

Examination of the Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future

Matters, Issues and Questions for Stage 3 Hearings

Inspectors: Katie Child BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI
David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI
Rosie Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Programme Officer: Ian Kemp
Tel. 0772 3009166, Email: ian@localplanservices.co.uk
Address: PO Box 241, Droitwich, Worcestershire WR9 1DW

This document sets out Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQ) for the Stage 3 hearings on the draft Sheffield Plan.

The Stage 3 hearings will focus on the development management policies in Part 2 of the Plan. The Stage 1 Hearings will cover strategic matters and the Stage 2 hearings will look at site allocations and housing supply.

Written Statements

To ensure the Stage 3 hearings are focused, representors are invited to respond to the questions in this document. Written statements should be submitted to the Programme Officer by **6 September 2024** via email, and three paper copies sent to the above address.

You should only respond to the questions which directly relate to the written representations you submitted on the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan. Please note that there is no requirement to submit a written statement and you may wish to rely on your previous representations. All previous written comments on the submission Plan will be taken into account.

You are requested to submit separate statements for each Matter, with page and paragraph numbers to allow for ease of reference.

The hearing sessions

The Stage 3 hearing sessions are due to start on **Tuesday 5 November 2024**. The location of the hearings will be confirmed in due course. The sessions will also be livestreamed so they can be watched online.

Speaking at or observing the sessions

If you previously made comments on the submission Plan and are seeking a change to the Plan, there is a right to take part in and speak at a hearing session on the relevant matter. If this applies and you wish to speak at the hearings please contact the Programme Officer in email/writing by **30 August 2024**. You should indicate:

1. Which matter/issue/question number this relates to, and
2. Who you are representing (where relevant)

Anyone can observe the hearing sessions – either by attending the event or watching online. If you wish to attend the event in person to observe, you are requested to notify the Programme Officer by the above date.

Further information

Further information on the examination is set out in the Hearings Programme (V6 June 2024) and the Inspectors Guidance Notes V2 (23 February 2024). All documents, including the submitted Plan and other evidence, can be viewed on the examination webpage at [Sheffield Plan \(localplanservices.co.uk\)](http://Sheffield Plan (localplanservices.co.uk))

If you have any questions about this document or the examination process, please contact the Programme Officer.

MIQ contents

	Page number
Matter 19 – Residential Development Policies	3
Matter 20 – Economic Development Policies	6
Matter 21 – Retail and Communities Policies	8
Matter 22 – Climate Change and Managing Natural Resources	11
Matter 23 – Natural Environment Policies	15
Matter 24 – Design and Built Environment Policies	19
Matter 25 – Transport and Connectivity	20
Matter 26 – Monitoring and implementation	22

Matter 19 - Residential Development Policies

Issue – Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies on residential development which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy NC1: Principles Guiding the Development of Strategic Housing Sites]

[Policy NC2: Development in the Residential Zones]

[Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing]

[Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living]

[Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities]

[Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation]

[Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites]

[Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards]

[Policy NC9: Housing Density]

[Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments]

Questions

Policy NC2: Development in the Residential Zones

- 19.1 Is a zoning approach to residential development necessary in order to effectively protect the living environment in residential areas of the city? How will the policy operate alongside Policy NC14?
- 19.2 How were the boundaries of the residential zones defined?
- 19.3 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy NC2 and is it justified? Is it the case that proposals for unclassified uses will be assessed on their merits and could be acceptable if they do not have an adverse impact on residential amenity?
- 19.4 Does the policy wording provide clear direction to applicants on how the Council will determine applications in the residential zones? Are preferred and acceptable uses permitted in principle, as set out in paragraph 2.10?

Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing

[also see questions regarding viability and deliverability in Matter 8 MIQs]

- 19.5 How would the second bullet point relating to sites with a capacity of less than 10 dwellings work in practice? Is the approach deliverable?
- 19.6 Why is the minimum required contribution in part a) based on gross internal floor area rather than units?

- 19.7 Is the Council's proposed additional wording for part a) (ER7 in CD31) necessary to ensure clarity regarding the transfer price and how the policy operates?
- 19.8 Is Policy NC3 to be applied to Build-to Rent schemes?
- 19.9 Is the application of Policy NC3 justified in respect of specialist housing for older and disabled people?

Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living

- 19.10 Is there a clearly identified need for the level of accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair adaptable dwellings specified in parts a) and b)? Is this supported by viability evidence?
- 19.11 Is flexibility needed in Policy NC4 to address site-specific circumstances which may make it difficult to achieve M4(2) or M4(3) requirements?
- 19.12 Planning Practice Guidance states that where step-free access is not viable, neither of the Optional Requirements in Part M should be applied. Is the third paragraph in Policy NC4 on exceptions consistent with this?
- 19.13 What are the 'areas of need' referred to in Policy NC4? Should these be identified on the Policies Map?
- 19.14 What is the Council's justification for proposing to remove part c) of the policy? (ER6 in CR31)
- 19.15 Is the requirement for specialist housing for older or disabled people to provide 100% wheelchair adaptable or wheelchair accessible, as set out in the final paragraph of Policy NC4, justified?

Policy NC5: Creating Mixed Communities

- 19.16 Is the mix of unit sizes and house types set out in parts a) and b) justified by need and viability evidence? Will the mix enable planned densities to be achieved?
- 19.17 Are parts a) and b) applicable to student accommodation schemes?
- 19.18 Is the definition of highly accessible areas in Policy NC5 consistent with the definition in Policy NC11?
- 19.19 What is the justification for the distance of 200m and the 20% threshold in part c of the policy?

Policy NC6: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation

- 19.20 How was the area identified as suitable for Purpose-Built Student Accommodation defined? Are the boundaries justified?
- 19.21 Is the area-based approach in Policy NC6 justified and does the policy provide sufficient flexibility? How will proposals be dealt with in parts of the city outside the defined area?
- 19.22 What is the evidential basis for the 2% wheelchair accessible bed spaces in part d) of the policy?

Policy NC7: Criteria for Assessing New Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites

- 19.23 Is part a) of the policy consistent with national policy on Gypsies and Travellers and is it sufficiently flexible?
- 19.24 Is the accessibility requirement in part d) justified and fair? Does it mirror requirements relating to general residential development?
- 19.25 What does the term 'reasonable access to the Strategic Road Network' mean, as set out in part e), and why is this necessary for Gypsies and Travellers?
- 19.26 In the case of any future private sites which are no longer fit for purpose, is it feasible and reasonable to require the re-provision of pitches/plots as set out in part j)?

Policy NC8: Housing Space Standards

- 19.27 Is the use of the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) supported by the Council's evidence on need and viability?
- 19.28 What is the definition of 'adequate living space', as referred to in part b) of the policy?
- 19.29 How should development be flexible and adaptable to meet the changing needs of occupants, as specified in part c)?
- 19.30 Are the sizes and depths of private amenity/garden space, as referred to in the Definitions, justified and reasonable?

Policy NC9: Housing Density

- 19.31 Are the density ranges and distance thresholds in Policy NC9 justified and supported by evidence? Why are upper levels used for most of the identified areas and does this provide sufficient flexibility?
- 19.32 Is the wording of part a) effective in respect of conserving and enhancing the historic environment? Is the Council's proposed amendment LS10 (in CD31) to part a) necessary for soundness?
- 19.33 Do Policies NC5 and NC9 conflict with one another in respect of density?

Policy NC15: Creating Open Space in Residential Developments

- 19.34 Is the requirement for 10% open space on sites of 100 or more dwellings justified and deliverable?
- 19.35 What open space requirements will apply on sites below 100 dwellings?
- 19.36 How would the minimum standards referred to in the first bullet point of Policy NC15 be measured?
- 19.37 Are the Council's proposed amendments SV38 and SV41 (in CD31) necessary for soundness reasons?
- 19.38 Is proposed amendment GD12 (in CD31) to paragraph 4.52 necessary to establish the approach to playing pitches and ensure soundness

Matter 20 - Economic Development Policies

Issue - Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies on economic development which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District]

[Policy EC2: Development in the City Centre Office Zones]

[Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones]

[Policy EC4: Development in Industrial Zones]

[Policy EC5: Assessment of Proposals for Commercial, Business and Service Uses, Retail Warehouse Clubs and Leisure outside Centres]

[Policy EC6: Economic Development and Sensitive Uses]

[Policy EC7: Promoting Local Employment in Development]

[Policy EC8: Development in University/College Zones]

Questions

Policy EC1: Development in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID)

- 20.1 How were the boundaries of the AMID defined?
- 20.2 Is the designation of the AMID necessary to effectively support and deliver innovation-focused economic development on key sites in the area? How will the policy operate alongside the zoning approach provided by other policies in the area (e.g. NC2, NC16, EC3, EC4)?
- 20.3 Does Policy EC1 provide sufficient flexibility for the range of economic and other complementary uses that may develop in the AMID during the Plan period? Is it justified?
- 20.4 Is it sufficiently clear where the AMID objectives referred to in Policy EC1 can be found within the Plan?

