

Examination of the Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future

Matters, Issues and Questions for Stage 2 Hearings

Erratum: Matters, Issues and Questions for Stage 2 Hearings republished on 12 February 2024 to correct a typographical error in relation to Question 15.19. SS06 should read SWS06.

Introduction

This document sets out Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQ) for Stage 2 Hearings regarding the soundness of the Sheffield Plan: Our City, Our Future (the Plan). Prior to the forthcoming hearing sessions, responses are invited from participants on the Stage 2 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.

When responding to questions specific to sites, please respond to each site in Character Area or Sub-Area order and respond to all relevant questions in relation to that site and your representations on a site by site basis. For example, if the Council was responding to questions regarding site allocation CW04, it would be necessary for the Council to respond to

questions 9.23 – 9.32 and 9.56 in respect of this site allocation. Representors would only comment on those questions relevant to their representations on that particular site.

Matter 8: Viability

Issue 1: Does the Plan take a justified and effective approach to the viability and deliverability of sites and policies?

- 8.1 Taking account of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (September 2022) (VI01 – VI03), would the cumulative requirements of the Plan's policies put the viability of Plan implementation at serious risk? Have all of the Plan's policy requirements been factored in?
- 8.2 Has the Whole Plan Viability Assessment been subject to consultation/stakeholder engagement with regard to the assessment's assumptions and approach?
- 8.3 Does the Whole Plan Viability Assessment adequately reflect the nature and circumstances of proposed allocations in the Plan?
- 8.4 Paragraph 2.4 of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment refers to the emerging Plan not including strategic sites at the time of this report. Has sufficient account been taken of the strategic sites outlined in the Plan in numerous locations? Do the typologies assessed adequately cover the range of strategic sites?
- 8.5 Have the proposed affordable housing requirements in Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing been appropriately considered in testing sites, both in terms of the appropriate percentage of affordable housing and the appropriate tenure mix?
- 8.6 The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that residential and non-residential development is not viable or marginal in some areas. What is the Council's position on these findings? In the lower viability areas, what development is currently taking place or has recently taken place, and does it include provision for affordable homes and/or planning obligations? Overall, is there evidence to show that the Plan is deliverable?
- 8.7 Is Build-to-Rent realistic in viability terms within the City Centre?
- 8.8 Has adequate consideration been given to a) sheltered and extra-care housing, b) student accommodation and c) non-residential uses within the Whole Plan Viability Assessment?
- 8.9 Are the density assumptions made in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment consistent with Policy NC9: Housing Density?
- 8.10 Have there been any changes in circumstances which could affect the assumptions made in relation to land values, sales values, build costs, developer profit and other viability appraisal inputs, for example recent inflationary pressures?

Matter 9: Central Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is the Plan consistent in how sites are dealt with?

- 9.1 Site allocations are referred to within numerous policies for the Central Sub-Area, the six Character Areas, and other Sub-Areas, Appendix 1 and Annex A of the Plan. However, the site allocations within Appendix 1 and Annex A in particular do not always appear to be consistent in terms of housing numbers, land use or site naming. Of these two elements of the Plan, which is correct?
- 9.2 Is Appendix 1 necessary for soundness as it appears to partially replicate Annex A?

Issue 2: Is Policy SA1 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.3 How were the six Character Areas, Priority Locations and Catalyst Sites in the Central Sub-Area defined in Policy SA1? What is the rationale for the Priority Locations and Catalyst Sites?
- 9.4 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 18,640 new homes and 10.1 hectares of employment land in Policy SA1 a) and c)? Are the figures justified?
- 9.5 Is the approach to purpose built student accommodation in Policy SA1 b) justified?
- 9.6 Is it sufficiently clear on what basis the Category 'C' charging Clean Air Zone in Policy SA1 h) would be adopted?
- 9.7 Does the Council have a Car Parking Strategy that has assessed the overall supply and needs for publicly available car parking both on and off-street within the Central Sub-Area? What is the overall strategy and what are the implications of that strategy going forward during the Plan period?
- 9.8 As the Sheffield Midland Station and Sheaf Valley Development Framework does not form part of the development plan, is the reference to this document in Policy SA1 i) necessary for soundness?

Character Area One: Kelham Island, Neepsend, Philadelphia and Woodside

Issue 1: Is Policy CA1 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.9 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 2,745 new homes and 1.3 hectares of employment land in Policy CA1 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 9.10 What is the basis for the figure of at least 2,653 homes for the designated Kelham/Neepsend neighbourhood planning area?

