

Examination of the Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future

Supplementary Matters, Issues and Questions for Stage 2 Hearings

Introduction

This document sets out Supplementary Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQ) for Stage 2 Hearings regarding the soundness of the Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future (the Plan). Prior to the forthcoming hearing sessions, responses are invited from participants on the Supplementary MIQs for Stage 2 Hearings. Participants should have regard to the recently published Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (EXAM38 – 42)(April 2024).

Stage 1 Hearings cover predominantly strategic matters, while Stage 2 and Stage 3 Hearings respectively address viability, site allocations and housing supply, and development management policies.

The Examination will be focussed on the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 35 and other requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published in September 2023.

Participants should only respond to the questions which directly relate to the written representations they submitted to the consultation on the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan.

Further information about the Examination is provided in the Guidance Note V2 and the latest published Provisional Hearings Programme, which should be read alongside the Stage 2 MIQ.

Please respond to the Stage 2 supplementary MIQ in a **single** supplementary statement for Stage 2, with page and paragraph numbers to allow for ease of reference.

The deadline for submission of the supplementary MIQs for Stage 2 Hearings is 5 June 2024 (electronic copies) and 7 June 2024 (paper copies).

- A. Does the Whole Plan Viability Assessment adequately reflect the nature and circumstances of proposed allocations in the Plan, including evidence presented in the Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2022) and Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2024) regarding the impacts of flood risk?
- B. Given the evidence presented in the Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2022) and Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2024) regarding the impacts of flood risk, is the additional condition on development on the site allocations outlined in Appendix 2 of the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (EXAM 34) justified and consistent with national policy?
- C. Are the mitigation measures identified in the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the timing at which they should be addressed (i.e. at or before planning application stage) sufficient to justify allocating each of the sites outlined in Appendix 2 of the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency?
- D. Many of the proposed allocations are in areas protected by existing flood defences, which are owned and maintained by the Council. To minimise the residual risk of flooding to these sites resulting from any breach, what arrangements are in place to ensure that flood defences will be appropriately maintained and, if necessary, improved, in future? Is additional mitigation necessary?
- E. Annex A of the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies sites which may be at risk of flooding from reservoirs. How has this risk been taken into account in the Plan preparation process, and is any mitigation required?
- F. In relation to sites CW01, CW02, CW04, HC03, LR01, LR02, LR04, LR05, SV02, SV03, SV04, SV05, SV07, SV11, SV16, SV17, SV18, SV22, SD01 and SD03, the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends that further detailed modelling of the River Sheaf/Porter Brook/Little Don is required to ascertain whether the site can pass the exception test and/or to prove that the site can be safe for its lifetime.

What is the anticipated timescale for completion of the updated modelling for the new Sheaf and Porter Brook model being

undertaken by the Environment Agency? Will this include the Little Don?

In the absence of up to date modelling information in relation to fluvial flood risk, is allocation of these sites justified for the level of development proposed and within the anticipated timeframes?

- G. In order to address the cumulative impact of development, the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends that joint drainage strategies are undertaken for sites HC03/HC08/HC11/SV04/SV16/SV22/SV25, SV01/SV02/SV05/SV11, KN18/KN34/KN35, SES04 – SES07, SS01/SS04, SU12/SU30, SU13/SU24/SU26. How can this be secured through the Plan?
- H. Why is site SES17 still considered to be deliverable/developable when the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends it should not be developed due to surface water flood risk?
- I. Are Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment site-specific assessments available for sites CW14, CW17, ES41, HC07, HC08, HC30, KN10, KN23, LR06, NES03, SD05, SES09, SES14, SES16, SS18, SU10, SU19, SU37, SU55, SV09, SV15, SV19, SWS03, SWS04, SWS05?
- J. What is the effect of the findings of the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment on the quantum of employment development proposed for allocation within the Plan?

Please provide this as a total and broken down on a site by site basis and include whole sites proposed for de-allocation and any likely reduction in site yield. It would also be helpful if the Council could provide a brief explanation for the reasons for each de-allocation or reduction in site yield.

- K. What is the effect of the findings of the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment on the quantum of housing development proposed for allocation within the Plan?

Please provide this as a total and broken down on a site by site basis and include whole sites proposed for de-allocation and any likely reduction in site yield. It would also be helpful if the Council could provide a brief explanation for the reasons for each de-allocation or reduction in site yield.

- L. For proposed allocations which already have planning permission, how has flood risk been assessed through the plan preparation process? Is this consistent with the requirements for planning and flood risk in paragraphs 161 - 165 of the Framework?

J Gilbert

R Morgan

D Troy

INSPECTORS