Policy EC2: Development in the City Centre Office Zones

- 20.5 How were the boundaries of the City Centre Office Zones set out on the Policies Map and Map 4 in the Plan defined?
- 20.6 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy EC2 and is it justified?
- 20.7 What is the basis for the threshold of at least 60% for the total gross floor area being office (Class E (g)(i)) use in the City Centre Office Zones in Policy EC2? Is it justified?

Policy EC3: Development in General Employment Zones

- 20.8 How were the boundaries of the General Employment Zones defined?
- 20.9 Do Policies EC3 and EC4 provide sufficient opportunities for the expansion of existing economic sites and premises in the General Employment and Industrial Zones and flexibility to respond to changes in demand and economic circumstances where appropriate, particularly arising from the Class E changes to the Use Classes Order? Are the policies consistent with national policy, including paragraphs 82 and 122 of the NPPF and justified by appropriate evidence?
- 20.10 What is the basis for the list of acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy EC3 and is it justified? Is it the case that proposals for other uses will be assessed on their merits and could be acceptable if they do not introduce uses that would undermine the operation and expansion of existing and new businesses in the area?

Policy EC4: Development in Industrial Zones

- 20.11 How were the boundaries of the Industrial Zones defined?
- 20.12 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy EC4 and is it justified?

Policy EC5: Assessment of Proposals for Commercial, Business and Service Uses, Retail Warehouse Clubs and Leisure outside Centres

- 20.13 What are the distance and floorspace thresholds in part e) based on? Are they justified by evidence and consistent with national policy?
- 20.14 What are the distance and floorspace thresholds for assessing the impact under Policy EC5 h) based on? Are they justified by evidence and consistent with national policy?
- 20.15 Is the wording 'unlikely to have a significant adverse impact' under Policy EC5 f) sufficiently clear? Is it effective?
- 20.16 Is it clear what 'impact' are being referred to under Policy EC5 g)? Should this term be rephrased as 'adverse impacts' for effectiveness?

Policy EC6: Economic Development and Sensitive Uses

- 20.17 Is it clear what 'impact' is being referred to in the second paragraph of Policy EC6? Should this term be rephrased as 'adverse impacts' for effectiveness?

Policy EC7: Promoting Local Employment in Development

- 20.18 What is the justification for the thresholds for major employment-generating developments in the table under Policy EC7? Is it clear what is required from new development proposals under Policy EC7? Is the approach justified and effective?

Policy EC8: Development in University/College Zones

- 20.19 How were the boundaries of the University/College Zones defined?
- 20.20 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy EC8 and is it justified? Should there be any changes or other uses included?

Matter 21 - Retail and communities policies

Issue 1 - Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies on the City Centre which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy VC1: Commercial, Business and Service Uses and Leisure Developments in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area]

[Policy VC2: Development in the Cultural Zones]

[Policy VC3: Development in the Central Area Flexible Use Zones]

Questions

Policy VC1: Commercial, Business and Service Uses and Leisure Developments in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area

- 21.1 How were the boundaries of the Primary Shopping Area defined? Are they appropriate and consistent with definitions in national policy?
- 21.2 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy VC1 and is it justified?
- 21.3 What is the basis for the threshold of at least 50% of the individual units comprising the preferred uses (commercial, business and service uses (Class E)) on street level frontage within the City Centre Primary Shopping Area? Is it justified by the evidence base and effective?
- 21.4 Is the proposed amendment RH4 (CD31) to Policy VC1 necessary for soundness and is it justified?

Policy VC2: Development in the Cultural Zones

- 21.5 How were the boundaries of the Cultural Zones set out on the Policies Map and Map 5 in the Plan defined?
- 21.6 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy VC2 and is it justified?
- 21.7 What is the basis for the threshold of at least 70% of the ground floor area comprising the preferred uses (learning and non-residential institutions (Class F1), theatres and concert halls) in the Cultural Zones? Is it justified by the evidence base and effective?

Policy VC3: Development in the Central Area Flexible Use Zones

- 21.8 How were the boundaries of the Central Area Flexible Use Zones set out on the Policies Map defined?
- 21.9 How were the boundaries of the Night-Time Quiet Areas set out on the Policies Map and Map 5 in the Plan defined?
- 21.10 What is the basis for the list of acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy VC3 and is it justified?

