



## Sheffield Plan Examination

Inspectors – Katie Child B.Sc. (Hons) MA MRTPI, Rosie Morgan B.Sc. (Hons) MCD MRTPI, and David Troy B.Sc. (Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer – Ian Kemp, tel. 0772 3009166

Email: [ian@localplanservices.co.uk](mailto:ian@localplanservices.co.uk) Address: PO Box 241, Droitwich, Worcestershire WR9 1DW

---

## Post Main Modifications Note to the Council

**5 June 2026**

### **1. Overview**

1.1 Thank you for sending the representations on the Proposed Main Modifications. We have read the representations and, as a result, have identified a number of areas where we have further questions/requests for the Council. These are detailed below.

1.2 It would be appreciated if you could respond to the questions/requests below as soon as possible and provide us with an estimated timeline for carrying out any associated further work. These matters will need to be resolved and dealt with before we publish our final report. Please let us know via the Programme Officer when to expect your response.

### **2. Innovation Corridor road scheme**

2.1 The Department of Transport has recently written to the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority confirming the withdrawal of the Innovation Corridor road scheme from the Major Road Network/Large Local Majors programme (EXAM 216). This is a material change of circumstances. We appreciate that there are other sources of funding which exist and that the Council could potentially explore these in the future, or re-submit a bid to the aforementioned programme. However, although the road is identified in the Sheffield Transport Vision (2024) and Transport Strategy (2019) as part of the strategic priorities for improving access in this area, it is not identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as a scheme which is necessary to support growth in the Plan. The Innovation Corridor road scheme is also not factored into the Council's overall transport modelling work. The IDP only includes reference to improving cycling, walking and public transport links in this area.

- 2.2 Representations on the main modifications from British Land (5.0026) also refer to the existence of extant planning permissions within site ES01 and the presence of a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) on part of the route close to ES01. This raises questions about the deliverability of several sections of the road. On site ES01 the safeguarded route could have implications for future detailed schemes and blight development. In terms of the LWS, it appears that a significant section would be developed over by the road. Policy GS9 as modified requires any loss of LWS to be compensated with alternative provision. There is no evidence before us of how or where this scale of re-provision would be facilitated or whether the terms of Policy GS9 could be met.
- 2.3 Taking account of all factors in the round, there appears to be considerable uncertainty regarding the deliverability of the road scheme and whether the route on the Policies Map is feasible. In conclusion, we are not persuaded that there is a reasonable prospect of the Innovation Corridor road route, as shown on the Policies Map, being delivered within the Plan period. As such, in order for the Plan to be justified and effective, further main modifications are necessary to the Plan to delete reference to the road in Policy SA4(j). The safeguarded road route also needs to be removed from the Policies Map. These changes will need to be published for consultation and subject to further Sustainability Appraisal/Habitats Regulations Assessment work as necessary.

### **3. Appraisal of sites put forward during consultation on the additional Green Belt sites in May 2025**

- 3.1 Representations have been raised about how new sites in the urban area put forward during consultation in May 2025 (on the additional Green Belt site options) have been dealt with (5.0467 and others).
- 3.2 Document EXAM 130B sets out the subsequent Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and site appraisal of four new site options in the Green Belt which were proposed by representors during the May 2025 consultation. The Council is requested to confirm whether any new sites within the current urban area (not in the Green Belt) were promoted during the May 2025 consultation process? E.g. sites which have not previously been identified/appraised by the Council as part of the Plan preparation process.
- 3.3 If there are any new sites which are not in the Green Belt, the Council is requested to provide us with details of these sites (location, size and overview of suitability and deliverability). If the evidence is new there may be a need to subsequently publish SA/site appraisal evidence for consultation. This is linked to paragraph 141 in the NPPF 2023 which refers to the need to examine all reasonable options when justifying the need for Green Belt releases and to maximise the use of previously developed land.
- 3.4 The Council is also requested to provide further information on the new Green Belt site options in Table 3 in EXAM 130B – specifically, summary information on whether the sites are suitable and deliverable.

