy DE3 sets out requirements for design of the public realm and landscape design. Policy DE4 sets out requirements for the design of streets, roads and parking. Policy	No	PDSP.170.001	AlisonRx

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			difference to the feel of the area. A few park benches would mean that elderly people, or anyone struggling, could sit down part way along the street for a rest.	GS7 requires developers to provide street trees.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Supports the designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.175.001	Andrew Rixham
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	The designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space is supported. There should however be reference to the other greenspaces in this area as follows: "Create, protect and enhance accessible green spaces and recreational opportunities to support biodiversity net gain, connect natural habitats and develop ecological stepping stones".	Support for Bolehill Wood Local Greenspace designation noted and welcomed. Creation of greenspace and support for biodiversity is covered in other citywide policies, such as BG1 in the Part 1 document and in Part 2 – policies NC15, GS5-GS7. A number of amendments to policy BG1 are proposed to highlight the importance of extending the network of blue and green infrastructure.	No	PDSP.205.002	ClareW
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Supports designation of Local Green Spaces at Bole Hill Woods.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.267.004	Jill17

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: South Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA6: South Sheffield	Supports the designation of Bolehill Wood as a Local Green Space.	Note and welcome the support.	No	PDSP.342.001	Penny Dembo

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need. Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Starbuck Farm, Beighton for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Starbuck Farm is not in the South Sub-Area and is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.016.011	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Additional text should be added to paragraph 4.72 relating to Dore. The Mass Transit Corridor should be referred to in paragraph 4.74. Further site allocations may need to be	No changes required. A Mass Transit Corridor from part of the City Centre to the Southwest is already referred to in policy SA7. Paragraph 4.72 refers to the extensive areas of countryside and Green Belt in the	No	PDSP.027.003	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			considered for the Sheffield Plan. This could be as a result of a higher housing requirement and the demonstration of exceptional circumstances (see CST response to Policy SP1) and/or a refined spatial strategy (see CST response to Policy SP2) that responds to the role of Mass Transit Corridors as a focus for development. In such circumstances the CST site at Dore should be included as an allocation.	sub-area and any development proposals must take these into account, as appropriate. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.			Wood Associates)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Part a) of the policy states that approximately 755 new homes will be delivered in the Southwest Sheffield Sub Area. The allocations detailed in Appendix 1 provide a capacity of 701, it is not clear where the remaining 54 (to total 755) are derived. The capacity led approach results in limited growth in this sustainable area of the city which benefits from a railway station, park and ride and existing and proposed cycle routes to the city centre. Part b) of the Policy refers to a housing requirement figure of at	The Council considers that the amount of new housing allocations in the Southwest sub-area of the city is appropriate and justified and that there is no need to release further land for development in the Dore area. Sites which are under construction (but where completions have not been accounted for) have not been included in Appendix 1 as proposed site allocations. Windfalls will continue to provide additional supply in the Dore	No	PDSP.046.007	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			least 40 homes in Dore Neighbourhood Plan. The policy includes a footnote advising that the figure of 40 include 14 homes on large sites and 26 homes with existing planning permission on small sites. The requirement figure of 'at least 10' homes is considered vague and open to interpretation and a more robust figure and allocation should be provided to ensure delivery.	Neighbourhood Plan. The figure of 40 homes reflects known commitments and is therefore a minimum figure.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The plan should include site reference S02442 (in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)) as a housing allocation within the southwest Sheffield sub-area. The plan should make it clear the site is capable of delivering approximately 75 dwellings within 0-5 years of the plan being adopted.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Site S02442 is a greenfield site in the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances do not exist to alter the Green Belt boundary.	No	PDSP.049.002	Jonathan Harrison (Submitted by nineteen47)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Land at Little London Road should be allocated for housing under policy SA7. Policy EC3 should be more flexible and not prohibit residential development.	The site in question is separated from the nearby residential uses by the River Sheaf and is accessed through the existing business park. The site is clearly more suited to employment uses and the	No	PDSP.050.001	Laver Regeneration (Submitted by Asteer Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				introduction of residential use on this site would create significant restrictions on the operation of the existing businesses. Given this, a General Employment Zone that excludes housing is appropriate.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Suggests redesignation of Queens Road Retail Park as a District Centre given the range of offer and the comparable approach that the local planning authority has taken to Heeley Retail Park. If anything, Queens Road Retail Park fulfils a District Centre style offer better than Heeley Retail Park.	Heeley Retail Park is part of a wider area that includes smaller shops and is therefore appropriately allocated as a District Centre. The Queens Road Retail Park is a stand-alone retail park divorced from other shops and uses that a District Centre contains and is therefore designated as a Flexible Use Zone rather than a District Centre.	No	PDSP.070.002	Orchard Street Investment Management (Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The Southwest Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. Review the Spatial Strategy and identify sites to meet the need for Industrial and Logistics. Allocate Rula's site at the former Hesley Wood tip for employment purposes.	The Logistics Study has identified suitable sites to meet the needs. There is no local requirement to identify sites specifically in the southwest of the City. Hesley Wood is not within the Southwest sub-area. The site has not been included in the supply of sites for logistics need as it is considered to be a greenfield site in the Green Belt, so does not meet the requirements of the preferred spatial strategy for potential allocation.	No	PDSP.071.010	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	This Sub-Area includes 755 new homes. However, as highlighted earlier there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. The sites at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge and Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield are not in the South Sub-Area and are greenfield sites in the Green Belt; allocation of the sites would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.079.009	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	Suggest several amendments/points of clarification relating to policy SA7 as it pertains to Dore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - omission of a statement regarding protection of the Green Belt boundary (and infill on Long Line) - lacking a description of the Residential Zones, Local Centre, Conservation Area, Ecclesall Woods Local Nature Reserve/Local Wildlife Site 	No changes needed. The reference to Green Belt boundaries in SA6 is to provide clarity around boundaries that will remain unchanged when SS17 Norton Aerodrome is removed from the Green Belt. No other sub-area policies specifically mention protection of Green Belt boundaries as that is implicit in policies in Part 2. The potential for infill at Long Line does not represent Green Belt release and therefore does not specifically require stating in SA6 as it is covered within GS2; SA7 is	No	PDSP.102.007	Dore Village Society

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conflict in terminology – ‘Residential Zones’ and ‘Urban Areas’ - 40 homes housing requirement for Dore Neighbourhood Plan area (are these additional to those that have planning permission?) 	<p>consistent with other Sub-area policies in not listing all Local Centres separately and the Policies Map identifies the features referenced; the ‘urban area’ refers to those areas of the city that are not within the Green Belt (see Glossary) and within the urban area are many different policy zones including residential zones; the figure of 40 homes for Dore includes those within the Neighbourhood Plan area that have planning permission (this is already explained in footnote 24). It is a gross figure and also allows for the fact that windfall sites may come forward during the Plan period.</p>			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	No information was submitted with this representation.	Noted - no comment made.	No	PDSP.109.001	Hallam Cricket Club
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	POLICY SA7: The “h” of Broomhill is missing in the 2nd. Line and in e).	Agree to amend the typing errors.	Yes	PDSP.140.006	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The plan aims to improve active travel but does not go far enough in this important area. It is important in this area of Sheffield to create active travel routes (walking and cycling) between the universities and the areas where most students live.	Whilst policy CO1 supports the delivery of active travel infrastructure associated with new development, Policy T1 supports the broader delivery of active travel infrastructure across the city, aligned with the priorities set out in the Transport Strategies of both Sheffield City Council and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.	No	PDSP.170.002	AlisonRx
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Policy SA7: Southwest Sheffield	The aims of the plan in section e) "Support the vitality and vibrancy of the District Centres at Banner Cross, Broomhill, Ecclesall Road, and London Road, and Local Centres" are completely at odds with the aims set out in Enabling Sustainable Travel point 5.10. As the owner of numerous commercial premises in these areas, the Plan is unable to achieve its aims in section e) if its Travel policy is enacted.	No change needed. It is not agreed that the two aims are incompatible. Enhancing sustainable transport connectivity to support modal shift, can improve the attractiveness and inclusiveness of the environment, enabling more people to access services in their local or district centre. The Plan includes policies, including SP1 and T1, which support multimodal transport improvements to enhance connectivity, and create an effective, sustainable transport network.	No	PDSP.317.001	MattE
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area	Map 12: Southwest Sub-Area	Notes policy accords with Dore Neighbourhood Plan.	No change needed.	No	PDSP.102.006	Dore Village Society