Issue 2: Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies on sustainable communities which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy NC10: Development in District and Local Centres]

[Policy NC11: Access to Key Local Services and Community Facilities in New Residential Developments]

[Policy NC12: Hot Food Takeaways]

[Policy NC13: Safeguarding Local Services and Community Facilities]

[Policy NC14: Safeguarding Sensitive Uses from Noise, Odours and other Nuisance]

[Policy NC16: Development in Flexible Use Zones outside the Central Sub-Area]

[Policy NC17: Development in the Hospital Zone]

Questions

Policy NC10: Development in District and Local Centres

- 21.11 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy NC10 and is it justified?
- 21.12 What is the basis for the threshold of at least 50% of the individual units in the District and Local Centres comprising the preferred uses in Policy NC10? Is it justified by appropriate evidence and effective?

Policy NC11: Access to Key Local Services and Community Facilities in New Residential Developments

- 21.13 What is the evidence to support the minimum accessibility standards to key local service and community facilities for new residential development under Policy NC11 a) to d)?
- 21.14 Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required in terms of the assessment of the accessibility standards and the mitigations required as part of development proposals when

these requirements cannot be met? Should the final paragraph of Policy NC11 be qualified by 'wherever possible'?

- 21.15 Is the Plan positively prepared to support the creation of new burial spaces for different faith and religious communities across the City? Is it consistent with paragraph 93 of the NPPF and effective?

Policy NC12: Hot Food Takeaways

- 21.16 What is the basis for the 800m exclusion zone for hot food takeaways around secondary schools set out in Policy NC12 a) based on? Is it justified and consistent with national policy?
- 21.17 What is the basis for the threshold of no more than 25% of the units in District or Local Centres comprising new or extended hot food takeaways in Policy NC12 b) based on? Is it justified by the evidence base and effective?
- 21.18 Is the proposed amendment SV36 (CD31) to Policy NC12 b) necessary for soundness and is it justified?

Policy NC13: Safeguarding Local Services and Community Facilities

- 21.19 Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what type of 'valued community facilities' are included, and what will be expected of proposals for new development under Policy NC13? Is Policy NC13 positively prepared and effective?
- 21.20 What does the requirement under Policy NC13 a) mean? How will the 'continued use' of that community facility be assessed and how will it be judged that it is unviable? Is it justified and effective?
- 21.21 What are the thresholds set out in Policy NC13 b) and c) based on? Are they justified by the evidence base and effective?

Policy NC14: Safeguarding Sensitive Uses from Noise, Odours and other Nuisance

- 21.22 Does Policy N14 ensure that new development takes into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site? Is the policy consistent with national policy, including paragraphs 185 and 187 of the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance and is it justified by appropriate evidence?
- 21.23 Is it clear what 'harmful' impacts are being referred to in the first paragraph of Policy NC14? Is the policy consistent with paragraph 185 of the NPPF?
- 21.24 What are the time limits set out in Policy NC14 a) and b) based on? Are they justified by appropriate evidence and effective?
- 21.25 Are the definitions of 'noise-sensitive uses', 'appropriate design features', 'acceptable level' and 'significant background noise' that apply to Policy NC14 sufficiently clear and robust? Are they justified by appropriate evidence and effective?

Policy NC16: Development in Flexible Use Zones outside the Central Sub-Area

- 21.26 How were the boundaries of the Flexible Use Zones outside the Central Sub-Area set out on the Policies Map defined?
- 21.27 What is the basis for the list of acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy NC16 and is it justified?

Policy NC17: Development in the Hospital Zones

- 21.28 How were the boundaries of the Hospital Zones set out on the Policies Map defined?
- 21.29 What is the basis for the list of preferred, acceptable and unacceptable uses in Policy NC17 and is it justified?

Matter 22: Climate Change and Managing Natural Resources

Issue 1 – Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies relating to climate change and natural resources which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Reduced Carbon Emissions]

[Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation]

[Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes]

[Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings]

[Policy ES5: Managing Air Quality]

[Policy ES6: Contaminated and Unstable Land]

Questions

Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Reduced Carbon Emissions

- 22.1 How do the requirements in the first paragraph of Policy ES1 compare with current Building Regulations and the changes expected to be implemented through the Future Homes Standard and the Future Buildings Standard?
- 22.2 If the required reduction in carbon emissions for new buildings goes beyond current and planned Building Regulations, does Policy ES1 meet the tests set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 13 December 2023 (Planning – Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update)? Specifically:
- What costs would be associated with the requirements to reduce carbon emissions, and what, if any, would be the effect on housing supply and affordability?
 - How would the expected reduction in regulated emissions for new dwellings be calculated?

- Would the required reduction in carbon emissions for new dwellings be applied flexibly, and if so, in what circumstances?

22.3 In considering whether a development met the requirements set out in the first paragraph of Policy ES1, how would the contribution of any habitat creation or restoration, or improvement in soil management (as referred to in parts e) and f) of the policy), be assessed?

