

Examination of the Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future

Matters, Issues and Questions for Stage 1 Hearings

Introduction

This document sets out Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQ) for Stage 1 Hearings regarding the soundness of the Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future (the Plan). Prior to the Stage 1 hearing sessions, responses are invited from participants on the Stage 1 MIQ.

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 outlined 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 (Pre-Submission) Draft Sheffield Plan.

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

Please respond to the MIQ with separate statements for each Matter, with page and paragraph numbers to allow for ease of reference.

Matter 1: Procedural/Legal Requirements

Issue 1: Whether the Council has complied with relevant procedural and legal requirements in preparing the Plan?

Plan preparation and consultation

- 1.1 Has the Plan been prepared and publicised in accordance with the statutory procedures of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the consultation requirements in the Regulations¹?
- 1.2 Has the Plan been produced in compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (CD20), allowing for effective engagement of all interested parties and meeting the minimum consultation requirements set out in the Regulations? Has all relevant and available evidence been made available for consultation at the various stages?
- 1.3 To what extent has the Plan's production been consistent with the Council's Local Development Scheme (CD21)?

Integrated Impact Assessment (including Sustainability Appraisal)

- 1.4 How has the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) (CD17) informed the Plan's preparation at each stage of its development? How were options considered? Is it clear how the IIA has influenced the Plan?
- 1.5 Does the IIA adequately and accurately assess the likely effects of the policies and proposals in the Plan on the IIA Sustainability Aims? Does the IIA test the Plan against reasonable alternatives where these exist, such as different options for housing and economic growth? Does the IIA test for housing growth consistent with the local housing need including the cities and urban centres uplift? Was the testing of the policies and proposals in the Plan and of the reasonable alternatives undertaken on a like for like basis? Were reasons given for rejecting the appraised alternatives?
- 1.6 Has the IIA's methodology been appropriate? What concerns have been raised and how would the Council respond to these concerns?
- 1.7 In overall terms does the Plan meet the legal requirements of Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and the relevant Regulations, and accord with paragraph 32 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance with regard to sustainability appraisal?

¹ Regulations 18 and 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

- 1.8 Were consultation requirements complied with in respect of sustainability appraisal?

Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.9 How were the Habitats Regulations Assessment Appropriate Assessment (CD18, January 2023) and Sheffield Local Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment Addendum (CD19, August 2023) carried out and was the methodology appropriate? Do they meet the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and reflect relevant case law?
- 1.10 What relevant designated sites were considered? What potential impacts of the Plan were factored in? What were the overall conclusions of the HRA documents and how have these conclusions informed the Plan's preparation?
- 1.11 Have any concerns been raised regarding the HRA documents, and what are they? How would the Council respond to these concerns?
- 1.12 How and when has Natural England been involved in the HRA process and have their concerns been satisfactorily resolved?

Other matters

- 1.13 Is the submitted Plan sufficiently clear on which policies would be superseded and which would remain extant on adoption of the Plan?
- 1.14 Does the Plan include all relevant strategic policies to address the Council's priorities and adequately set out an overall strategy for development as required by paragraphs 20-22 of the Framework?
- 1.15 Will the Plan's strategic policies have a minimum time period of 15 years at adoption, consistent with paragraph 22 of the Framework?
- 1.16 Is the Plan's relationship to existing and emerging Neighbourhood Plans justified and reasonable, including the clear identification of strategic policies within the Plan which Neighbourhood Plans would be required to be in general conformity with?
- 1.17 Has regard been had to any made Neighbourhood Plans in preparing the Plan? Is there any specific conflict between any policies of the Plan and any made Neighbourhood Plan?
- 1.18 How does the Plan meet paragraph 11 a) of the Framework?
- 1.19 Is it clear how the Plan secures development that contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change in accordance with Section 19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004?

- 1.20 How have issues of equality been addressed in the Plan? In particular, in what way does the Plan seek to ensure due regard is had to the need to achieve the three aims defined in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in relation to those who have a relevant protected characteristic?
- 1.21 Is the geographical illustration of all relevant policies shown on the Policies Map?
- 1.22 Is the Plan clear, consistent and unambiguous in how it provides definitions within the Plan's supporting text and the Glossary?

Matter 2: Duty to Co-operate

Issue 1: Whether the Council has complied with the Duty to Co-operate in preparing the Plan?