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area		Suggest designation of a site at Spider Park (Fulwood / Lodge Moor area) as a Local Green Space.	Acknowledge the request for this land to be designated as a Local Green Space but the land is currently designated as Green Belt.	No	PDSP.111.001	HCYA (Hallam Community & Youth Association)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area		Regarding the Former Dyson Refractories, Baslow Road site - Although a brownfield site this is not suitable for housing and the plan should identify what is and is not an appropriate land use here. An hotel or outdoor leisure use if well designed may be suitable.	The land is appropriately designated as Green Belt; should any development proposals come forward for this site, they will be assessed against Green Belt policy and other relevant planning policy.	No	PDSP.116.028	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Page 208

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge /Deepcar Sub-Area	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	The Stocksbridge/ Deepcar Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, we propose the Council Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm	No	PDSP.016.012	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site.	is not in the Stocksbridge/Deepcar sub-area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge / Deepcar Sub-Area	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies the proposed allocations in policy SA8 as being unviable. While each site will have its own circumstances, the council will need to demonstrate they are deliverable within the plan period for these allocations to be sound and included within the plan. At present the evidence available for all the sites allocated in Policy SA8 is that they are unviable and not deliverable. As such it would be unsound to include these site allocations within the plan.	No change needed. While the Whole Plan Viability Assessment may indicate sites in certain locations in general terms may be unviable, this will not apply to all sites and the site allocation process has concluded that this site allocations are viable and deliverable.	No	PDSP.04 2.035	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge / Deepcar Sub-Area	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge /Deepcar	The Stocksbridge Deepcar Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy allocates 970 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. The Council should update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site.	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Starbuck Farm is not in the Stocksbridge/ Deepcar Sub-Area and it is a	No	PDSP.07 1.011	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge / Deepcar Sub-Area	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	There are details missing from Map 13, page 82 of Part 1, that do not reflect policy SA8. Policy SA8 sets out in Part b) that it is required to 'deliver site Allocations SD01 to SD13 – including strategic sites: SD02, SD03 and SD05'. Map 13 shows Sites SD03 and SD05 as a Housing sites only, when they should be shown as Strategic Housing Sites to reflect the policy.	Agreed. The errors found on Map 13 will be corrected. And Policy SA8 should be amended to correspond with the amended Map 13.	Yes	PDSP.07 7.001	Speciality Steel UK (Submitted by JLL)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge / Deepcar Sub-Area	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.07 9.010	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge /	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge /	Repeats comment PDSP.079.010	See response to PDSP.079.010	No	PDSP.07 9.011	Strata Homes (Submitted

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Deepcar Sub-Area	Deepcar					by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge / Deepcar Sub-Area	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	The Stocksbridge/ Deepcar Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA8 includes 1,070 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To overcome the objection and address soundness matters, the following changes are proposed: Update Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs. Allocate the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.079.012	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge /Deepcar Sub-Area	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations are very effective.	Support for Policy SA8 is welcomed.	No	PDSP.216.001	Deborah
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 4: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	Policy SA8: Stocksbridge / Deepcar	It is unacceptable to increase the population of Stocksbridge/ Deepcar by approximately 25% (proportionally more than other parts	No change needed. Policy SA8 sets out the delivery of sustainable transport improvements and creates a	No	PDSP.366.003	Ruth Morgan

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Sub-Area		of Sheffield) without providing assurance of improved public transport.	Mass Transit Corridor from the City Centre to the Upper Don Valley. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides more information on transport infrastructure projects that are needed to support the growth proposed in the Plan. Additional references to the potential reopening of the Upper Don Valley passenger railway line have been proposed as amendments to the Plan.			

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	The Chapeltown/ High Green Sheffield Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy only allocates land for 25 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. We propose the Council update the Spatial	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.016.013	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations			Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan and allocates the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site.	Starbuck Farm is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/High Green	The identification of Chapeltown/High Green as a Principal Town is supported. But the lack of allocations (25 dwellings) means that the localised need for this Sub Area is not being met and harms its ability to carry out its function as a Principal Town. The policy states that 145 dwellings will be delivered in total in the Ecclesfield Neighbourhood Plan Area made up of small windfall sites and large sites with planning permission. There is no discussion of the deliverability of the small sites or whether there are enough to meet local needs. It is suggested that further allocations need to be made in the area. The lack of housing delivery will have serious consequences for affordable housing delivery. Draft Policy identifies 10% of all homes on qualifying sites will be affordable. The majority of new homes delivered will be on small sites (145 dwellings) which are unlikely to provide any affordable housing. If the new homes (25 dwellings) delivered on	No change needed. Support for recognition of Chapeltown High Green's status as a Principal Town is welcomed. The housing requirement is calculated on a city wide basis taking into account the number of homes needed to support the city's jobs growth target in the Strategic Economic Plan. Sufficient deliverable sites have been allocated to meet that requirement. Applying the spatial strategy to Chapeltown/High Green sub area where there are fewer development opportunities available in than in other sub areas, has resulted in a low number of homes being delivered under the policy.	No	PDSP.019.007	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			<p>large sites are policy compliant, a maximum of 3 affordable homes will be delivered. This could be easily rectified by taking a more balanced approach to the Green Belt in the sub-area. The lack of opportunities on non-Green Belt sites in the area means that there's inability to provide access to sufficient appropriate accommodation, including affordable housing in the sub area. It is considered that this, and the identification of Chapeltown/High Green as a Principal Town provides the exceptional circumstances required to release further Green Belt sites in this location. Land at Springwood Lane, High Green sits within parcel CN-2 of the Council's 'Green Belt Review'. The Green Belt Review identifies parcel CN2 as the lowest scoring of all Green Belt parcels in Chapeltown North. However, our evidence suggests that the site would have limited impact and would provide a clear defensible boundary to stop any encroachment into the countryside. This site is the most credible option for a new site allocation within the Chapeltown/High Green area. Delivery of the site would enable the provision of a mix of house types and tenures and would contribute to meeting the needs within the area.</p>	<p>However, the spatial strategy utilises the land available across the city taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The deliverability of individual sites is evidenced in the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment.</p>			

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	Chapeltown/High Green is correctly identified as a Principal Town within the Sheffield Plan settlement hierarchy. It is important that developments are provided within this locality to meet the demands of the growing population. Whilst an emphasis upon urban and brownfield sites is considered acceptable the lack of alternative sites within High Green means that greenfield sites adjacent to the existing development boundary should also be considered. The proposed site at Springwood Lane provides logical development site that would assist in meeting the housing needs not only of High Green but also of the wider area, including much needed affordable housing. The parcel is self-contained and would provide a strong new defensible edge to the Green Belt in this location. The site is in a sustainable location close to services and facilities and within easy reach of public transport opportunities and will promote walking and cycling. The development would respect and complement both the landscape setting and the informal woodland setting of Spring Wood, whilst strengthening the physical connection and visual relationship between	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Therefore, exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify removing the Springwood Lane Site from the Green Belt and allocating it for residential development.	No	PDSP.019.008	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			both. Suggests allocation of the site at Springwood Lane, High Green.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	In the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Chapeltown is noted as having an under-supply of smaller and larger properties to meet a variety of needs. The lack of new housing in Chapeltown due to a tight Green Belt boundary is exacerbating these issues and further supports the need for Green Belt release in sustainable locations near key transport hubs, such as within 1.2km of train stations. Chapeltown is located on a key transport corridor, has a train station and is one of three 'Principal Towns' in the Sheffield settlement hierarchy. It is, therefore, a sustainable settlement capable of accommodating a larger portion of growth. This alternative spatial approach also supports the Sheffield Plan aims. The allocation of the Warren Lane site to meet both housing and employment needs in a sustainable location.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify removing land at Warren Lane from the Green Belt and allocating it for residential development.	No	PDSP.034.007	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	The Chapeltown/ High Green Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for Industrial and Logistics. The policy only allocates land for 25 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence	No change needed. The Local Plan policies have been through sustainability and viability testing, see the Integrated Impacts Assessment Report and Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No	PDSP.071.012	Rula Developments (Submitted by Spawforths)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations			base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan should allocate the Starbuck Farm, Beighton site as a Housing Site.	Starbuck Farm is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area, and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	Allocate the site at Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify removing the land at Whitley Lane from the Green Belt and allocating it for residential development.	No	PDSP.079.013	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	Allocate the site at Whitley Lane, Ecclesfield for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Whitley Lane is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be	No	PDSP.079.014	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	The Chapeltown/ High Green Sub-Area sites will not meet the identified need for housing. Policy SA9 includes 25 new homes. However, there is very little evidence on the deliverability of the sites allocated. To address soundness matters, Strata Homes propose the Council Update the Spatial Strategy to address the evidence base and meet the identified housing needs; and the Plan allocates the site at Townend Lane, Stocksbridge for housing use.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Townend Lane is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.079.015	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	Policy SA9 Chapeltown/High Green is legally compliant, meets the duty to co-operate and is Sound.	Support for policy SA9 is welcomed.	No	PDSP.090.001	Visionary Planning UK
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	Supports protection of Smithy Wood from development.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.267.005	Jill17