Policy ES2: Renewable Energy Generation

22.4 The first paragraph of Policy ES2 expects all new developments to use low-carbon energy sources and, where feasible, avoid the onsite combustion of fossil fuels. Are these requirements justified and consistent with national policy? Has the effect on development viability been assessed?

22.5 In the context of part c), what does 'any protected areas' refer to?

22.6 Is the third paragraph of Policy ES2, concerning wind energy, consistent with paragraph 158 and footnote 54 of the NPPF?

22.7 How were the locations for smaller and larger wind turbines selected? What alternatives were considered, and why were they discounted?

Policy ES3: Renewable Energy Networks and Shared Energy Schemes

22.8 With regard to Policy ES3 a), how would the feasibility of connecting new development to an existing network be determined? Has the requirement been costed, and the effect on development viability accounted for?

19.39 In Policy ES3 b), how would 'potential network routes' be identified and safeguarded?

Policy ES4: Other Requirements for the Sustainable Design of Buildings

[Note – Questions about Sustainable Drainage Systems will be covered under Policy GS11]

22.9 Is Policy ES4 e) consistent with national guidance on development and flood risk? How does it relate to the requirements in Policy GS9?

22.10 With regard to Policy ES4 h), is the requirement for compliance with the optional water efficiency requirement in Building Regulations Approved Document G, which restricts daily wholesome water consumption for a new dwelling to 110 litres per person, justified and supported by evidence? If so, to comply with the optional requirement, should Policy ES4 h) refer to limiting the consumption of wholesome water in new dwellings, rather than buildings?

22.11 Is the requirement for providing green, blue or brown roofs in Policy ES4 j) supported by evidence and costed?

Policy ES5: Managing Air Quality

- 22.12 How have the thresholds for 'significant development' contained in Table 1 been derived?
- 22.13 For the purposes of Policy ES5, the residential development threshold for an Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) is 80 dwellings. However, within the Central Sub-Area, Annex A requires the submission of an AQIA for sites with a development capacity of less than 80 dwellings. What is the basis for this lower threshold for some allocated sites and why is it not needed for smaller unallocated sites?
- 22.14 How would the Plan ensure that appropriate air quality mitigation measures were put in place for other sites below the Table 1 thresholds which may come forward during the Plan period?

Policy ES6: Contaminated and Unstable Land

- 22.15 Does Policy ES6 clearly set out the circumstances in which an assessment into land contamination or instability would be required, and the form that such an assessment should take?

Issue 2: Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies relating to minerals development which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy ES7: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources and the Exploration, Appraisal and Production of Fossil Fuels]

[Policy ES8: Use and Production of Secondary and Recycled Aggregates]

Questions

Policy ES7: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources and the Exploration, Appraisal and Production of Fossil Fuels

- 22.16 Is the approach to the safeguarding and extraction of mineral resources consistent with national policy in the NPPF, advice in the Planning Practice Guidance, and the outcome of joint working with neighbouring Mineral Planning Authorities?
- 22.17 With regard to the first paragraph of Policy ES7, is it clear what is expected of decision-makers or developers in respect of a site with likely surface mineral resources? Is Policy ES7's expectation of investigation of economic potential for extraction clearly defined, justified and effective?
- 22.18 How would proposals for mineral extraction (including the limited extraction of building stone for the repair of historic buildings) be addressed with regard to other environmental constraints, such as the

natural and historic environment, highways, flood risk, and effects on the living conditions of local residents?

- 22.19 Is the approach to the exploration, appraisal and production of oil and gas consistent with national policy?
- 22.20 What is the justification for the requirement in Policy ES7 g) that proposals demonstrate that, following public consultation, the planning impacts identified by the affected local community have been fully addressed and the proposal has their backing?
- 22.21 Where is Map 13, as referred to in paragraph 3.22 of the supporting text?
- 22.22 Are the Petroleum Exploration and Development Licences shown on the Policies Map?
- 22.23 Has sufficient account been taken of the need for high quality restoration and aftercare of worked sites, consistent with paragraph 210 h) of the NPPF?

Policy ES8: Use and Production of Secondary and Recycled Aggregates

- 22.24 Is the approach to the use and production of secondary and recycled aggregates consistent with national policy and justified through the outcomes of joint working, including any Local Aggregates Assessment?
- 22.25 With regard to paragraph 210 e) of the NPPF, are there any sites for the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregates within Sheffield's administrative area? If so, should they be safeguarded and mapped as part of the provision for minerals within Sheffield?
- 22.26 Taking into account Policy ES8 b), how would any new facilities for the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregates, which came forward on appropriate sites within the Plan period, be safeguarded?