- 9.11 What is meant by 'enable the area to become an 'Outdoor' Neighbourhood' in Policy CA1 g)? Is it clear what is expected?
- 9.12 What does the 'proposed extension' to the Night-Time Quiet Area refer to?
- 9.13 Does Policy CA1 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?
- 9.14 Are there any main modifications required to Policy CA1 for the Plan to be found sound?

Issue 2: Is Policy CA1A justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.15 How were sites KN03, KN05, KN07, KN13, KN15, KN21, KN24, KN27, KN30 and KN36 selected to form the Priority Location in Neepsend?
- 9.16 Policy CA1A refers to a new waterside park, neighbourhood hub, public square, pedestrian bridge and main route through the area. Is it clear where these features would be located within the Priority Location, and how they would be delivered?
- 9.17 Are there any main modifications to Policy CA1A required for the Plan to be found sound?

Issue 3: Is policy CA1B justified, effective and in line with national policy?

- 9.18 How were sites KN03, KN07, KN15 and KN24, which form part of the Catalyst Site between Penistone Road, the River Don and Rutland Road selected? Should site KN21 be included? If so, is the housing figure in Policy CA1B a) correct?
- 9.19 Should redevelopment of the area be guided by a masterplan, and if so, should this be referred to in Policy CA1B and the conditions on development within Annex A?
- 9.20 Which sites are within the emerging Kelham Island and Neepsend Masterplan, and how does this relate to the Catalyst Site?
- 9.21 Are the references to listed buildings in Policy CA1B c) correct?
- 9.22 Are there any main modifications to Policy CA1B required for the Plan to be found sound?

Issue 4: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations KN01 – KN36 individually, respond to the following questions:

- 9.23 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

- 9.24 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 9.25 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the employment and mixed-use sites? Is it justified?
- 9.26 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions, and completions/construction?
- 9.27 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 9.28 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 9.29 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 9.30 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 9.31 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
- 9.32 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 9.33 Is a Heritage Impact Assessment available for site KN11?
- 9.34 Given existing development on sites KN03, KN04, KN07, KN09 - KN11, KN18 - 22, KN27, KN30, KN33 and KN35, are the proposed allocations realistically deliverable within the Plan period?
- 9.35 Site KN30 is allocated for housing but is also within a General Employment Zone (Policy EC3) where housing is identified as being unacceptable. In relation to KN30, is there a conflict between Policy CA1A and EC3, and how could this be resolved?
- 9.36 Site KN03 falls within an area which appears to have no current surplus for either primary or secondary education. How can this be mitigated?
- 9.37 Part of sites KN05, KN13, KN20, KN30 and KN36 appear to fall within a Hazardous Installation Consultation Zone. What are the implications of this for the delivery of housing on these sites and what, if any, mitigation would be needed?
- 9.38 Would the allocation of sites KN18 and KN30 be consistent with paragraph 187 of the Framework?
- 9.39 Is the loss of the publicly available pay and display car parking on sites KN26 and KN33 justified? What are the implications for the overall availability of car parking within the Central Sub-Area?

- 9.40 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites KN01, KN04 and KN36 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 9.41 Is it necessary to allocate sites KN06, KN12, KN16 and KN31 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Character Area Two: Castlegate, West Bar, The Wicker, Victoria

Issue 1: Is Policy CA2 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.42 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 1,845 new homes and 2.1 hectares of employment land in Policy CA2 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 9.43 Does Policy CA2 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?
- 9.44 Are any main modifications necessary to Policy CA2 to make the Plan sound?

Issue 2: Is Policy CA2A justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.45 How were the site allocations that form part of the Priority Location in Castlegate selected?
- 9.46 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 330 new homes and 1 hectare of non-residential development in Policy CA2A a)? Are the figures justified?

Issue 3: Is Policy CA2B justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.47 How were the site allocations that form part of the Priority Location in Wicker Riverside selected?
- 9.48 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 795 new homes and 0.1 hectare of non-residential development in Policy CA2B a)? Are the figures justified?

