

Statement of Common Ground – Sheffield City Council Local Plan – Hearing Matter 7

Highways – Statement of Common Ground

Agreement between:

British Land

Sheffield City Council

National Highways

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The purpose of this document is to establish and confirm a position of Common Ground between Stantec (on behalf of British Land), Sheffield City Council (SCC) and National Highways (NH) in relation to the Local Plan and the areas of highway around Meadowhall Shopping Centre and The River Don District (RDD).

2. Planning History

- 2.1. There are a number of sites that are relevant to this Statement of Common Ground. The table below summarises the relevant sites as well as the planning application reference and decision date.

Scheme	Local Plan Site Allocation	Planning Application Reference	Decision Date
The Leisure Hall (TLH)	Not Allocated	16/04169/FUL	May 2018
The River Don District	Land to the south of Meadowhall Way (Site Reference: ES01)	18/03796/OUT*	July 2020
The Meadowhall Masterplan (TMM)	Not Allocated	20/03766/OUT	December 2023

*This planning permission was modified (s73) and planning reference: 21/04322/OUT is now the operative outline planning permission.

- 2.2. All of the planning decisions included for mitigation works. The TLH scheme included for a number of mitigation measures, however as the TMM scheme was not appropriately tested, as due to COVID-19 and the major highway works that were being carried out at Junction 33 of the M1, data collection to update the baseline modelling was not possible. As a result, it was agreed between the applicant, NH and SCC that a condition would be attached to the TMM consent, requiring further work to be undertaken, post approval, once new surveys could be undertaken to update the baseline model and identify the appropriate mitigation.
- 2.3. It was however agreed that the revised TMM proposals would generate fewer trips than the previously approved TLH scheme and therefore no mitigation beyond the scale of what was previously agreed would be required. The precise scope of works will depend upon the phasing of development and the outcome of the conditioned traffic modelling.
- 2.4. This work is ongoing and the requirement to determine necessary mitigation will be tested, in accordance with the Planning Conditions, as each reserved matters application comes forward for each of the schemes.

Statement of Common Ground – Sheffield City Council Local Plan – Hearing Matter 7

3. Draft Sheffield Local Plan

- 3.1. Various documents have been submitted as part of the Local Plan Examination for review. The key document is the SCC Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the necessary infrastructure to deliver the Local Plan allocations. It is agreed that further work is required and ongoing by SCC to identify the details of how these mitigation measures will be funded and delivered.
- 3.2. Any sites coming forward, which are not allocated in the Local Plan will be required to demonstrate that any additional impact from that site can be accommodated within the scope of the identified mitigations, or identify additional measures, with contributions to be agreed.
- 3.3. Recent discussions with SCC have highlighted that a methodology for the fair distribution of costs will be required and that they will be preparing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that will look at a fair distribution of costs of the highway's mitigation required (and expressed in the IDP) based on relative impacts of specific allocations. This will also identify any forward funding that will be required to deliver any early infrastructure requirements.
- 3.4. In addition, Section 4 of the Sheffield City Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan¹ report provides a summary of the mitigation included in the infrastructure schedule. Table 6² of the report summarises the strategic road network mitigation measures and Table 7³ summarises the local road network mitigation measures. A summary of the mitigation measures relevant to development in the Lower Don Valley, in the vicinity of Meadowhall, are summarised in Table 1 below.

¹ ARUP, Sheffield City Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2: Infrastructure Schedule, April 2024

² ARUP, Sheffield City Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2: Infrastructure Schedule, April 2024, Page 57

³ ARUP, Sheffield City Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2: Infrastructure Schedule, April 2024, Page 58

Statement of Common Ground – Sheffield City Council Local Plan – Hearing Matter 7

Table 1: Summary of Mitigation Schemes

Junction	Indicative Mitigation Measure	Indicative Timescale	Indicative Cost*
M1 Junction 34 North and South	Scenario 1: Mitigation A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Meadowhall Roundabout (M1J34N), a new dedicated left turn slip road onto the M1 northbound from Meadowhall Road. • At Tinsley Roundabout (M1 J34S), an extra circulatory lane is added between the M1 off slip and Sheffield Road, with three lanes in each direction being provided on Sheffield Road. 	By 2029	£4,355,00
	Scenario 2: scenario 1 plus: Mitigation B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional offside lane merge at the Meadowhall Road exit (to provide a three-lane exit) at the Meadowhall Roundabout (M1 J34N), with a reduction to two circulatory lanes between the Tinsley Viaduct and Meadowhall Road. • An extra lane on Tinsley Roundabout (M1 J34S) between Shepcote Lane and Sheffield Road (NE). Mitigation C: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional lane at M1 J34N on the M1 off-slip and on the roundabout at Meadow Bank Road, allowing for additional capacity through the junction from M1 southbound to Meadowhall Road 	Subject to future monitoring	£1,670,000
M1 Junction 34 North (NB)	Upgrade existing lane gain to a ghost island merge to enable both lanes on the slip road to be used to access the motorway	Subject to future monitoring	£465,000
A6178 / Vulcan Road Roundabout	Widening to three traffic lanes	2029	£1,020,000

* Indicative costs established by Sheffield City Council

- 3.5. Annex A of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that these mitigation measures will be funded through Section 106 contributions/ Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Sheffield City Council's Capital Programme. This is agreed as it would not be sound to rely solely on existing consents or potential future consents that may or may not come forward to deliver the schemes.
- 3.6. To understand the funding methods further Stantec met with SCC on Thursday 16th May 2024 to discuss how the mitigation measures would be funded. During the discussions, SCC agreed that these mitigation measures would not be solely funded through either the TMM or RDD approvals. SCC will be preparing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that will look at a fair distribution of costs of the highway's mitigation required. The SPD will set out a formula or calculation (possibly a cost per vehicle trip generated by the development) for splitting the overall cost of the mitigations. It is agreed that there needs to be a policy mechanism to deliver the mitigation on a fair share basis.

4. Conclusions

- 4.1. In conclusion it is agreed that:
- i. A range of highways mitigation measures centred around Meadowhall have been identified as appropriate to mitigate the impacts of the Local Plan development allocations.

Statement of Common Ground – Sheffield City Council Local Plan – Hearing Matter 7

- ii. It is agreed that it is not appropriate for any one development to deliver these schemes.
- iii. The current highway planning conditions relating to both TMM and RDD identifies that the detail of the necessary mitigation measures for each phase of both the RDD and TMM developments will be determined in accordance with the Planning Conditions, as reserved matters are drawn down from each consent.
- iv. As TMM is not an allocated site in the Local Plan, the conditioned transport assessment will need to demonstrate as a minimum that any impact on the SRN can at least be accommodated by the Local Plan M1 J34 Scenario 2 mitigation. There needs to be a policy mechanism (an SPD) to deliver developer contributions that are proportionate and commensurate with impacts on the transport network. Delivery could include funding from CIL, SCC Capital Programme and developer contributions.

Name	Role	Organisation	Signature	Date
M LOVERIDGE	PRINCIPAL TRANSPORT PLANNER	Stantec (on behalf of British Land)		01/07/2024
MICHAEL JOHNSON	HEAD OF PLANNING	Sheffield City Council		02/07/2024
S D JONES	REGIONAL STRATEGIC MANAGER	National Highways		01/07/2024