Matter 23 - Natural Environment Policies

Issue 1 – Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies relating to the protection and enhancement of open space, landscape character and the countryside which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy GS1: Development in Urban Greenspace Zones]

[Policy GS3: Landscape Character]

[Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land]

Questions

Policy GS1: Development in Urban Greenspace Zones

- 23.1 How have the Urban Greenspace Zones referred to in Policy GS1, and shown on the Policies Map, been identified?
- 23.2 Paragraph 8.6 says that Policy GS1 will apply to Urban Greenspace Zones shown on the policies map, but also to smaller greenspaces of less than 0.4ha. On what basis will such smaller sites be identified for the purposes of applying Policy GS1? Have they been identified and mapped?
- 23.3 How would any greenspaces created during the lifetime of the plan be protected?
- 23.4 Is it the intention of Policy GS1 that criteria a) – g) all would need to be met for development in Urban Greenspace Zones to be acceptable? Is this justified, and if so, are any changes are required to assist with interpretation?

Policy GS3: Landscape Character

- 23.5 Is the approach to landscape character in Policy GS3 supported by evidence and consistent with national policy?

Policy GS4: Safeguarding the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

- 23.6 Should the Plan include measures to promote equitable access to healthy food, safeguard land capable of sustainable local food production, and support related food infrastructure?

Issue 2: Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies relating to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity]

[Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain]

[Policy GS7: Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows]

[Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity]

Questions

Policy GS5: Development and Biodiversity

- 23.7 Does Policy GS5 set out a clear and effective approach to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, which accords with the requirements of paragraph 179 of the NPPF, the Planning Practice Guidance, and the recent emphasis on nature recovery in the Environment Act 2021 and the Environment Improvement Plan 2023?
- 23.8 What is meant by 'provide opportunities for natural process to occur' in Policy GS5 d)?
- 23.9 How does Policy GS5 e) differ from the requirements for protection of priority species in the first part of Policy GS5? Should a definition be included for locally and nationally vulnerable species?
- 23.10 Is part f) of Policy GS5 clear as to its intention? It requires a reduction in human impact resulting from various activities, but on what and where?
- 23.11 What is meant by 'biosecurity hazards' in Policy GS5 h)? What is the justification for the suggested practices and measures to protect and build resilience in native species? What form would these measures take, and how would they be secured?
- 23.12 Are criteria b) and j) both needed? Could they be combined?

Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain

- 23.13 Is Policy GS6 consistent with the statutory framework and national guidance, including the Planning Practice Guidance for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)? Are any modifications needed to make the policy sound in this respect?
- 23.14 Is the requirement for BNG in excess of 10% in certain circumstances justified? How would areas with a 'particular ecological need' be identified, and what level of BNG would be required? What would be the effect of the requirement for BNG in excess of 10% on development viability?
- 23.15 With reference to Policy GS6 b), how will appropriate sites for off-site BNG be identified in advance of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy being completed?

Policy GS7: Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows

- 23.16 With reference to Policy GS7 a), would the requirement to replace any trees that need to be removed on a greater than one for one basis, with trees of an extra heavy standard, apply in all circumstances? Would it always be justified and appropriate?
- 23.17 With reference to Policy GS7 d), how would opportunities for off-site tree planting be identified? How would any financial contribution be calculated?
- 23.18 What is the basis for the specific requirements for tree planting in residential and non-residential developments contained in part e)?
- 23.19 Is the requirement for the provision of street trees in developments of 10 or more homes consistent with NPPF paragraph 131, which requires that planning policies and decisions ensure new streets are tree-lined, unless there are clear reasons by this would be inappropriate?
- 23.20 Is Policy GS7 f) clearly expressed in terms of the types of species to be used and where?

Policy GS8: Safeguarding Geodiversity

- 23.21 Having regard to Policy GS5 and the first paragraph of Policy GS8, does the Plan set out a consistent approach to the protection and enhancement of Local Wildlife Sites and Local Geological Sites? Are any modifications needed to reflect paragraph 179 of the NPPF and guidance on biodiversity and geodiversity in the Planning Practice Guidance?
- 23.22 Should Policy GS8 set out safeguards to minimise the impact of stone extraction on the geological interest of the site, the wider environment and the living conditions of any neighbouring properties?

Issue 3 – Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies relating to flood risk and water resources which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

[Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk]

[Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources]

[Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems]

Questions

Policy GS9: Managing Flood Risk

- 23.23 How has Policy GS9 been informed by the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment? Does it take account of advice from the Environment Agency, the Local Lead Flood Authority and any other relevant flood risk management bodies?