#### **4. Boundary of allocation sites NWS30 and SES29 (Yorkshire Water)**

4.1 Representations from the site promoters/owners indicate that NWS30 and SES29 include small areas of land owned by Yorkshire Water which are not available for development. The Council is requested to confirm if this is correct. And if so, whether these areas of land should be removed from the site boundaries for effectiveness reasons, and the site areas adjusted accordingly? This would involve consultation on further modifications to adjust the site areas in the Plan and amendments to the Policies Map.

#### **5. Boundary of site NES38 (access road)**

5.1 Representations from Norfolk Estates (5.0119) indicate the site boundary near the track to Holme Lane Farm is narrow and should be widened to allow the new road to pass through. The Council is requested to confirm its position on this matter and whether the boundary and site area should be adjusted for effectiveness reasons? This would involve consultation on further modifications to adjust the site area in the Plan and amendments to the Policies Map.

#### **6. Application to secure Listed Building status for the bridge adjoining site SES29**

6.1 A number of representations refer to a recent application to Historic England to secure Listed Building status for the old bridge at Highfield Lane (including 5.0472). The supplied map includes part of the access road leading up to the bridge which runs across the allocation site frontage. It would be appreciated if the Council could:

- a) Confirm whether the Council intends, in the meantime, to add the structure to the Council's local list of heritage assets;
- b) Outline the anticipated timescale for Historic England's decision on the Listed Building application;
- c) Outline what implications a potential listing of the structure could have on the ability to access site SES29 and facilitate development on the site. In particular, is it feasible to gain vehicular access to SES29 via Orgreave Lane only, with no access off Highfield Lane?
- d) Are you content that the policy as drafted, taken together with other elements of the development plan, would adequately take the heritage matters into account (whether the bridge is statutorily or locally listed)? Does the anticipated site capacity remain justified?

#### **7. Deliverability/timing of site HC07**

7.1 Representations have questioned whether site HC07 is capable of delivering housing within the next five years, and refer to a recent application for an amended scheme which was refused by the Council in February 2026 (4693011). The Council is requested to respond to the representation and provide an update on the matter. This should include reasons for refusing the application, details of any appeals, and whether the Council considers the scheme for 1,105 homes is deliverable within the estimated timeframe in the trajectory.

## **8. Policy NC3 Affordable Housing and viability testing**

- 8.1 A number of representations on the proposed main modifications object to the percentage of affordable housing being linked to Gross Internal Floor Area (GIFA) rather than units (including 4619529, 4690585 5.0425 and HBF). This is notwithstanding that the GIFA approach is set out in submitted Policy NC3 and was covered in the Inspector's Main Issues and Questions (and is set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on CIL and Developer Contributions 2015). Section 19.6 in the Council's hearing statement (WS19/1) sets out the Council's response on the use of GIFA.
- 8.2 However, further comments have been made on how affordable housing percentages have been tested in the Council's Whole Plan Viability Assessment work (VI01 and EXAM 131). In VI01 it states that all of the proposed development plan policies have been taken account of and Policy NC3 is quoted in full (with the references to GIFA). This was the position that the Council maintained at the hearings. EXAM 131 indicates that the same approach was taken as in VI01. Nevertheless, our attention has been drawn to paragraph 3.29 in VI01 which indicates that the modelling work is based on units rather than GIFA. It would be appreciated if the Council could confirm and explain what approach it has taken in the viability work. The base appraisals in Appendix 14 in VI01 appear to apply the percentage in terms of both units and GIFA.

## **9. Policy GS5 Biodiversity**

- 9.1 Representation 5.0433 (Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust) says that Priority Habitats and Priority Species are incorrectly placed within the hierarchy in the modified version of Policy GS5, and should be listed within the national, rather than the local category. Please can the Council provide a response to this representation, including a view on whether a further main modification is required to make the policy sound.

## **10. Policy BG1 Blue and green infrastructure**

- 10.1 Representation 5.0478 raises concerns about whether the proposed modifications to Policy BG1 could hinder development, including on the allocated sites. The Council is requested to respond to the representation and confirm whether the two new bullet points and the new final paragraph in the policy are justified and proportionate. Is the new bullet on green spaces consistent with the condition in the site allocation policies which requires schemes to '*explore opportunities to provide ecological corridors having regard to the Local Nature Recovery Network.*' Does the final new paragraph relate to designated wildlife sites?

Katie Child, David Troy and Rosie Morgan  
INSPECTORS