Issue 4: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations CW01 – CW23 individually, please respond to the questions set out above at questions 9.23 – 9.32. In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 9.49 Would the development of site CW02 be consistent with national policy, particularly paragraph 99 of the Framework?
- 9.50 Is a Heritage Impact Assessment available for site CW07?
- 9.51 Should site CW03 be allocated as works are underway on site? If it should, where does the figure of 368 homes come from? Should it be increased to 525? Is the inclusion of the landscaped area at the corner of West Bar and Bridge Street justified, having regard to paragraph 99 of the Framework?
- 9.52 Given the existing development on sites CW06, CW12, CW16 and CW20, are the proposed allocations realistically deliverable within the Plan period?
- 9.53 Part of site CW23 appears to fall within a Hazardous Installation Consultation Zone. What are the implications of this for the delivery of housing and what, if any, mitigation would be needed?
- 9.54 Sites CW07 and CW08 appear to be entirely built up. What is the justification for the suggested conditions relating to ecological mitigation, and how would they be delivered on site?
- 9.55 Is the loss of the publicly available pay and display car parking on sites CW12 and CW15 justified? What are the implications for the overall availability of car parking within the Central Sub-Area?
- 9.56 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites CW02, CW03, CW04, CW10 and CW11 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?

Character Area Three: St Vincent's, Cathedral, St George's and University of Sheffield

Issue 1: Is Policy CA3 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.57 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 4,185 new homes and 0.16 hectares of employment land in Policy CA3 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 9.58 Are the residential typologies referred to in Policy CA3 a) and paragraph 4.28 of the supporting text justified? What does high-end housing consist of?

- 9.59 Is Policy CA3 b) correct in referring to sites SU01 to SU57?
- 9.60 What does 'enhance the offer at the University of Sheffield' mean? What would this look like? Is Policy CA3 c) justified and effective?
- 9.61 Should Policy CA3 g) refer specifically to the delivery of open space allocations SU54 – SU56?
- 9.62 Does Policy CA3 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?
- 9.63 How was the 'proposed extension' to the Night-Time Quiet Area defined?
- 9.64 Is Policy CA3 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?
- 9.65 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

Issue 2: Is Policy CA3A justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.66 How were the site allocations that form part of the Priority Location in Furnace Hill selected?
- 9.67 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 2,290 new homes in Policy CA3A a)? Are the figures justified?
- 9.68 Is Policy CA3A j) effective as drafted? Is it clear what would be expected and delivered?

Issue 3: Is Policy CA3B justified, effective and in line with national policy?

- 9.69 How were the site allocations that form part of the Catalyst Site at the Gateway between Scotland Street, Smithfield, and Snow Lane selected?
- 9.70 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 1,480 new homes in Policy CA3B a)? Is this justified?

Issue 4: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations SU01 – SU56 individually, please respond to the questions set out above at questions 9.23 – 9.32. In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 9.71 Are there Heritage Impact Assessments available for sites SU08, SU16, SU24, SU26, SU29, SU33, SU34, SU38, SU39, SU43, SU48, SU53, SU54, and SU56?
- 9.72 Do the site allocations take proper account of the listed buildings on sites SU46 and SU50?

- 9.73 Is the first condition in Annex A regarding air quality necessary for an open space use for site allocation SU54?
- 9.74 Are sites SU54, SU55 and SU56 proposed for allocation for open space use justified?
- 9.75 For sites SU19 and SU44, are the capacities in the Plan appropriate, given discrepancies between the Sheffield Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment December 2023 (HELAA)(EXAM 3A and 3B) and the Plan capacities?
- 9.76 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites SU03, SU04, SU07, SU08, SU09 and SU12 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 9.77 Is the loss of the publicly available pay and display car parking on sites SU12, SU13, SU17, SU27, SU37 and SU43 justified? What are the implications for the overall availability of car parking within the Central Sub-Area?
- 9.78 Given the existing development on sites SU06, SU08, SU10, SU12, SU16, SU26, SU34, SU37, SU40 and SU47 are the proposed allocations realistically deliverable within the Plan period? How will the land with multiple different uses on sites SU06, SU08, SU12, SU16, SU26, SU34, SU37, SU40 and SU47 be assembled and delivered?
- 9.79 Is it necessary to allocate sites SU01, SU07, SU09, SU14, SU19, SU22, SU25, SU32, SU44, SU46 and SU53 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete? If site SU44 remains allocated, is the capacity appropriate given discrepancies between the Council's HELAA 2023 (EXAM 3A and 3B) and the Plan capacities?