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 4: Chapeltown / High Green Sub-Area	Policy SA9: Chapeltown/ High Green	The Council has moved from the 40,000 homes at Reg 18 and the 53500 suggested by the Government (which was rejected) to 35,700, which is a decision driven by political gain rather than doing what is required to help tackle the housing crisis. We therefore passionately believe this makes the plan 'unsound'. We agree Sheffield City centre should be significantly developed to meet the growing housing and employment needs for the city. However, we also believe the Plan doesn't deliver enough homes in the fringes of Sheffield and more should be done in these areas. Chapeltown/High Green should be targeting significantly more housing. It is a popular place to live, has good transport connections and is a key employment contributor/business growth area in the City, which adds to the demand for new housing. Only 25 new homes are proposed there. If the appropriate number of brownfield sites cannot be provided, then less sensitive Green Belt sites should be brought forward by realigning the Green Belt boundary in these areas. A site in Grenoside, Sheffield (S35 8QJ) has potential	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The land at Grenoside is not in the Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area and it is a greenfield site in the Green Belt; allocation of the site would be inconsistent with the preferred spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.403.001	Tom Rusby

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			for a residential or senior living development and should be allocated. The site has capacity for up to 80 dwellings (35 units per hectare), with generous amenity and public open space provided. We also propose to enhance the Whitley Lane Road, to make it safer for road and pedestrian users.				

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Specific comments within this section relate to BG1 Blue and Green Infrastructure and IN1 Infrastructure provision. Detail is provided in other comments.	No change needed. Comments on BG1 Blue and Green Infrastructure and IN1 Infrastructure Provision are dealt with under comment references PDSP.002.004 and PDSP.002.005 respectively. There are no general comments on chapter 5.	No	PDSP.002.003	Environment Agency
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Support the policy approach.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.007.005	Sport England

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Identify proposed Killamarsh station.	Policy T1 will be amended to add Killamarsh to the new stations list.	Yes	PDSP.015.005	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	There is not enough transparent evidence to demonstrate housing supply. Requirements in the LP will mean a housing market that is not affordable or meets the needs of the population.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.046.008	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	There is inconsistency of figures in housing supply tables 1 and 2.	Acknowledge that housing capacity figures should be consistent throughout the document. A schedule will be produced to highlight any changes arising in site and overall capacity. This will also take account of new planning permissions during 2022/23.	Yes	PDSP.102.008	Dore Village Society
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Welcome reference to Pathways to Net Zero report.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.140.007	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Comment supports commitment to prioritise sustainable travel methods.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.140.008	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Supportive of proposed future railway provision.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.140.009	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Welcomes mention of cargo bikes and consolidation hubs.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.140.010	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	There is a welcome reference to the expectation of improved viability of development sites over time. Such opportunity should be taken to require higher carbon reduction and affordable homes standards.	Comment noted.	No	PDSP.140.011	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Welcome reference to South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority's transport role and also to Gear Change and the National Bus Strategy. It would be appropriate to mention here the Council's support for SYMCA's exploratory work regarding franchising of buses.	Support noted. It is unnecessary to refer to bus franchising as it is not directly related to planning decisions on development. However, we recognise the potential for public transport services to be improved as a result of franchising.	No	PDSP.140.012	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	The Nature Recovery Network plans must be included as an enforceable part of planning as soon as they are available. Suggest amending GS6 to increase the width of buffer zones to rivers & streams	Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed so it is too early to incorporate it in the draft Plan. We aim to include it when complete in an SPD and/or in the plan at next review	No	PDSP.188.002	Boo

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		to 20 metres and address the need for vegetation along city's watercourses to be protected and enhanced.	stage. The Environment Agency set out the following buffer distances required for watercourses: (a) at least 10 metres for rivers and streams and (b) a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is)			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Public transport provision improvements are needed, particularly in relation to bus access into the heart of the City Centre.	No change needed. As part of the Connecting Sheffield City Centre scheme, Sheffield City Council have made the decision to maintain the closure of Pinstone Street. The Sheffield Connect city centre shuttle service now provides an accessible link around in and around the city centre	No	PDSP.336.001	Patricia Dawson-Butterworth
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Extend text to reflect the importance of sustainable travel including e-bikes.	Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield.	Yes	PDSP.356.001	Richard Attwood
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	This repeats comment PDSP.356.001.	See response to comment PDSP.036.001	Yes	PDSP.356.002	Richard Attwood

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Suggest amending GS6 to increase width of buffer zones to rivers & streams to 20 metres and address the need for vegetation along city's watercourses to be restored.	The Environment Agency set outs the following buffer distances required for watercourses: (a). at least 10 metres for rivers and streams and (b) a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is)	No	PDSP.375.003	Sean_Ashton
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	BG1 - Suggest amending BG1 to give greater ambition to meeting Natural England's national Accessible Natural Green Space standards, while also ensuring access doesn't unduly impact on biodiversity. See Response Modification.	Agree – the aim is to incorporate Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' to help strengthen policy.	Yes	PDSP.375.004	Sean_Ashton
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Add new ambitions to grow green spaces and natural networks within the City. Suggests a new policy to achieve nature recovery.	Agree. Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Policy BG1 should provide better sign-posting to relevant policies in Part 2 of the Plan.	Yes	PDSP.375.005	Sean_Ashton

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Spatial strategy will not meet housing need. Insufficient evidence to support windfall allowance. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need.	No change needed. Proposed site would not be consistent with the spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.016.014	AAA Property Group (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Viability concerns on brownfield sites. Inadequate evidence base for windfall assumptions And for broad locations for growth. Distribution of supply too low in relation to needs identified in the SHMA. Uneven distribution of supply disadvantages Chapeltown/High Green.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.019.009	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Undeliverable approach due to viability concerns. Delivery of most new homes in areas where affordable housing is unviable. Supply reliant on windfalls and broad locations for growth. Uneven distribution of homes will impact types delivered. Propose Green Belt release to meet the housing needs of Chapeltown/High Green.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.019.010	Avant Homes Yorkshire (Submitted by Pegasus Group)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply	Target for 85% brownfield delivery is not evidenced as deliverable. Uncertainty about delivery of sites in broad locations for growth which shouldn't be included within supply. Consider Green Belt release. Windfall allowance is too high.	No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery.	No	PDSP.020.009	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		of New Housing					
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Target for 85% brownfield delivery is not evidenced as deliverable. Uncertainty about delivery of sites in broad locations for growth which shouldn't be included within supply. Consider Green Belt release. Windfall allowance is too high.	No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery, including on windfall sites. The brownfield target reflects the capacity of deliverable and developable sites.	No	PDSP.020.010	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Target for delivery of new homes on brownfield land is restrictive and difficult to monitor. Implies housing growth will be delivered only through existing planning permission.	No change needed. Take up of previously developed land is consistently monitored, and the policy clearly allows for windfall development to come forward.	No	PDSP.025.002	Camstead Ltd (Submitted by Astrum Planning)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Uneven distribution of housing development. Fails to address the housing needs of different areas of Sheffield. Provide a greater proportion of new homes outside the City Centre. Concern about the viability and deliverability of sites in the City Centre and in broad locations for growth. Impact of spatial strategy on infrastructure delivery.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.027.004	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Central area capacity is over ambitious, and many sites will not be deliverable. Unlikely to be enough deliverable sites to sustain the required level of delivery in the Central Area. There are exceptional circumstances to meet housing need, including family housing.	No change needed. Capacity is led by the spatial strategy and by robust analysis carried out to support the City Centre Vision. Site selection takes account of site constraints. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment takes account of likely complexity of delivery in estimating when a site is likely to be delivered. Sheffield's housing market extends into neighbouring districts where a greater proportion of new homes are likely to be homes suitable for families.	No	PDSP.034.008	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Strong demand and preference for larger homes and houses with gardens rather than apartments. Spatial strategy focussing on the Central Area does not balance housing demand with delivery.	No change needed. Masterplanning work being undertaken to ensure opportunities taken to diversify the range of housing delivered where possible.	No	PDSP.034.009	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply	Most allocations will be unviable based on the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.	No change needed. No change needed. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report	No	PDSP.035.002	Freddy & Barney LTD (Cornish Works) (Submitted by