- 2.1 Has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with all relevant organisations on strategic matters of relevance to the Plan's preparation, as required by the Duty to Co-operate?
- 2.2 What mechanisms or formal agreements have been established between authorities on cross-boundary strategic matters? Are these up to date? With regard to housing need, requirement and supply, who has the Council engaged with and how has this been undertaken? What inter-relationships are there with other authorities in respect of the housing market, commuting, migration, and infrastructure provision? How have the above matters been addressed through co-operation, including the housing requirement? What specific outcomes are there? Please make specific reference to any relevant documents, such as Statements of Common Ground.
- 2.3 What is the position of neighbouring authorities in terms of the planned level of housing in Sheffield? Does the overall provision being planned in the Plan have any implications for other authorities? If so, what are they and how are these being addressed?
- 2.4 In determining the need for different types of employment land over the Plan period, how have inter-relationships with other local authorities in terms of economic growth, travel to work, and employment land provision been taken into account, particularly in relation to the need identified for large scale logistics development? Does the overall provision being planned in the Plan have any implications for other authorities? If so, what are they and how are these being addressed?

- 2.5 If any strategic matters remain unresolved, what are these and are there satisfactory reasons for the lack of resolution?
- 2.6 Are there other genuinely strategic matters as defined by Section 33A(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)? How have those matters been addressed through co-operation and what are the resulting outcomes?

Matter 3: Housing Need

Issue 1: Whether the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy with regard to housing need and the housing requirement?

- 3.1 What is the minimum number of new homes needed over the Plan period as calculated using the standard method and including the cities and urban centres uplift based on the latest available figures at the point the Plan was submitted? Are the calculations accurate and do they reflect the Planning Practice Guidance's methodology and advice?
- 3.2 Having had regard to the Planning Practice Guidance, are there any exceptional circumstances in Sheffield which justify an alternative approach to following the standard method in its entirety, including the cities and urban centres uplift? If so, what are they, are they supported by robust evidence, and what should the housing requirement for Sheffield be?
- 3.3 The Planning Practice Guidance refers to the expectation that the increase in the number of homes to be delivered in cities and urban centres is delivered in those areas, rather than the surrounding areas, unless it would conflict with national policy and legal obligations. Would there be any conflict with national policy and legal obligations if the cities and urban centres uplift was applied?
- 3.4 Do paragraph 11 of the Framework and the policies within footnote 7 of the Framework provide a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the Plan area?
- 3.5 Are there any reasonable alternative spatial strategies for Sheffield which could result in a material difference with regard to the significant level of unmet housing need which remains to be positively accounted for? Could housing need be met in a way which did not require land to be removed from the Green Belt?
- 3.6 Is the housing requirement figure of 35,530 homes by 2039 (2,090 per annum) in Policy SP1 a) justified?

Issue 2: Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the provision for other housing needs?

- 3.7 Would the Plan deliver a diverse mix of housing types and tenures suitable to meet the needs of different groups within the community?
- 3.8 What is the annual need for affordable housing and the total affordable housing need over the Plan period?
- 3.9 Has the need for affordable housing been accurately calculated and based on robust, up-to date data? Has this need been calculated in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance? What is the past record for affordable housing completions and forms of delivery? How does the Council consider this will change in the future?
- 3.10 How does the need for affordable housing compare to the housing requirement figure for Sheffield set out in Policy SP1 a)?
- 3.11 Based on the requirements for particular Affordable Housing Market Areas, how many affordable homes is the Plan expected to deliver? How does this compare to the identified need? If needs will not be met, what alternative options has the Council considered?
- 3.12 Does the Plan support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites, consistent with paragraph 78 of the Framework?
- 3.13 What are the identified needs for specialist housing, for example housing for older and disabled people and student accommodation, within the overall housing need for Sheffield? How will these needs be met?

Issue 3: Whether the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the need for and supply of pitches and plots for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?

Note: Site SES03 Land to the east of Eckington Way will be discussed during Stage 2 hearings, while Policy NC7 within the Plan's Part 2 will be addressed in Stage 3 hearings. The relevant Planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS) was published in December 2023.