- 23.24 Does the approach to managing flood risk in Policy GS9 reflect national policy in paragraph 161 of the NPPF, which requires plans to take account of all sources of flood risk?
- 23.25 What is meant by 'occupied footprint' in Policy GS9 a) of the Flood Risk Principles?
- 23.26 With reference to criteria c) and e) of the Flood Risk Principles, what is the justification for the approach to proposals for water compatible uses in the functional floodplain and areas of high probability of flooding? Is criterion e) consistent with national policy?
- 23.27 How has the land that is safeguarded for flood storage been identified? How would any impact of proposed development on the ability of this land to operate as flood storage be assessed?
- 23.28 What is the justification for the approach to culverting and building over open watercourses set out in Policy GS9 c) under Flood Risk Management for Development Sites? Does it reflect the advice of the Environment Agency?
- 23.29 Policy GS9 g) - k) under Flood Risk Management for Development Sites sets out requirements when developing on a site in a zone with a high probability of flooding. Should this include sites with a medium probability of flooding?
- 23.30 Does the Policy make clear the tests (sequential and exception) that would need to be satisfied for development to be considered acceptable before the measures in Policy GS9 g) - k) were applied?
- 23.31 Policy GS9 has two sets of criteria a) - f). Is this clear and unambiguous?

Policy GS10: Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources

- 23.32 Is it clear how proposals will achieve the objectives set out in Policy GS10 a) – e)?
- 23.33 Policy GS10 a) requires that development must enhance as well as conserve the features set out in (i)-(iii). Would this be achievable and reasonable in all cases?
- 23.34 Should Policy GS10 refer to the need to conserve heritage assets?

Policy GS11: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

- 23.35 What should a SuDS statement contain? How has the requirement for SuDS statements in applications of 10 or more developments or 1,000 sqm been derived?
- 23.36 To be effective, should Policy GS11 refer to the need for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of SuDS?
- 23.37 If additional detail on SuDS is required to assist the implementation of Policy GS11, how would this best be provided?

Matter 24 - Design and Built Environment

Issue – Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies relating to design and the built environment which are effective, justified and consistent with national policy?

[Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character]

[Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings]

[Policy DE3: Public Realm and Landscape Design]

[Policy DE4: Design of Streets, Roads and Parking]

[Policy DE5: Design of Shop Fronts]

[Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre]

[Policy DE7: Advertisements]

[Policy DE8: Public Art]

[Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets]

Questions

Policy DE1: Local Context and Development Character

24.1 What progress has been made on the production of the City Centre Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document?

Policy DE2: Design and Alteration of Buildings

24.2 What are 'character buildings' in part c)?

24.3 What are 'slab-like proportions' in part f)?

Policy DE6: Design of Tall Buildings and Protection of Views in the City Centre

24.4 What is a tall building for the purposes of Policy DE6? What work has been done to define a tall building in the Sheffield context?

24.5 Is it appropriate that the Tall Building Areas will be identified in a future Supplementary Planning Document, rather than being set out in the Plan or on the Policies Map?

24.6 How would tall building proposals be assessed outside Tall Building Areas?

24.7 Has the Council identified distinctive features of the city skyline and key views of local landmarks, as referred to in parts a) and b) of the policy?

24.8 Why are Landmark Buildings to be identified in a future Supplementary Planning Document, rather than being set out in the Plan or on the Policies Map?

Policy DE7: Advertisements

- 24.9 What is the definition of 'Housing Areas' referred to in part i)?
- 24.10 Is the approach to illumination of advertisements in part j) justified?

Policy DE9: Development and Heritage Assets

- 24.11 Are Policy DE9 and Policy SP1 m) consistent with the NPPF? Does Historic England support the wording of Policy DE9?
- 24.12 What local heritage lists exist in Sheffield? Are they complete?
- 24.13 Is the Council's proposed amendment DH25 (in CD31) to part b) necessary for soundness or is it a minor change?
- 24.14 Is the final paragraph of Policy DE9 consistent with national policy on heritage assets?
- 24.15 What status do Areas of Special Character have and should they form part of the Plan?

Matter 25 - Transport and Connectivity

Issue - Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies relating to transport, connectivity and communications which are effective, justified and consistent with national policy?