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		of New Housing		has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.			DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Cost of redeveloping brownfield sites will impact on viability and reduce affordable housing delivery. Allocation of greenfield sites would contribute to delivering more affordable homes.	No change needed. Allocated sites reflect the spatial strategy. Acknowledge the likely impact on affordable housing delivery but not all affordable homes will be provided through S106 agreements.	No	PDSP.037.002	Gladman Developments Ltd
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Target for 85% brownfield delivery is not evidenced as deliverable. Uncertainty about delivery of sites in broad locations for growth which shouldn't be included within supply. Propose Green Belt release.	No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for housing delivery. Green Belt release would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy. The brownfield target reflects the capacity of deliverable and developable sites.	No	PDSP.040.004	Hague Farming Ltd (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and	No sites are allocated for specialist older people's housing. The scale of need for older people's accommodation should be identified in the Plan.	No change needed. The need for older people's accommodation is citywide and	No	PDSP.042.036	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations		Supply of New Housing		does not need to be addressed spatially in policy H1.			Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Focus on previously developed land will be unviable and will not deliver sufficient affordable housing. Focus on previously developed land concentrates development in certain locations and will not deliver a mix of housing types. Propose alternative sustainable greenfield sites in the Green Belt.	No change needed. The allocated sites reflect the spatial strategy. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.	No	PDSP.042.037	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Broad locations for growth should be removed from the supply– insufficient evidence of deliverability. Recent high levels of windfalls incorporate high levels of student housing that won't continue.	No change needed. The Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment sets out the evidence base for the level of capacity likely to come forward in broad locations for growth.	No	PDSP.042.038	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
							Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	No sites are allocated for specialist older people's housing. The scale of need for older people's accommodation should be identified in the Plan.	No change needed. The need for older people's accommodation is citywide and does not need to be addressed spatially in policy H1.	No	PDSP.042.039	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	The policy approach will not create a housing market in line with the Plan's aims and objectives to provide quality, choice and affordability. Deliverability not demonstrated. Broad locations for growth – insufficient evidence that they are developable. Distribution of housing sites by sub area will result in an unsustainable pattern of development that doesn't meet identified housing needs. Propose Green Belt release to meet housing needs. Not all sites with planning permission will be delivered – no lapse rate assumed. Site allocations	No change needed. Distribution of site allocations reflects the spatial strategy. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and Site Selection Methodology set out the evidence base for inclusion of sites.	No	PDSP.046.009	Hft (Submitted by ID Planning)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			with permission are not all deliverable and some have lapsed. Site allocations with existing uses may not be available.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Central Area capacity is over ambitious and many sites will not be deliverable. Unlikely to be enough deliverable sites to sustain the required level of delivery in the Central Area. There are exceptional circumstances to meet housing need, including family housing.	No change needed. Capacity is led by the spatial strategy. Site selection takes account of site constraints, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment takes account of likely complexity of delivery.	No	PDSP.054.004	Lovell Developments (Yorkshire) Ltd and J England Homes Limited (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Terminology should reflect provision of all types of housing for older people.	Accept – an amendment to part (g) is proposed.	Yes	PDSP.056.003	McCarthy Stone (Submitted by The Planning Bureau)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Central Area capacity is over ambitious and many sites will not be deliverable. Unlikely to be enough deliverable sites to sustain the required level of delivery in the Central Area. There are exceptional circumstances to meet housing need, including family housing.	No change needed. Capacity is led by the spatial strategy. Site selection takes account of site constraints, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment takes account of likely complexity of delivery.	No	PDSP.067.005	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Prioritising delivery of new homes on previously developed land risks loss of employment land and the impact has not been properly considered. Housing requirement falls below the standard method figure. Release land from the Green Belt at Orgreave for employment to enable further employment land to be developed for residential.	No change needed. the proposed allocation would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment takes considers both employment and residential sites and there is no double counting. Sites proposed for allocation for employment uses would not be expected to come forward as housing sites. Loss of current employment land for new homes is taken into account within the Employment Land Review in relation to 'churn' within the market.	No	PDSP.068.004	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Spatial strategy will not meet housing need. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need. Propose allocation of Green Belt site to meet housing need.	No change needed. Proposed site would not be consistent with the spatial strategy. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify the release of greenfield sites in the Green Belt.	No	PDSP.079.016	Strata Homes (Submitted by Spawforths)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and	No alternative site identified for New Age Travellers currently living at Club Mill Road.	No change needed. Acknowledge the need for alternative accommodation for the New Age Travellers,	No	PDSP.105.002	Friends of Wardsend Cemetery

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations		Supply of New Housing		however the need does not fall within the planning definition of travellers and there is uncertainty over the level of need and specific locational requirements for this group which has evolved over time. Policy NC7 provides a criteria-based approach for determining future planning applications for traveller sites including New Age Traveller provision.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Delivery of affordable housing - additional sites should be allocated to deliver on affordable housing need. Over reliance on windfall sites.	No change needed. The spatial strategy utilises the land available taking account of the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and protect the Green Belt. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment provides evidence on the supply from windfall sites.	No	PDSP.112.003	Home Builders Federation
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply	Need for alternative New Age Traveller provision to better meet needs and open up the Upper Don Trail for walking and cycling.	No change needed. Acknowledge the need for alternative accommodation for the New Age Travellers, however the need does not fall within the planning definition	No	PDSP.151.002	Upper Don Trail Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		of New Housing		of travellers and there is uncertainty over the level of need and specific locational requirements for this group which has evolved over time. Policy NC7 provides a criteria-based approach for determining future planning applications for traveller sites including New Age Traveller provision.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing	Support the policy approach to setting a target for 85% of homes to be delivered on previously developed land.	Support welcome.	No	PDSP.268.006	Jim Bamford

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling	Concern about impact of transport proposals on historic	Transport schemes will be subject to public consultation as they are developed. Policies D1 and DE9	No	PDSP.003.019	Historic England

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations		Sustainable Travel	assets. Requested involvement in development of proposals.	would be important considerations when considering transport schemes.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Need to understand the cross-boundary transport impacts particularly on the SRN (M1) and the A57.	Strategic transport modelling to establish the impacts of the proposed development on local and strategic networks, and identify mitigations, is ongoing. Discussions with neighbouring authorities are ongoing and the aim is to agree a Statement of Common Ground.	No	PDSP.009.005	Bassetlaw District Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Endorsement of Policy T1, particularly reference to reopening the Barrow Hill Railway Line to passengers and improved connectivity between Sheffield and Chesterfield/ North East Derbyshire. Mitigating traffic congestion along the route of the A61 is an important priority for Derbyshire County Council, which requires a joined up and coordinated approach between the County and City Councils.	Support noted and welcomed. Strategic transport modelling work has been presented to neighbouring Districts and we will continue to liaise with Derbyshire County Council where mitigations are deemed necessary. The aim is to agree a Statement of Common Ground.	No	PDSP.011.002	Derbyshire County Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Support for identification of the Barrow Hill line re-opening.	Support noted and welcomed	No	PDSP.013.005	North East Derbyshire District Council

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	The lines are difficult to see on Map 15.	The colours of the routes on the maps will be reviewed	Yes	PDSP.014.010	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	The lines are difficult to see on Map 16.	The colours of the routes on the maps will be reviewed	Yes	PDSP.014.011	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	To ensure that development proposals have regard to any future versions of the transport strategy Policy T1 should be amended to also reference any subsequent replacement strategy.	Agreed that the additional wording suggested would provide flexibility for any future transport strategy updates to be taken account of.	Yes	PDSP.015.006	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Amend Policy T1 to support re-opening of both the Barrow Hill and Don Valley lines.	Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line.	Yes	PDSP.015.007	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Include greater reference to freight, including the rail freight terminal at Tinsley, delivery bays in city and district centres, overnight lorry parking on edges of the city.	Policy T1 encourages movement of freight by rail, and other sustainable modes at a national/regional level. Paragraph 5.19 expresses support for local strategies such as E-Cargo bikes and consolidation hubs but is agreed this should be referenced more clearly in the policy wording and a new bullet is proposed to be added to the Local Level section of policy T1. Servicing requirements associated with new development are included in relation to 'operational' parking in Annex B Parking Guidelines.	Yes	PDSP.015.008	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Add explanation of the Enhanced Bus Partnership Plan in paragraphs 5.10-5.18.	Support for the Enhanced Partnership is stated in the City-Region level part of policy T1. It is agreed that explanatory reference should be included in the introductory paragraphs 5.10-5.18.	Yes	PDSP.015.009	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Extend the Mass Transit corridors (A625 and A621) identified in the Local Plan to serve areas SW of Sheffield.	No change is proposed as the Mass Transit Corridors have been identified as part of The Sheffield Transport Strategy and the Local Plan does not propose any changes to those. The extent of	No	PDSP.027.005	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				any schemes promoted along those corridors will be based upon further analysis of need at the time of scheme development.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Extend the Mass Transit corridors (A625 and A621) identified in the Local Plan to serve areas SW of Sheffield.	No change is proposed as the Mass Transit corridors have been identified as part of The Sheffield Transport Strategy and the Local Plan does not propose any changes to those. The extent of any schemes promoted along those corridors will be based upon further analysis of need at the time of scheme development.	No	PDSP.027.006	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Submitted by Richard Wood Associates)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Strongly supports the proactive approach in Policy T1.	Support noted and welcomed	No	PDSP.068.005	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Some areas are becoming less suitable for older people to live in due to deteriorating bus services. Extend and improve the Tram system. e.g. to hospitals. concern about impact of the Clean Air Zone on public transport and taxis access to city centre.	Policy T1 provides support for the delivery of improvements to bus services through the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership and the projects associated with the Mass Transit corridors. It also supports the need to secure the future of the tram and expansion in future	No	PDSP.094.001	Age UK Sheffield/Sheffield 50+