- 3.14 Is the identified need for Gypsies and Travellers, including New Age Travellers, and for Travelling Showpeople soundly based and supported by up-to-date, robust and credible evidence that is consistent with national policy set out in the PPTS (2023)?
- 3.15 Are the assumptions made about unknown and concealed households, unauthorised sites, those living in brick and mortar dwellings, new household formation, migration, cross-border

- collaboration, and transit provision reliable for Gypsies and Travellers, New Age Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople?
- 3.16 How did you contact Gypsies and Travellers, New Age Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople when assessing the level of need for pitches and plots? Was engagement effective? Does the level of engagement have implications for the robustness of the Council's needs assessment?
- 3.17 What is the breakdown of need in five year periods over the Plan period and how is this need split between Gypsies and Travellers, New Age Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?
- 3.18 Does the Plan make suitable provision for Gypsies and Travellers, including New Age Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople?
- 3.19 Does the Plan provide a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against locally set targets? Have any recent permissions addressed short-term needs for pitches and plots? What provision is made for years 6 to 10 of the Plan period, and, where possible, for years 11 - 15? Have any windfall sites come forward in recent years?
- 3.20 How were the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers, New Age Travellers and Travelling Showpeople considered through the site allocation process? Was the site selection process for allocations robust and consistent? Did the site selection process consider all potential sources of sites? Is the Council's approach to site selection justified?
- 3.21 Policy SP1 g) refers to a total of 12 yards as a minimum to meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople communities, while Policy H1 refers to provision for Gypsies and Travellers covered by the definition in national policy being made through extensions to existing sites and provision of new sites. Is this consistent with the Council's own assessment of need for Gypsies and Travellers, New Age Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople, the Planning for Travellers Topic Paper (HS10) and the PPTS?
- 3.22 With regard to provision for Gypsies and Travellers, is there scope for extension of the Redmires site? Is this feasible and how many additional pitches would be delivered? When would this be delivered?
- 3.23 Are Policies SP1, H1 and SA5 consistent with one another? Are they consistent with paragraph 5.15 of the Planning for Travellers Topic Paper (HS10) which indicates that identified need must be met through allocation of new sites?

Matter 4: The Spatial Strategy

Issue 1: Are the Vision, Aims and Objectives of the Plan soundly based?

- 4.1 Are the Vision, Aims and Objectives of the Plan appropriate for Sheffield and are they soundly based and supported by evidence? Do they align with the Spatial Strategy?
- 4.2 Are there any other matters which should be included, clarified, or given greater emphasis within the Vision, Aims and Objectives?
- 4.3 How does Figure 1 relate to the vision statement set out in paragraphs 2.2 - 2.9, and is there internal consistency in this regard?

Issue 2: Whether the Overall Growth Plan is justified and effective?

Note: Detailed questions on a number of elements of Policy SP1 will be covered in relevant Matters.

- 4.4 Is the Overall Growth Plan, as set out in Policy SP1, justified and consistent with national policy? Will it provide an effective basis to deliver the Vision for Sheffield?
- 4.5 Is there robust evidence that the 372 site allocations referred to in Policy SP1 c) are deliverable/developable, and that they can be relied upon to meet Sheffield's needs for housing, employment, mixed use and recreational development within the Plan period?
- 4.6 Having regard to Policy SP1 m), how does the Plan set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?

Issue 3: Is the Plan's Spatial Strategy soundly based?

- 4.7 Is the Plan's Spatial Strategy soundly based? Does it represent an appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives available?
- 4.8 How was the distribution of development established within the Plan? What alternative options were considered as part of the Plan's preparation and why were they discounted? What was the process, and what factors influenced the spatial distribution of development across the Plan Area? Why was the preferred option chosen?
- 4.9 Noting Policy SP1 n), how have flooding constraints been taken into account in determining the spatial distribution of development? Is the Plan consistent with paragraph 161 of the Framework?
- 4.10 Is the Plan's Spatial Strategy overly reliant on a mixture of large and small urban sites?

- 4.11 Would the strategy of focusing development within the Central Sub-Area and other urban locations align with the objective of creation of thriving neighbourhoods and communities with a housing market that works for everyone?
- 4.12 Is the Plan's settlement hierarchy as set out in Policy SP2 and the Glossary soundly based?
- 4.13 Is the '20-minute neighbourhood' within Policy SP2 appropriate and achievable?
- 4.14 Is the Plan's approach to Broad Locations for Growth soundly based?
- 4.15 What investment is needed to facilitate the transition from employment to housing in the Broad Locations for Growth? Is this realistic and achievable within the Plan period?
- 4.16 With regard to the Broad Locations for Growth and the cross-referred policies listed in Policy SP1 e), have some Broad Locations been omitted? Are there inconsistencies in Policy H1 and the policies for the Sub-Areas in this regard?
- 4.17 Are Broad Locations for Growth clearly defined on the Key Diagram, the relevant Sub-Area maps, and the Policies Map?
- 4.18 Are the Broad Locations for Growth always consistent with the Flexible Use Zones?
- 4.19 Is Policy AS1 justified and effective? Is it sufficiently flexible?