[Policy CO1: Development and Trip Generation]

[Policy CO2 and Annex B: Parking Provision in New Development]

[Policy CO3: Broadband and Telecommunications]

Questions

Policy CO1: Development and trip generation

- 25.1 Is the definition of 'minimum service frequency standard' in the Glossary that applies in Policy CO1 d) sufficiently clear and robust? Is it justified by appropriate evidence and effective?
- 25.2 What is the justification for the thresholds for a Travel Plan set out in Policy CO1 and Table 3? Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required in terms of the Travel Plans and the mitigations required as part of development proposals?
- 25.3 Do the thresholds in Table 3 relating to significant trip-generating development apply to proposals involving a change of use, as well as new development? Is Policy CO1 effective? Should Table 3 form part of Policy CO1 itself?
- 25.4 Are the suggested amendments GC24, GC25 and GC34 (CD31) to Policy CO1 and Table 3 needed for soundness and are they justified?

Policy CO2 and Annex B: Parking provision in new development

- 25.5 What is the justification for the parking standards for new development in Policy CO2 and Annex B? Are the residential and non-residential car parking standards sufficiently flexible? Are these requirements consistent with paragraphs 107 and 108 of the NPPF?
- 25.6 Should the car parking standards for new residential development in the Central Sub-Area under Policy CO2 a) be the same as those listed in the Parking Guidelines in Annex B? Is the suggested amendment GC7 (CD31) to Policy CO2 a) necessary for soundness and is it justified?
- 25.7 Should the policy requirements in the bullet points under Policy CO2 a) be qualified by 'where appropriate'?
- 25.8 What is the justification for the 'expected car parking standards' for new residential development outside the Central Sub-Area in Annex B? Are these requirements consistent with national policy?
- 25.9 Are the cycle parking standards in the Parking Guidelines in Annex B classified as 'minimum' standards? Is this justified and consistent with national policy?
- 25.10 Is the approach taken to electric and zero emission vehicles in Policy CO2 e) justified and consistent with national policy and the Parking Guidelines in Annex B, in particular paragraph 16 f) of the NPPF? Does Policy CO2 avoid unnecessary duplication of the requirements of other regulatory regimes, such as the Building Regulations?
- 25.11 Is it sufficiently clear what type of infrastructure and capacity for electric and zero emission vehicles will be required as part of new development proposals in Policy CO2 e) and the Parking Guidelines in Annex B, and under what circumstances? Are the suggested amendments GC35 and GC36 (CD31) to electric vehicle charging infrastructure in Annex B needed for soundness? Are they justified and consistent with national policy?
- 25.12 Is the approach taken to housing and category 3 wheelchair accessible dwellings in the accessible car parking standards table in Annex B justified? Are the suggested amendments GC26 and GC27 (CD31) to accessible car parking standards in Annex B needed for soundness and are they justified?

Policy CO3: Broadband and Telecommunications

- 25.13 Is the policy effective and consistent with national policy, including paragraphs 114 - 116 of the NPPF and justified by evidence?
- 25.14 As the installation of telecommunications equipment will have some level of impact and a planning balance is required to assess these factors, is the requirement in Policy CO3 b) that they should demonstrate that there is 'no adverse impact' on visual amenity justified? Should this be 'no unacceptable adverse impact' for effectiveness?

- 25.15 Is the proposed amendment GD3 (CD31) to Policy CO3 b) relating to heritage assets necessary for soundness and is it justified? Is this covered adequately by other policies in the Plan?
- 25.16 To avoid repetition with national policy, in particular paragraph 116 of the NPPF, should the final paragraph of Policy CO3 be deleted? Does proposed amendment GD18 (CD31) deal with and is necessary for soundness?

Matter 26 – Developer contributions, implementation and monitoring

Issue - Is the Plan's approach to developer contributions justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Does the Plan set out a clear framework for implementation and monitoring?

[Policy DC1: Developer Contributions]
 [Chapter 11 Implementation]
 [Chapter 12 Monitoring indicators]

Questions

Policy DC1: Developer contributions

- 26.1 Are older person housing schemes comprising 10 or more units expected to contribute towards education and health facilities and open space? What is the Council's justification for this approach?
- 26.2 Should Infrastructure Delivery Plans be produced for sites other than strategic housing sites?
- 26.3 Is proposed modification RH7 (in CD31), adding the term 'social value' into the Glossary, necessary for soundness reasons?

Monitoring indicators

- 26.4 Do the monitoring indicators in Chapter 12 provide sufficient detail on targets, relevant policies and delivery mechanisms to allow effective monitoring of the policies in the Plan?
- 26.5 Should the monitoring indicator on net change in open space be split to provide information on different types of open space and sports facilities, as defined in Policy GS1 and requested by Sport England?
- 26.6 Is the Council's proposed change SV25 to the heritage monitoring indicator (as set out in document CD31) necessary for reasons of soundness?