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				<p>where viable. As part of the introduction of the Clean Air Zone we have also launched a range of Financial Support Scheme and also a range of exemptions to support people that are driving older more polluting vehicles, and as a result would face a daily charge for entering the CAZ. The response to our Financial Support Scheme has been very positive and a significant number of taxi drivers have applied for assistance. At present around 300 of the nearly 400 buses serving Sheffield are compliant with the engine emissions standards and the remaining non-compliant buses are in the process of confirming their approach to upgrading vehicles and are not facing daily charges. We therefore consider that the CAZ will drive a significant improvement in the fleet serving Sheffield and improve air quality as a result, and we are not seeing any adverse effect on mobility across the city.</p>			

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Support for T1. Does not go far enough in creating a fully comprehensive network of joined up and safe active travel routes. Needs to address better public transport between Sheffield and Peak District. Need citywide plan for electric vehicle charging and cycle parking.	Support for policy T1 is welcomed. No change is proposed. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and SYMCA Active Travel Implementation Plan. The transport policies in the Plan set out the priorities for an effective transport network and seek to improve connectivity at national, regional and local levels. Local Plan Policy CO2 (e) supports the inclusion of re-charging infrastructure, in accordance with the provisions set out in the Parking Guidelines, however the strategy for electric vehicle charging is outside of the Local Plan. South Yorkshire’s Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy once developed will sit under the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.	No	PDSP.099.004	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling	Object to the need to deliver improved trans-Pennine road links as this would encourage more	An amendment will be made to reflect the high-level support for trans Pennine connectivity as set	No	PDSP.140.013	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Area Policies and Site Allocations		Sustainable Travel	traffic across the Peak District. Strongly supports the delivery of vital east-west rail links and the Midland Mainline Electrification Programme.	out in the Sheffield Transport Strategy.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Support for policy T1. The policy should include reference to support for the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority's (SYMCA) investigation of franchising.	Support is noted and welcomed. SYMCA are currently undertaking a formal assessment of bus franchising and until the outcome of that work is known it isn't appropriate to reference this in the Local Plan. However, Policy T1 specifically refers to supporting the objectives of the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership which is in place for 3-5 years whilst the assessment work continues.	No	PDSP.140.014	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Local Plan policies should support safe equestrian access to future development. Use CIL funding to improve the off-road network for higher status users of the PROW and facilities such as a community horse arena.	No change proposed as Policies CO1 and DE4 provide principles for safe, inclusive access, however specific access requirements will be considered at the planning application stage. The policies proposed in the Plan provide an appropriate framework for considering planning applications for facilities such as horse arenas.	No	PDSP.146.001	The British Horse Society

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes.	Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield.	Yes	PDSP.153.001	Councillor Douglas Johnson
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes.	Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield.	Yes	PDSP.155.001	Councillor Ruth Mersereau
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes.	Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory	Yes	PDSP.156.001	Councillor Tom Hunt

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations				text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Include a statement that the built environment in redevelopment plans will be shaped to be more friendly to pedestrians and public transport. Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes. Extend the tram to Northern General Hospital. Install a segregated cycle route from the city centre to the Northern General Hospital.	Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield. Policy CO1 makes provision for ensuring that development proposals maximise access by walking, cycling and public transport, with design requirements being set in policy DE4. In relation to specific cycle routes, Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the	Yes	PDSP.160.001	Sheffield Green Party

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				Sheffield transport strategy and SYMCA active travel implementation plan. Regarding the tram system, Policy T1 supports the need to secure the future of the tram and expansion in future where viable.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Better bus access to hospitals is needed. Greystones needs better bus services. Better access to disabled parking on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road is needed.	No change proposed. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for an effective transport network and seeks to improve connectivity at national, regional and local levels. This includes Mass Transit corridors which serve key areas of the city including the Northern General Hospital. Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road are identified as Mass Transit Corridors. The Parking Guidelines set out the requirements for disabled parking spaces in relation to new development. General on-street provision (not related to a new development) is not a matter for the Local Plan.	No	PDSP.190.001	caro999
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Support for Policy T1 encouraging and enabling sustainable travel.	Support noted and welcomed	No	PDSP.191.004	Carol Collins

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Re-opening the rail line which runs from Stocksbridge would provide sustainable access to sites in the Upper Don Valley.	Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line.	Yes	PDSP.260.004	Jan Symington
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Strongly supports Policy T1, paragraphs 5.10 to 5.18 Para 5.15 needs to be strengthened to secure upgrades to all lines to/from Sheffield, and reference re-opening of Barrow Hill and Deepcar lines.	Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line.	Yes	PDSP.268.007	Jim Bamford
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Support for elements of T1. Strengthen the policy by referencing powers beyond the Enhanced Partnership e.g. referencing franchising. Strongly oppose supporting delivery of trans-Pennine road links.	Support noted and welcomed. An amendment is proposed to reflect the high-level support for trans Pennine connectivity as set out in the Sheffield Transport Strategy. The South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) is currently undertaking a formal assessment of bus franchising and until the outcome of that work is known it is not appropriate to	Yes	PDSP.268.008	Jim Bamford

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				reference this in the Local Plan. However, Policy T1 specifically refers to supporting the objectives of the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership which is in place for 3-5 years whilst the assessment work continues.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Include reference to re-opening the Sheffield to Stocksbridge railway line and supporting tram extensions.	Policies SP1 and T1 include support for local rail upgrades and re-opening where this is viable. Additional reference will be added to Policy SP1, T1 and SA2, SA5 and SA8 to support the future re-opening of the Don Valley line and Barrow Hill line.	Yes	PDSP.316.003	maspiers
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Concerned about the proposed cycle route from Langsett Road to Crookes.	The cycle routes included on the Policies Map are existing cycle tracks, off road routes or quiet road routes. They are not proposed routes. This will be made clear on the Policies Map. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) Active Travel Implementation Plan.	Yes	PDSP.324.001	Mike Briercliffe

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Need city wide, joined up, segregated cycle routes. Women in particular will not cycle regularly as a means of transport unless they feel safe.	Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield transport strategy and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) active travel implementation plan.	No	PDSP.350.002	Polly Blacker
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Expand the introduction text to illustrate the equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes.	Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield.	Yes	PDSP.355.001	rich147
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Expand the introduction text to illustrate equal importance of cycling and electrically assisted non-vehicular travel including E-Bikes.	Paragraph 5.18 explains that the focus is on increasing the length and breadth of the active travel network across the city. However, it is agreed that the introductory text should be expanded to explain the importance of provision for non-standard bikes, including cargo bikes, and electric	Yes	PDSP.356.003	Richard Attwood

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				bikes, particularly given the sometimes more challenging topography of Sheffield.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Support for the Plan, including sustainable transport elements. Clarify if the Plan addresses the need to improve access and public transport to the two major hospitals in the city.	Support is noted and welcomed. The transport policies in the Plan such as Policy T1 set out the priorities for an effective transport network and seek to improve connectivity at national, regional and local levels. This includes Mass Transit corridors which serve key areas of the city including the Northern General Hospital, improved rail connections and railway re-opening to enhance regional accessibility, as well as securing the future of the tram.	No	PDSP.358.001	Richard Worth
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Include a strategy for a comprehensive network of cycle paths, including routes connecting local and district centres.	No change proposed. Policy T1 sets out the priorities for delivering sustainable travel, aligned with the priorities confirmed in the Sheffield Transport Strategy and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Active Travel Implementation Plan.	No	PDSP.408.001	Tranton

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy T1: Enabling Sustainable Travel	Reduce car ownership by increasing provision of car clubs. Add a requirement to provide car club spaces in or near district and local centres, and close to denser housing areas.	Policy CO2 encourages the provision of facilities for shared mobility, including parking for car club vehicles where appropriate. No further change is proposed.	No	PDSP.408.002	Trantion