Issue 4: Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to blue and green infrastructure and design principles and priorities?

- 4.20 Is the approach to the protection and enhancement of blue and green infrastructure in Policies SP1 I) and BG1, consistent with national policy and supported by evidence? Is it clearly set out?
- 4.21 Which features and/or areas constitute blue and green infrastructure for the purposes of the Plan? What evidence has been used to identify them, and have they been mapped?
- 4.22 What is the Green Network? Does this encompass all blue and green infrastructure or is it different? If so, how?
- 4.23 What status does the Local Nature Recovery Network have? Is this clearly set out?
- 4.24 How does the approach to the protection of 'valuable greenspace' differ from that to be applied to all blue and green infrastructure, and what is the justification for this?
- 4.25 What is meant by 'inappropriate built development' in the final paragraph of Policy BG1, and how does this relate to the requirements set out in Policies GS1 and GS2? Is Policy BG1 consistent with national policy on the protection of Green Belts?

- 4.26 Where new green infrastructure is created, how would this be protected through the Plan?
- 4.27 Is the approach to blue and green infrastructure in Policy BG1 and SP1 part l) internally consistent? Is suggested modification LS20 needed to make the Plan sound?
- 4.28 Are suggested modifications SV6, SV8, SV9, SV14 and SV15 necessary to make Policy BG1 sound? What would the resultant policy look like?
- 4.29 Is Policy D1 consistent with national policy, justified and effective?
- 4.30 With regard to Policy D1 f) and j), where are the principles of inclusive and dementia friendly design clearly set out?
- 4.31 Does Policy D1 repeat numbering for criteria a) and b), replicate criteria e) – g) at criteria i) – k), and partially replicate criterion h) at criteria l) and m)? Does Policy D1 h) make sense as drafted?

Matter 5: Employment

Issue 1: Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to employment land?

Employment Land Requirement

- 5.1 Is the requirement for 12.9 hectares of employment land per annum in Policy SP1 b) justified and supported by evidence? Where does the specific figure come from and how does it relate to the scenarios assessed in the Employment Land Review (ELR) Update 2021 (EM06)? Why was it chosen ahead of other scenarios tested?
- 5.2 What is the basis for the allowance for a flexibility factor (24.7 hectares) included in the ELR Update? Is this justified?
- 5.3 What is the basis for the replacement allowance for employment space lost to other uses (84.6 hectares over 20 years) in the ELR Update? Does the evidence justify such a significant allowance?
- 5.4 Is the methodology chosen (absorption trends (market based)) in the Sheffield Logistics Study (SLS) 2022 (EM30) for forecasting future large scale logistics development needs and its findings justified? Why was it chosen ahead of other methodology tested?
- 5.5 What is the basis for the 20% allowance of the future large scale logistics needs being met through the recycling or refurbishment of the existing large scale industrial/logistics sites included in the SLS? Does the evidence justify such a significant allowance?

- 5.6 What is the basis for the proposed split in the requirement for office development and industrial development in Policy SP1 b)? Is this justified?
- 5.7 How have the findings of the SLS (EM30) been taken into account in drawing up the proposed employment requirements in Policy SP1 b)?
- 5.8 Should a requirement for the provision of logistics/warehousing development be more explicitly set out in Policy SP1 b), in order to ensure effectiveness and consistency with national policy?
- 5.9 Are there "qualitative needs" for employment land in Sheffield that are not reflected in the "quantitative needs" identified but which should be provided for in the Plan?
- 5.10 Is the suggested amendment RH119 (CD31) to Policy SP1 b) needed for soundness?
- 5.11 In overall terms is the proposed employment land requirement appropriate and justified? Is it realistic? Should it be increased or decreased and if so on what basis?

Employment Land Supply

- 5.12 Is the strategy set out in the SLS (EM30) for addressing the shortfall in the supply of land to meet the forecast needs for large scale logistics uses justified by the evidence available?
- 5.13 Is sufficient land available to meet identified needs for logistics/warehousing uses in the wider functional economic market area in the Sheffield City Region?
- 5.14 (a) Does the Plan identify sufficient land and opportunities to ensure that the overall needs for additional employment floorspace will be met? (b) If not, would the adverse impacts of doing so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or do specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted in the Plan Area?

Issue 2: Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to retail and main town centre development?