Character Area Four: City Arrival, Cultural Industries Quarter, Sheaf Valley

Issue 1: Is Policy CA4 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.80 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 2,215 homes and 3.2 hectares of employment land in Policy CA4 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 9.81 As the Sheffield Midland Station and Sheaf Valley Development Framework and Sheffield Hallam University Masterplan do not form part of the development plan, is the reference to these documents in Policy CA4 c) and f) necessary for soundness?
- 9.82 What are the timescales for the preparation of the Sheffield Midland Station Masterplan for the area around the train station?

- 9.83 Does Policy CA4 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?

Issue 2: Is Policy CA4A justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.84 How were site allocations SV04 and SV16 that form part of the Priority Location and Catalyst Site at Moorfoot selected?
- 9.85 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 390 new homes and 0.84 hectares of non-residential floorspace in Policy CA4A a)? Are the figures justified?

Issue 3: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations SV01 - SV25 individually, please respond to the questions set out above at questions 9.23 – 9.32. In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 9.86 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites SV02 and SV04 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 9.87 Is the loss of the publicly available pay and display car parking on sites SV01, SV07, SV09, SV10, SV13, SV15 and SV16 justified? What are the implications for the overall availability of car parking within the Central Sub-Area?
- 9.88 Given the existing development on sites SV01, SV04, SV05, SV07, SV08, SV11, SV15, SV16, SV17, SV18, SV20 and SV22 are the proposed allocations deliverable within the Plan period? How will the land with multiple different uses on sites SV01, SV07, SV15, SV17, SV18 and SV22 be assembled and delivered?
- 9.89 Is it necessary to allocate sites SV06, SV20 and SV24 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Character Area Five: Heart of the City, Division Street, The Moor, Milton Street, Springfield, Hanover Street

Issue 1: Is Policy CA5 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.90 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 6,155 new homes and 3.4 hectares of employment land in Policy CA5 a)? Are the figures justified?

- 9.91 Does Policy CA5 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?
- 9.92 As the Heart of the City 2 Masterplan does not form part of the development plan, is the reference to this document under Policy CA5 d) necessary for soundness?
- 9.93 What does 'buildings of height' in Policy CA5 i) mean? Is it effective and justified?

Issue 2: Is Policy CA5A justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.94 How were site allocations HC03, HC08, HC11 and HC20 that form part of the Priority Location at Moorfoot selected? Is it necessary to include site HC20 as part of the Priority Location given it appears to have been the subject of development already?
- 9.95 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 2,180 new homes and 1.6 hectares of non-residential floorspace in Policy CA5A a)? Are the figures justified?

Issue 3: Is Policy CA5B justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.96 How were site allocations HC03, HC08 and HC11 that form part of the Catalyst Site in Policy CA5B selected?
- 9.97 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 2,085 new homes in Policy CA5B a)? Are the figures justified?

Issue 4: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations HC01 - HC30 individually, please respond to the questions set out above at questions 9.23 – 9.32. In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 9.98 Are there Heritage Impact Assessments available for sites HC07, HC10, HC13, HC19, and HC30?
- 9.99 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites HC01, HC03, HC07, HC08, HC09, HC10, HC11, HC12 and HC13 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 9.100 Is the loss of the publicly available pay and display car parking on sites HC01, HC04, HC09, HC17, HC25 and HC27 justified? What are the implications for the overall availability of car parking within the Central Sub-Area?

- 9.101 What are the likely implications of allocating site HC18 on retail provision within the City Centre?
- 9.102 Given the existing development on sites HC02, HC03, HC04, HC06, HC08, HC11, HC16, HC23 and HC24 are the proposed allocations deliverable within the Plan period? How will the land with multiple different uses on sites HC02, HC03, HC06, HC08, HC23 and HC24 be assembled and delivered?
- 9.103 Is it necessary to allocate sites HC05, HC10, HC12, HC14, HC19, HC20, and HC28 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Character Area Six: London Road and Queen’s Road

Issue 1: Is Policy CA6 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 9.104 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 1,495 new homes in Policy CA6 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 9.105 As the Sheffield Midland Station and Sheaf Valley Development Framework does not form part of the development plan, is the reference to this document in Policy CA6 b) necessary for soundness?
- 9.106 Is the term ‘proactively’ manage flood risk in Policy CA6 d) sufficiently clear?
- 9.107 Does Policy CA6 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations LR01 - LR08 individually, please respond to the questions set out above at questions 9.23 – 9.32. In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 9.108 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites LR01, LR02 and LR03 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 9.109 Given the existing development on sites LR01, LR02, LR04, LR05 and LR07, are the proposed allocations realistically deliverable within the Plan period? How will the land with multiple different uses on sites LR02, LR05 and LR07 be assembled and delivered?
- 9.110 Is it necessary to allocate site LR08 as works are underway on site?