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	The general policy aim would help to ensure that consideration will be given to the protection and enhancement of Blue and Green Infrastructure in line with the wide aims of Part 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy should include reference to the Sheffield & Tinsley Canal.	Agree - a reference to the Sheffield and Tinsley Canal should be added.	Yes	PDSP.001.004	Canal & River Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Watercourses are not clearly represented in Map 17. Reference should be made to extending the network or improving connectivity which could be done through Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS)	Agree in part – given the scale of Map 17, it would only be practical to show Main Rivers and not all water courses. However, both Main Rivers and Ordinary watercourses should	Yes	PDSP.002.004	Environment Agency

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Site Allocations			and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). A policy identifying the use of green spaces in the city for Natural Flood Management type measures could provide an important step to improve biodiversity and public involvement in strengthening blue green infrastructure.	be shown on the Policies Map. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Areas Safeguarded for Flood Storage are already shown on the Policies Map and are referred to in Policy GS9(f); they form part of the network of blue and green infrastructure.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Welcome that the scope of the policy covers not only the protection of blue and green infrastructure but also protection of heritage assets.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.003.020	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy is supported but reference could be made to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework.	Support noted and welcomed. A reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework should be added to the Policy.	Yes	PDSP.006.007	Natural England

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Broadly supports policy BG1 and acknowledges that playing fields form a valuable part of green infrastructure.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.007.006	Sport England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	The use of pattern legends with similar colours is difficult to read.	Agree. Adjustments should be made to the colours on Map 17 so that the different designations and Main Rivers are clearer	Yes	PDSP.014.012	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Consider policy to be sound.	Noted.	No	PDSP.086.004	University of Sheffield (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Support sustainable outdoor recreation opportunities but would welcome recognition in the Local	Agree that the supporting text should clarify that biodiversity should usually take precedence	Yes	PDSP.104.003	Friends of the Loxley Valley

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations			Plan of the potential tensions between human activity and biodiversity.	where there is a conflict with recreational objectives. An amendment is proposed to paragraph 5.25.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Dams, goits and weirs provide essential habitat, including where they are no longer fully in water, and so these heritage assets should also be protected as part of the blue and green infrastructure. Registered parks and gardens are both designated heritage assets and green infrastructure so should be recognised as part of the Green Network.	A reference to historic parks and gardens should be added to Policy BG1. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries. This would therefore be an important consideration for development proposals within the river corridor.	Yes	PDSP.116.029	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Dams, goits and weirs provide essential habitat, including where they are no longer fully in water, and so these heritage assets should also be protected as part of the blue and green infrastructure. Registered parks and gardens are both designated heritage assets and green infrastructure so should be recognised as part of the Green Network.	Agree policy should be amended to highlight the heritage significance of blue and green infrastructure. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries.	Yes	PDSP.116.030	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	The draft Local Plan does not contain adequate policies for the sustainable development of local food infrastructure.	Agree in part. The plan protects allotments (Policy GS1) and gives significant weight to the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land (Policy GS4). However, a reference to local food production should be added to the first paragraph in Policy BG1.	Yes	PDSP.121.013	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Repeats comment PDSP.121.013	See response to comment PDSP.121.013	Yes	PDSP.121.014	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Registered parks and gardens are both designated heritage assets and green infrastructure so should	Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. However, agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has	Yes	PDSP.122.003	Rivelin Valley Conservation Group

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			be recognised as part of the Green Network.	not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Agree that the Policy should be clearer about protection of designated ecological and geological sites and provide a signpost to Part 2 policy GS5.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Map 17 does not show Blue & Green Infrastructure.	Map 17 already shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview, but the detail is provided on the Policies Map. Policies BG1, GS1, GS2, GS5, GS7 and GS8 provide appropriate levels of protection from development. However, agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has	Yes	PDSP.125.008	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps but these are not publicly available. There is no Character Area Plan for most of the Priority City Arrival Area where significant opportunities for deculverting, renaturalisation and connected public access are available along the Porter Brook.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. A reference to active travel routes along river banks should be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	Yes	PDSP.125.009	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	This Policy requires expansion to include a recognition of the heritage significance of blue/green infrastructure and the importance of protecting these.	Agree policy should be amended to highlight the heritage significance of blue and green infrastructure.	Yes	PDSP.125.010	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Policy should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure.	Map 17 shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Agree that the Policy should be clearer about protection of designated ecological and geological sites	Yes	PDSP.127.007	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				and provide a signpost to Part 2 policies GS5 and GS6.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	There needs to be more emphasis on nature recovery and on extending the Green Network. Rewording of policy suggested. The definition of the 'Green Network' refers to Map 17 however Map 17 is not a Green Network map, it is simply a map of existing green spaces and ecologically designated sites. Rewording of Map 17 title suggested. Reference should be made to the Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. A reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework should be added to the Policy and supporting text.	Yes	PDSP.131.002	Sheffield Green & Open Spaces Forum
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	The first sentence of Policy BG1 should be reworded to include reference to the 'urban forest'.	Whilst trees and woodland are an important part of the character of much of the urban area of Sheffield, the term 'urban forest' could be misunderstood by many people. Policy GS7 provides an	No	PDSP.137.001	Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG)

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Site Allocations				appropriate framework for protecting trees, woodlands and hedgerows and promoting new tree planting.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Protection, management and enhancement of the blue and green infrastructure of the city will increase biodiversity and combat climate change.	Support welcomed and noted.	No	PDSP.140.015	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Plan should also acknowledge the role of other agencies and registered charities involved in work to extend the Green Network. The Plan should also adopt and commit to deliver Natural England's Green Infrastructure Standards for England (2023).	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. A reference to the different agencies involved in delivering projects should be added to the supporting text to Policy BG1 (see amendment to paragraph 5.24).	Yes	PDSP.151.003	Upper Don Trail Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to riverside access should be added to the supporting text of Policy BG1. Sub-Area policies SA1-SA8 should be amended to refer to extending and enhancing active travel routes along one bank of Main Rivers wherever practicable and where it is consistent with biodiversity and heritage objectives. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.	Yes	PDSP.177.002	Andy Buck
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	BG1 says that greenspaces will be protected from inappropriate built development. The word 'inappropriate' is too vague.	Disagree. This is an overarching policy and needs to be read in conjunction with policies in Part 2 of the Plan which clarify what	No	PDSP.190.002	caro999

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Policies and Site Allocations				is meant by inappropriate development.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Wholly supports the policy of protecting Sheffield's Blue and Green Infrastructure.	Support noted and welcomed.	No	PDSP.191.005	Carol Collins
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Urban Green Space Zones, Green Belt and geological sites should be shown on Map 17 for clarity and to make absolutely clear that these are not for development.	Map 17 already shows the main Urban Green Space Zones as well as Green Belt and geological sites. The map provides an overview, but the detail is provided on the Policies Map. Policies BG1, GS1, GS2, GS5, GS7 and GS8 provide appropriate levels of protection from development.	No	PDSP.193.004	Caroline Quincey
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Supportive of the green space designation of Bolehill Wood. Would like to see more mention and policy targets for urban food growing and sustainable food production.	Support for Bolehill Wood Local Green Space designation noted and welcomed. A reference to local food production will be added to the first sentence of Policy BG1. Add objective on sustainable local food	Yes	PDSP.198.001	ChloeCheeseman

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				production to the objectives on A Green City.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Local Nature Recovery Network should be included as a supplement to the Plan. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the width of the buffer zones adjoining rivers and streams.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a).	Yes	PDSP.201.005	Claire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy should encourage connection of green spaces where possible to create a real green network.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1.	Yes	PDSP.205.003	ClareW

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.	Yes	PDSP.220.002	DJGShef
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel	Yes	PDSP.229.002	Gaffer

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be	Yes	PDSP.232.002	Gill

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.	Yes	PDSP.245.002	Hilary
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Concerned about potential conflict in objectives of promoting public access to blue and green infrastructure and protecting and enhancing biodiversity.	Agree that the Policy should clarify that biodiversity should usually take precedence where there is a conflict with recreational objectives – see proposed amendment to paragraph 5.25.	Yes	PDSP.260.005	Jan Symington

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Map 17 doesn't show the blue and green infrastructure. There needs to be more emphasis on linking blue and green spaces all over the city, and on enhancing biodiversity. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available. Very sensible that the Local Plan proposes protecting the Green Belt and that most of the new housing will be in the inner-city areas. Key documents such as South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Strategy produced in 2011, and Access to Nature - capacity and demand maps 2021 have not been referred to.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a). References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. A separate Station Masterplan is being prepared for much of the City Arrival Area and will provide more detail than can reasonably be shown in the Local Plan.	Yes	PDSP.267.006	Jill17
Part 1: Vision, Spatial	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	The industrial heritage of the water-power sites linked to water	Agree policy should be amended to highlight the heritage significance of blue	Yes	PDSP.270.002	Jim McNeil

