

# SHEFFIELD PLAN EXAMINATION HEARINGS

## **AGENDA**

**Tuesday 25 June 2024**

**9.30am at Howden House, 1 Union Street, Sheffield S1 2SH**

**MATTER 1 - Procedural/legal requirements**

**MATTER 2 - Duty to Co-operate**

---

Please note:

- This session is timetabled for the whole day.
- Please see the Hearings Programme for a list of the participants.
- Hearing Statements by other parties and background documents produced by the Council can be viewed on the Examination website.
- If you wish to attend the hearing session to observe, please contact the Programme Officer in advance. Alternatively, the hearing sessions will be livestreamed and available to watch online.

1. Opening by Inspectors

2. Opening by Council

### **Matter 1: Procedural/legal requirements**

### **3. Plan preparation and consultation (Questions 1.1 - 1.3)**

- How have the general consultation bodies referred to in Regulation 18 of the Local Plan Regulations 2012 been engaged during the different stages of the Plan Preparation? [Q1.1]
- Is the Statement of Community Involvement published in 2020 still relevant and up to date? [Q1.2]
- Is the timing of the Sheffield Plan set out in the Local Development Scheme (CD21), including its adoption, still realistic? [Q1.3]
- Update on the Joint South Yorkshire Waste Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans/Designations in the Plan area [Q1.3]

#### **4. Integrated Impact Assessment (including Sustainability Appraisal) (Questions 1.4 - 1.8)**

- Is there a non-technical summary for the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) Report?
- Is there a copy of the Interim IIA Report 2022? Was this published as a separate document for consultation?
- Additional IIA work on options for the scale and distribution of employment.

##### Development and appraisal of options for housing growth

- How were options for the scale and distribution of growth identified and refined through the various stages of plan preparation?
- Were all reasonable alternatives for development in the Green Belt identified and appraised?
- Should the development of individual small sites on the edge of the urban area have been appraised as a reasonable alternative?
- How was the appraisal of Green Belt options taken into account in identifying the final options for housing growth (options 1-5)?
- Were the final Strategic Locations in the Green Belt (identified in tables 7.6 and 7.7 of CD17) appraised through the IIA? Why were they discounted?
- Following the appraisal of Green Belt options, which focussed on large sites or clusters of sites capable of accommodating around 1,000 dwellings, why was Option 3 selected, which includes a single site in the Green Belt, with a capacity of only 270 dwellings?
- What was the reason for discounting part of Strategic Location 6, and only allocating Norton Aerodrome in Option 3?
- Table 9.1 of CD17 gives a total housing supply figure for Option 3 which is higher than the housing requirement figure of 35,530 in Policy SP1. Which elements of supply have been lost/reduced?

##### Appraisal of sites and policies

- What was the approach to the appraisal of sites through the IIA?
- Have all sites been appraised, including those identified to the Council since 2022?
- What was the approach to considering the sustainability, equality and health impacts of the policies in the Plan?
- Any other issues on the IIA

## **5. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Questions 1.9 - 1.12)**

- Disagreement between the Council and Natural England on whether it has been clearly demonstrated that mitigation measures to reduce traffic levels and pollution impacts are deliverable (as set out in row 1 of the table in the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and Natural England April 2024)
  - o Update on the latest position
  - o What are the barriers to providing further clarification in the HRA Addendum or agreeing other solutions?
  - o Are there any other areas of disagreement with Natural England?
  - o Subject to the resolution of the above issue on mitigation delivery (plus other agreed modifications to the Plan), would Natural England be in a position to confirm that, in their view, the Plan is not likely to lead to adverse effects on the integrity of any national network site?
- Concerns raised by the Peak District National Park Authority on the HRA methodology
  - o Is the 7km Zone of Influence justified? What is Natural England's position on this matter?
  - o Evidence that there is scope for delivery of effective mitigation measures identified by the Council?
  - o Potential resolutions identified by the Authority relating to key forms of mitigation and a Mitigation Delivery Plan.
  - o Any other outstanding objections from the Authority.
- Proposed modifications SV37, SV38 and SV41 (in CD31) to Policies NC15 and GS5 relating to mitigation on the designated sites.
- Any other points relating to the Council's HRA work.

## **6. Other matters (Questions 1.13 - 1.22)**

- Is there a strategic employment policy in the Plan equivalent to strategic housing Policy H1? If not, why not? [Q1.14]
- If it is anticipated the Plan will not have 15 Year timeframe at the time of adoption, how will this be addressed? [Q1.15]
- Does the Plan (Para. 1.28, Part 1) identify all strategic policies that Neighbourhood Plans should be in general conformity with? [Q1.16]
- How will the mitigation measures identified in the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment be taken into account in responding to the effects of climate change? [Q1.19]

- What negative impacts of the Plan have been identified on those people who have a relevant protected characteristics as defined in S. 149 of Equality Act 2010? How will they be addressed? [Q1.20]
- Are the suggested Main Modifications (CD31) to the definitions in the Plan's supporting text and the Glossary necessary? [Q1.22]

## **7. Any other issues on Matter 1**

### **Matter 2: Duty to Co-operate**

#### **8. Duty to Co-operate (Questions 2.1 - 2.6)**

- How and when did this engagement commence and what processes and groupings have been used by Sheffield to engage with the local planning authorities and other relevant organisations? [Q2.1]
- Is their commitment to ongoing engagement through the delivery of the Plan on matters identified? What format will this take? [Q2.2]
- Are there satisfactory reasons for the areas of disagreements set out in the Statement of Common Ground with the relevant local planning authorities (i.e. large scale logistics needs) (Section 4, EXAM37)? [Q2.5]

#### **9. Any other issues on Matter 2**