- 5.15 Are the quantities of additional comparison and convenience retail floorspace capacity in the Sheffield Retail and Leisure Study 2022 (EM22) realistic indications of the likely quantitative and qualitative needs for those forms of development in the Plan Area? Are the assumptions realistic and floorspace capacity justified?
- 5.16 Does the Plan allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail needs as required by paragraph 86 of the Framework? How does the Plan ensure that the needs for retail

- will be met in full and will not be compromised by limited site availability?
- 5.17 Does the Plan identify the need for other uses such as leisure, commercial, office and other main town centres development needed in the identified centres, including the City Centre, District Centres and Local Centres? How will the need for such uses be met over the Plan period, having regard to paragraph 86 of the Framework?

Issue 3: Is Policy SP3 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 5.18 What is the basis for the hierarchy of centres in Policy SP3 and is it justified? Should any other retail centres/areas be included?
- 5.19 How were the boundaries of City Centre, District Centres and Local Centres set out on the Policies Map drawn up and what are they based on? Are they appropriate and consistent with definitions in national policy?
- 5.20 In overall terms, is the approach set out in Policy SP3 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Matter 6: Green Belt

Issue 1: Is the principle of release of Green Belt land soundly based?

- 6.1 Do the Proposed Sheffield City Region Combined Green Belt Review – A Common Approach – August 2014 (GB01); Green Belt Review (September 2020) (GB02); and Green Belt Review Addendum (December 2022) (GB03) provide a robust justification for proposed Green Belt boundary changes?
- 6.2 Taking into account paragraph 140 and 141 of the Framework, how has the Council sought to make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land and to optimise the density of development through Plan preparation?
- 6.3 When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, paragraph 142 of the Framework states that the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account. How and where has this been taken into account by the Council?
- 6.4 Having made the decision to review the Green Belt boundaries, how has the Council determined at a strategic level where alterations should be made to meet identified needs?
- 6.5 How has the potential to off-set the impact of removing land from the Green Belt been considered, for example through

compensatory improvements to environmental quality and the accessibility of remaining Green Belt land?

Issue 2: Is the Green Belt Review Methodology soundly based?

- 6.6 What was the methodology used in the Council's Green Belt Review work and was it appropriate?
- 6.7 The Proposed Sheffield City Region Combined Green Belt Review – A Common Approach – August 2014 (GB01) did not identify specific land parcels. The Green Belt Review (September 2020) (GB02) set out 75 general areas and then identified 204 smaller parcels for assessment. How were these areas defined and what were their boundaries based on?
- 6.8 The Sheffield Landscape Character and Green Belt Capacity Study (April 2018) (GB08) assessed 172 parcels of land, while the Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment (2011)(GB04) considered 16 character areas and the Landscape Character Assessment Addendum (September 2022) (GB07) considered capacity of 34 further areas. Is this generally consistent with the 75 general areas and 204 smaller parcels for assessment in the Green Belt Review (September 2020) (GB02)?
- 6.9 The Green Belt Review (September 2020) (GB02) assessed parcels of land against four of the five Green Belt purposes set out in paragraph 138 of the Framework. How did the Council take these findings into account in preparing the Plan?
- 6.10 Is the Council's general site allocations assessment methodology for sites in the Green Belt soundly based and in line with national guidance?
- 6.11 Have all rejected sites in the Green Belt been fully assessed against relevant Green Belt purposes?
- 6.12 What approach is taken to villages inset in the Green Belt or washed over by Green Belt?

Issue 3: Is the Plan's approach to identifying site allocations in the Green Belt and Green Belt additions and deletions soundly based and in line with national policy?

- 6.13 Having regard to paragraphs 140 – 143 of the Framework, do exceptional circumstances exist at a strategic level to alter the Green Belt boundary?
- 6.14 Is Policy SP1 h) which sets out the need for protection for existing Green Belt boundaries around existing built-up areas, with one strategic land release on a predominantly brownfield site at the former Norton Aerodrome for residential use, consistent with the Council's evidence base on Green Belt, with particular reference to the additions to and deletions of Green Belt land which are

- identified on the Policies Map? What boundary changes would result from the adoption of the Plan and are they clearly and unambiguously set out in the Plan?
- 6.15 Have the exceptional circumstances for all additions and deletions of Green Belt land been fully evidenced and justified as paragraph 140 of the Framework requires? Do exceptional circumstances exist to support these changes to the Green Belt boundary? Each proposed addition to and deletion of Green Belt land should be individually evidenced and justified in the Council's hearing statement, with reference to the above questions and relevant elements of the evidence base.
- 6.16 What would the impact of the proposed boundary changes at Site SS17 Former Norton Aerodrome be on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt? Do the exceptional circumstances exist necessary to justify this alteration to the Green Belt boundary?