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations			should also be protected as part of the blue and green infrastructure.	and green infrastructure. Part 1 Policy D1 already refers to Sheffield's distinctive heritage associated with water-powered industries.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Local Nature Recovery Network should be included as a supplement to the Plan. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the width of the buffer zones adjoining rivers and streams.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a).	Yes	PDSP.271.005	JimC
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Policy	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is	Yes	PDSP.271.006	JimC

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure.	not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from inappropriate development. Policy should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.	Yes	PDSP.271.007	JimC
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on	Yes	PDSP.281.002	John59

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available.	the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document	Yes	PDSP.284.002	JoM

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Suggests that new areas for green spaces and blue and green infrastructure improvements should be identified as currently the Local Plan priorities are not explicitly strong regarding this. Also requires policy to identify/differentiate between how much value each open space is worth.	No changed required. The Plan identifies a number of locations where new green space will be created in the Central Area and as part of allocated sites in other areas. Policy GS1 provides an appropriate policy framework for assessing the value of green spaces, if and when development proposals arise.	No	PDSP.285.003	Jonathan789
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Suggests that new areas for green spaces and blue and green infrastructure improvements should be identified as currently the Local Plan priorities are not explicitly strong regarding this. Also requires policy to identify/differentiate between how much value each open space is worth. Would also like to see blue infrastructure such as rivers being utilised to their full extend, being de-culverted and opened up for more access. Suggests adding Local Plan ambition to meet the accessible green space standards provided by Natural England.	The standards set out in Part 2, Table 4, were recommended by the Sheffield Open Space Assessment and reflect the availability of accessible natural greenspace in Sheffield. References to active travel routes along river banks should however, also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Policy GS9 already includes an expectation that rivers will be deculverted wherever practicable.	Yes	PDSP.285.004	Jonathan789

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it. The Character Area and Priority Housing Sites maps should show existing riverside trails, current initiatives and future opportunities. Reference is made to the South Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy and its Natural Capital Maps, but these are not publicly available.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. References to active travel routes along river banks should also be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.	Yes	PDSP.306.002	LisaG
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature	Yes	PDSP.329.002	nahtalix

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	There is not enough future provision or protection for the existing green and blue infrastructure/ local nature network. Would like to see more provision as well as strengthening of Local Plan priorities to provide more green spaces.	Disagree - the plan provides a robust framework for considering planning applications that affect greenspace and the local nature network – see Policies GS1, GS2 and GS5-GS7 in particular. However, agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats – see proposed amendment to Policy BG1.	Yes	PDSP.333.004	NicolaDempsey99
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Local Nature Recovery Network should be included as a supplement to the Plan. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the width of	Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document. Policy GS9	Yes	PDSP.341.003	PaulMaddox1960

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			the buffer zones adjoining rivers and streams.	already specifies buffer zones for development next to rivers.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Map 17 doesn't show the blue and green infrastructure. There needs to be more emphasis on linking blue and green spaces all over the city, and on enhancing biodiversity.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.	Yes	PDSP.343.002	penny71
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 and accompanying Map 17 are unsound as they simply describe the existing green-blue network but do not propose a vision or strategy for improvement to connect or extend it.	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be	Yes	PDSP.346.002	PeterB

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	The Upper Don Trail should be named in the Local Plan with a commitment to its development and completion, including the improved cycle route north past Wardsend Cemetery and through the Millenium Park in Oughtibridge to link further north.	References to active travel routes along river banks should be added to Sub-Area policies SA1 to SA8.	Yes	PDSP.350.003	Polly Blacker
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Welcomes building in the inner city to avoid building on the Green Belt. Plan should be much more visionary regarding expansion of the Green-and Blue Network to include the inner city and other deprived areas.	Note support for protection of Green Belt. Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree policy BG1 should be strengthened to emphasise the potential for improving the <i>connectivity</i> of the Green Network and supporting nature recovery (as part of the Local Nature Recovery Network).	Yes	PDSP.354.001	rcb
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Map 17 does not show all the green and blue infrastructure. The Local Nature Recovery Network requires more emphasis in the Policy. Policy should clarify that designated ecological or geological sites will be protected from	Policies GS1 to GS11 support policy BG1 in helping to deliver nature recovery but agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats see proposed	Yes	PDSP.393.003	Sue22

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Site Allocations			inappropriate development. Policy should refer to provision of new quality green infrastructure.	amendments to Policy BG1. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy/Network has not yet been completed at the South Yorkshire level, so it is not possible to include it in the Local Plan. Instead, it should be identified in a supplementary planning document.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy BG1 is strong on protecting existing green spaces but lacks sufficient ambition to define and develop new wild and green spaces. The Plan needs to be more ambitious and prescriptive regarding the specified width of the buffer zones alongside rivers and streams. Specific objectives should be included to make green spaces that are primarily for sport and recreation better for wildlife alongside retaining and enhancing their wider recreational value.	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around <i>connecting</i> greenspaces and wildlife habitats -see proposed amendments to Policy BG1. Riverside buffer strips are covered under Part 2 Policy GS9(a). Management of existing sport and recreation areas is not development and is therefore not an issue that should be covered in the Local Plan. However, development for new sports or recreation space would need to comply with Policies GS5 and GS6.	Yes	PDSP.393.004	Sue22
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy,	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy BG1: Blue & Green Infrastructure	Policy needs to show more ambition regarding expansion of the Green Network (not just protection and enhancement of	Agree that the Plan should set out a clearer ambition around connecting greenspaces and wildlife habitats - see proposed	Yes	PDSP.393.005	Sue22

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations			what already exists). Sections of the Porter Trail, Upper Don Trail and River Sheaf Trail required by current planning conditions, and in some cases currently under construction, should be shown on the Policies Map. Existing or proposed river trails should be mentioned by name in the Policy.	amendments to Policy BG1. The importance of the watercourse should be highlighted in the supporting text of Policy BG1 and references to active travel routes along river banks will be added to relevant Sub-Area policies. However, it would be overly detailed to show all the riverside trails on the Policies Map.			

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Welcome the reference to main river corridors and the canal.	Welcome support.	No	PDSP.001.005	Canal & River Trust

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	We welcome the recognition given to the role Sheffield's	We welcome the recognition given to the role Sheffield's heritage assets play as an integral element of the character of many areas of the city, and that conserving them alongside new development will result in wide ranging benefits for the city.	Welcome support.	No	PDSP.003.021	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	We support this policy which should help to ensure that development within Sheffield is of a high standard that is appropriate to its context.	Welcome support.	No	PDSP.003.022	Historic England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policy D1 duplicates bullet points. Remove bullets i-m and separate bullet h.	Accept suggested policy amendment.	Yes	PDSP.014.013	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Object to terminology used in Policy D1 e.g. beautiful, high quality, in that it can be interpreted differently by different decision makers.	Policy D1 sets out the design requirements for new development in the city and reflects the theme of terminology used in the National Design Guide on 'Well Designed' and 'Attractive', while also reflecting the	No	PDSP.020.011	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				'Living With Beauty' report produced by the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission, which is an independent body set up to advise government on how to promote and increase the use of high-quality design for new build homes and neighbourhoods. The report explains that Local Planning Authorities should not be afraid to ask for 'beauty' and should refuse poor quality development.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Repeat of comment PDSP.020.011	See response to comment PDSP.020.011.	No	PDSP.020.012	Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Submitted by Barton Willmore)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policy D1: Need to make greater emphasis on the quality of design across all development.	No change needed. Draft policy already covers themes raised.		PDSP.099.005	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Plan needs to consider Loxley Valley & Peak Park as a whole with integrated protection, and LV as 'gateway' to the Peaks. Consider designating	Agree in part. The review of Conservation Areas and the designation process, albeit linked to the local plan, will progress outside of the local plan process as a distinct	Yes	PDSP.104.004	Friends of the Loxley Valley

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations			<p>'Areas of Special Character' as Conservation Areas. Lack of information on LNRS/NRN. Suggest Loxley Valley & LWS are considered as part of the future LNRS/NRN. Given Biodiversity Emergency suggest Biodiversity should hold sway over recreational opportunities.</p> <p>GSS - Include actual minimum distances for habitat buffer strips. Suggest buffer strips for Main Rivers is 20m and 10m for Ordinary Watercourses.</p> <p>Suggest continued Green Belt Designation of sites including Lidl, Forge Valley school &</p>	<p>piece of work. Work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not yet been completed so will be included when complete in an SPD and/or in the plan at next review stage.</p> <p>Policy GSS includes a requirement to provide appropriate buffer strips to designated sites and habitats. The Environment Agency set outs the following habitat buffer distances required for watercourses: (a) at least 10 metres for rivers and streams & (b) a distance of greater than 10 metres in some cases (dependant on the river type and how laterally active it is) – however, this is too detailed for inclusion in the Local Plan and is better dealt with in a supplementary planning document.</p> <p>The land referred to no longer performs the purposes of Green Belt. Heritage water assets are already</p>			

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			former college, & sites off Chapman Close & Greaves Lane to protect against further intensive development.	covered by policy. The Policies map is based on the best available Ordnance Survey base mapping that was available to the Council in digital format. The base map could be changed if other mapping becomes available.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Recommend that measures to mitigate climate change and reduce greenhouse emissions should be delivered through nationally recognised standards.	The Council declared a Climate Emergency in 2019, with a target of becoming net zero by 2030. The Plan proposes introduction of the Future Homes and Future Buildings Standards from 2025 which is in line with the Government proposals. From 2030 development will be expected to be net zero carbon for consistency with the Council target.	No	PDSP.112.004	Home Builders Federation
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Create a HES allied to Local Plan and supported by policies detailing how historic environment can bring public benefits. Increase list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield.	Agree in part. An encompassing term to be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets. The plan already creates a policy 'hook' for further guidance/strategies.	Yes	PDSP.113.001	Hunter Archaeological Society

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	D1 (a & b) items a & b repeated p.105-106.	Accept suggested policy rewording.	Yes	PDSP.116.031	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Increase list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield. Plan states aim for high standard of design. NPPF states that development which is not well designed should be refused, which the Plan should say the same. Policy would benefit from additional supporting text on the importance and benefits of heritage.	Agree in part. An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets. It is not necessary to duplicate the NPPF.	Yes	PDSP.116.032	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Repeat of comment PDSP.116.032	See response to comment PDSP.116.032.	Yes	PDSP.116.033	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Increase list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield.	An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets.	Yes	PDSP.116.034	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Repeat of comment PDSP.116.031	See response to comment PDSP.116.031.	Yes	PDSP.116.035	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Repeat of comment PDSP.116.034	See response to comment PDSP.116.034	Yes	PDSP.116.036	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	NHS would welcome further engagement on identifying health requirements of new and existing development.	This will be covered as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No	PDSP.119.001	NHS Property Services
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policies don't contain adequate provision to cover sustainable local food growing infrastructure.	A reference to local food production should be included in Policy BG1.	Yes	PDSP.121.015	Regather

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Repeat of comment PDSP.121.015	See response to comment PDSP.121.015	Yes	PDSP.121.016	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment.	An encompassing term to be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets	Yes	PDSP.137.002	Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	We applaud the wording of D1 a).	Welcome support.	No	PDSP.140.016	South Yorkshire Climate Alliance
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	No requirement for Rainwater Recycling and Water Run-off, which will increase water demand, flood risk and impact on drainage system capacity.	Policy ES4 includes the Building Regulations Optional Requirement for new dwellings to limit wholesome water consumption to 110 litres per person per day. ES4 also requires green/brown/blue roofs where viable and compatible with other design features, which will contribute towards reducing flood risk. GS9 & 11	No	PDSP.185.001	Ascreenname

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
				focus on measures to manage flood risk including use of Sustainable Drainage Systems where feasible. These measures have been incorporated into the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Any further measures would therefore render the Plan unviable unless other policies were amended to compensate.			
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policy D1 doesn't mention biodiversity or design features to encourage biodiversity in new development e.g. swift bricks	Although Policy D1 doesn't mention biodiversity or design features to encourage biodiversity, these are covered in Policy GS5 Development & Biodiversity – an amendment is proposed to include specific requirements for swift bricks.	No	PDSP.191.006	Carol Collins
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles and Priorities	Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Embed Loxley Valley Design Statement in the Plan. Embed Heritage Strategy in the Plan. Embed Waterways Strategy in the Plan.	Agree in part. An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets. Strategies should flow from policy not dictate it.	Yes	PDSP.260.006	Jan Symington
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy D1: Design Principles	Policy needs to refer to Sheffield's landscape as a Heritage Asset, not just the built environment. Increase	Agree in part. An encompassing term will be added to the policy covering additional heritage assets.	Yes	PDSP.381.001	Simon_Surveys

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations		and Priorities	list of Heritage categories to include others of particular importance in Sheffield.				

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	The policy states that development should not increase flood risk across the city – we would suggest re-wording to make clear that flooding isn't increased elsewhere (including out of the city).	Agree. The policy should be amended to make this clear.	Yes	PDSP.002.005	Environment Agency
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	The cumulative traffic impact of the site allocations is being considered, and where there is a significant traffic impact at the Strategic Road Network. SCC will need to ensure that this is mitigated appropriately. Early engagement and involvement in these sites (as they move through the planning process) is welcomed by National Highways. SCC will	The comments are noted and the support for the policy approach is welcomed. The aim is to agree a Statement of Common Ground with National Highways once the transport modelling has been completed and in advance to the public hearings.	No	PDSP.005.001	National Highways

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
			need to give consideration to public transport services around site allocations in meeting the criteria set out for the minimum service frequency standard within Policy NC11.				
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Broadly support Policy IN1, particularly the provision of sufficient sports facilities to meet the forecast demand. It also needs to meet the needs of respective sports that are played in the City and be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy so there should be additional text in the policy and supporting text to reference the Sheffield Playing Pitch Strategy September 2022.	The supporting text makes reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as a means of identifying requirements. The IDP references the Playing Pitch Strategy so the Strategy will be used to inform infrastructure needs and there is no need to replicate the reference in the Plan.	No	PDSP.007.007	Sport England
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Transport' should be in bold.	Agree.	Yes	PDSP.014.014	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Suggest the tram network is included in the policy section on Transport.	Agree – an amendment has been proposed	Yes	PDSP.015.010	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
and Site Allocations							
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Support the Policy but have concerns over the deliverability due to the restrictive nature of developments, viability and thus the funds raised by CIL. The majority of proposed development is on brownfield land in the central areas of which there are known viability issues. There should be a reliance on sites which are already in accessible locations with capacity on the road network, such as Orgreave Park, which is not reliant on public money.	The support for the policy is welcomed. However, the comment is about a specific site rather than the policy itself. In any case, the site is greenfield land within the Green Belt so its inclusion as a site allocation would not align with the Spatial Strategy. While certain parts of the Central Area may appear unviable according to the modelling in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, the report has acknowledged that this is not the experience in reality and notes, in Table 10.8, that there are many recent and active schemes in the City Centre. This evidence suggests that City Centre development remains viable.	No	PDSP.068.006	Norfolk Estates (Submitted by Savills)
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Add "All new build developments will be required to have physical infrastructure to support gigabit-capable full fibre connections. Policy CO3 in Part 2 of the Plan provides further details of this requirement."	There is no need to repeat the wording of policy CO3 here.	No	PDSP.102.009	Dore Village Society

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Contributions to community food growing should be included in the policy.	Food production is not generally considered to be an infrastructure item, but the policy does not exclude it if it is considered relevant. There is therefore no need to amend the policy. The definition of infrastructure in the Glossary sets out what is included, but not what is excluded. However, a reference to local food production will be included in Policy BG1.	No	PDSP.121.017	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Repeat of comment PDSP.121.017.	See response to comment PDFSP.121.017.	No	PDSP.121.018	Regather
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Add to infrastructure priorities adding to, joining up and developing connected and continuous green spaces throughout industrial, commercial and residential areas for public health and wellbeing, wildlife and biodiversity and the attractiveness of the city for investors, employers, workers and visitors.	Other policies in the Plan such as BG1 and those in Chapter 8 of Part 2 cover this issue.	No	PDSP.137.003	Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG)

Plan Document	Chapter	Policy	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations	Chapter 5: Topic Policies	Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision	Strongly support the policy, in particular improving active travel, the passenger rail network, the rail freight network, the bus network and the strategic highway network. The Council should collaborate with statutory providers to increase service frequency and quality, improve connectivity and reliability, and promote sustainable transport patterns to help decarbonise the system, boost productivity, and encourage healthier and more active travel.	No change needed. Support for the policy welcomed. The South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) is currently undertaking a formal assessment of bus franchising and until the outcome of that work is known it is not appropriate to reference this in the Local Plan. However, Policy T1 specifically refers to supporting the objectives of the South Yorkshire Enhanced Bus Partnership which is in place for 3-5 years whilst the assessment work continues.	No	PDSP.268.009	Jim Bamford

Plan Document	Chapter	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
---------------	---------	-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Publication Draft Sheffield Plan – Part 1 Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

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

This page is intentionally left blank