Issue 4: Is Policy GS2 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 6.17 Is Policy GS2 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
- 6.18 What is the reason for the definition of 'not materially larger' and 'disproportionate addition' as referred to in Policy GS2 b) and c)?
- 6.19 Is Policy GS2 d) clear and unambiguous as to what it permits?
- 6.20 Are the substantially developed road frontages at Chapeltown Road, Whiteley Wood Road and Long Line clearly defined?
- 6.21 Is it necessary to define inappropriate?

Matter 7: Infrastructure and Transport

Issue 1: Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to infrastructure?

- 7.1 Is Policy IN1 consistent with the Framework in setting out the contributions and the types of infrastructure required from development that are fully justified and ensure adequate mitigation measures are provided in a timely and phased manner, where necessary? Is the policy effective in this regard?
- 7.2 Is it sufficiently clear what the 'essential', 'required', 'important' and 'supportive' categories of infrastructure in Policy IN1 relate to? Is the policy effective? Should these terms be more clearly defined in the supporting text to the policy or the Glossary?

- 7.3 Does Policy IN1 provide an appropriate framework for dealing with the potential impacts of development on flood risk in all circumstances? Is it justified and consistent with national policy?
- 7.4 As the South Yorkshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy (2021) does not form part of the development plan, is the reference to this document under Policy IN1 necessary in the interests of soundness of the Plan? Can these details be provided in the supporting text?
- 7.5 Does the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 1 (IN01) and Part 2 Update (EXAM 3E) clearly set out the infrastructure required to support the growth and delivery of the development proposed in the Plan?

Issue 2: Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to transport?

Transport modelling and impacts of planned growth

- 7.6 How has the Council:
- a) Identified the transport demands arising from the policies, allocations and growth aspirations of the Plan;
 - b) Assessed the impacts of policies, allocations and growth aspirations on the performance of the transport network;
 - c) Identified any outcomes or mitigation as necessary;
 - d) Assessed the adequacy of any identified outcomes or mitigation; and
 - e) Identified any phasing and/or funding requirements necessary to ensure that the identified infrastructure measures are viable and deliverable?
- 7.7 The Sheffield Strategic Transport Modelling Assessment (STMA) (January 2024) (EXAM 3F-J) indicates that certain parts of the Local Road Network within the Plan area will become over capacity with the additional traffic generated by the Plan scenarios by 2029 and 2039. How does the Council intend to address this? Are mitigation measures proposed in the STMA justified and how will they be delivered?
- 7.8 The STMA indicates that certain parts of the Strategic Road Network within the Plan area will become over capacity with the additional traffic generated by the Plan scenarios by 2029 and 2039, particularly around Junctions 34 and 35 of the M1. How does the Council intend to address this? Are mitigation measures proposed in the STMA justified and how will they be delivered?
- 7.9 What has been the outcome of the discussions with National Highways on the potential impacts of the planned growth in the Plan on the Strategic Road Network? Have any additional actions

- been agreed between the Council and National Highways in a Statement of Common Ground since submission of the Plan?
- 7.10 Are mitigation measures proposed in the STMA to address the forecast increase in demand for public transport and active travel from the Plan's development sites during the Plan period justified? How will they be delivered?

Sustainable Transport, Transport Networks and Accessibility

- 7.11 Do Policies SP1 j), SP1 k) and T1 provide an appropriate policy framework for dealing with the potential impacts of development on transport networks and promoting sustainable transport options in line with paragraphs 104 - 109 of the Framework?
- 7.12 What is the justification for the new transport infrastructure listed under Policies SP1 j), SP1 k) and T1? Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities who will deliver the necessary transport improvements and when? Are they deliverable within the Plan period and is there funding in place? Are they clearly defined on the Policies Map?
- 7.13 Is support for rail infrastructure in Policies SP1 and T1 justified and up to date? Should the support for local rail upgrades and re-opening be qualified by 'where viable'? Are modifications needed to Policy SP1 j) to ensure internal consistency with other policies?
- 7.14 Should the importance of cycling, including the provision for non-standard cycles and electrically assisted cycles, such as E-bikes, be more explicitly set out in the supporting text to Policy T1?
- 7.15 Should opportunities for more sustainable freight movements, as promoted in paragraph 5.19, be more explicitly set out at a City level in Policy T1?
- 7.16 In overall terms, is the approach set out in Policies SP1 j), SP1 k) and T1 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

J Gilbert

R Morgan

D Troy

INSPECTORS