Matter 10: Northwest Sheffield Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA2 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 10.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 1,015 new homes and 28.3 hectares of employment land in Policy SA2 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 10.2 Is the list of strategic sites in Policy SA2 b) correct?
- 10.3 Does Policy SA2 g) cover all of the relevant local rail upgrades and reopening, where viable, in the Sub-Area?
- 10.4 Should Policy SA2 refer to the extension and enhancement of active travel routes along the Main Rivers in the Sub-Area, wherever practicable? Is the term 'active travel routes' sufficiently clear?
- 10.5 Does Policy SA2 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?
- 10.6 Does paragraph 4.56 of the supporting text provide sufficient reference to the importance of nature conservation, biodiversity, landscape character and heritage as well as outdoor recreation in both the Rivelin and Loxley Valleys?
- 10.7 Does Policy SA2 adequately address the addition and deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations NWS01 - NWS29 individually:

- 10.8 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- 10.9 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 10.10 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the employment and mixed-use sites? Is it justified?
- 10.11 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions, and completions/construction?
- 10.12 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 10.13 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?

- 10.14 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 10.15 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 10.16 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
- 10.17 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 10.18 Would the delivery of sites NWS03 and NWS10 be consistent with paragraph 180 of the Framework in respect of ancient woodland?
- 10.19 What effects would the development of site NWS02 have on the Neepsend Railway Cutting Site of Special Scientific Interest and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 10.20 What effects would the development of site NWS29 have on the Neepsend Brickworks Site of Special Scientific Interest and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 10.21 What effects would the development of sites NWS02 and NWS29 have on the Parkwood Springs Local Wildlife Site and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 10.22 Is there a Heritage Impact Assessment available for site NWS16?
- 10.23 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites NWS01, NWS02, NWS03, NWS04, NWS10 and NWS29 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 10.24 Can safe and suitable access for all users be provided to sites NWS02 and NWS29 via the road tunnel beneath the Grade II listed Bardwell Road Railway Bridge that is consistent with paragraph 110 of the Framework? Is it likely to result in any harm to the designated heritage asset and can this be mitigated?
- 10.25 Is the inclusion of site NWS09, located within Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council's area, justified within the Plan and on the Policies Map?
- 10.26 Is it necessary to allocate sites NWS09, NWS18, NWS21, NWS23, NWS24 and NWS28 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Matter 11: Northeast Sheffield Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA3 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 11.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 970 new homes and 28.8 hectares of employment land in Policy SA3 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 11.2 Is the list of strategic sites in Policy SA3 b) correct?
- 11.3 Should Policy SA3 refer to the extension and enhancement of active travel routes along the Main Rivers in the Sub-Area, wherever practicable?
- 11.4 Does Policy SA3 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?
- 11.5 Does Policy SA3 adequately address the addition and deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations NES01 - NES35 individually:

- 11.6 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- 11.7 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 11.8 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the employment and mixed-use sites? Is it justified?
- 11.9 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions, and completions/construction?
- 11.10 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 11.11 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 11.12 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 11.13 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 11.14 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?

- 11.15 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 11.16 Would the development of sites NES13, NES22 and NES28 be consistent with paragraphs 99 and 187 of the Framework?
- 11.17 Would the delivery of site NES01 be consistent with national policy on ancient woodland at paragraph 180 of the Framework?
- 11.18 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites NES01, NES03, NES04, NES05, NES06 and NES07 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 11.19 Given the existing development on site NES19 is the proposed allocation realistically deliverable within the Plan period?
- 11.20 Is it necessary to allocate sites NES14, NES15 and NES31 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Matter 12: East Sheffield Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA4 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 12.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 2,945 new homes and 100.3 hectares of employment land in Policy SA4 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 12.2 Is the list of strategic sites in Policy SA4 b) correct?
- 12.3 Does Policy SA4 and its supporting text provide sufficient reference to Meadowhall Shopping Centre's economic importance and its role within the City and the Sheffield City Region?
- 12.4 Should Policy SA4 refer to the extension and enhancement of active travel routes along the Main Rivers in the East Sheffield Sub-Area, wherever practicable?
- 12.5 Does Policy SA4 support the delivery of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, consistent with paragraph 190 of the Framework?
- 12.6 Does Policy SA4 adequately address the deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations ES01 - ES53 individually:

- 12.7 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

- 12.8 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 12.9 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the employment and mixed-use sites? Is it justified?
- 12.10 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- 12.11 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 12.12 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 12.13 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 12.14 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 12.15 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
- 12.16 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 12.17 Would the development of site ES18 be consistent with paragraph 187 of the Framework?
- 12.18 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites ES01 – ES13, ES22 - ES25 and ES30 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 12.19 Given the existing development on sites ES03, ES04, ES09, ES20, ES21, ES31, ES39, and ES40, are the proposed allocations deliverable within the Plan period? How will the land with multiple different uses on sites ES03, ES04, ES20, ES21 and ES39 be assembled and delivered?
- 12.20 Would the development of sites ES22, ES25, ES27, ES46 and ES47 be consistent with paragraph 99 of the Framework?
- 12.21 Is the loss of the publicly available car park on site ES47 justified? What are the implications for the overall availability of car parking within the area?
- 12.22 Given the need for full revocation of temporary hazardous substance consents, will sites ES22, ES28 and ES33 be available within the Plan period?
- 12.23 Is it necessary to allocate sites ES06, ES24, ES29, ES32, ES35, ES43, ES44, ES48, ES51 and ES53 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Matter 13: Southeast Sheffield Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA5 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 13.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 1,640 new homes and 22.6 hectares of employment land in Policy SA5 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 13.2 Is the list of strategic sites in Policy SA5 b) correct?
- 13.3 Is Policy SA5 e) consistent with Policies H1 and NC7?
- 13.4 With regard to Policy SA5 f), would the designation of a Local Green Space at Owlthorpe Fields be consistent with paragraphs 101 and 102 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance?
- 13.5 Does Policy SA5 g) cover all relevant stations?
- 13.6 Does Policy SA5 adequately address the addition and deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations SES01 – SES28 individually

- 13.7 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- 13.8 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 13.9 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the mixed-use sites? Is it justified?
- 13.10 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- 13.11 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 13.12 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 13.13 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 13.14 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 13.15 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
- 13.16 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

SES03 Land to the east of Eckington Way

- 13.17 Would the proposed site allocation be consistent with national policy set out in the Planning policy for traveller sites (2023)?
- 13.18 Site SES03 is allocated for Industrial and Traveller use and is within a General Employment Zone (Policy EC3) where housing and sensitive uses are identified as being unacceptable. Would the provision of a site for Travelling Showpeople be acceptable on this site? Is there a conflict between Policies SA5, H1, NC7, EC3 and ED6, and how could this be resolved?
- 13.19 How have site-specific constraints, such as the high pressure gas pipe, overhead power lines and tower, the Local Geological Site, and biodiversity been factored into site capacity and design?
- 13.20 What consideration has been given to the potential transport impacts of this allocation for employment and Travelling Showpeople development on the surrounding local and strategic highway network? How will effects be mitigated?
- 13.21 What effect would the allocation have on best and most versatile agricultural land and how would this be consistent with paragraph 174 of the Framework?
- 13.22 Site SES03 would appear to fall within or close to an air quality exceedance area and would be allocated for residential use for Travelling Showpeople. How can this be mitigated?
- 13.23 Would the allocation of SES03 be sufficient to accommodate 12 plots for Travelling Showpeople? Would there be sufficient scope for workshops and space for storing and maintaining equipment?
- 13.24 How would any effects of the employment and Travelling Showpeople uses on neighbouring living conditions be mitigated?
- 13.25 Some representations raise concerns about the proximity of site SES03 to an existing Gypsy and Traveller site. How close would the two sites be to one another?
- 13.26 Is there a Heritage Impact Assessment available for site SES03?

Other Southeast Sheffield sites

- 13.27 What effects would the allocation of site SES04 have on the Moss Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 13.28 For sites SES08, SES18 and SES24, are the capacities of the allocations in the Plan appropriate, given discrepancies between the Council's HELAA 2023 (EXAM 3A and 3B) and the Plan capacities?
- 13.29 Would the conditions on development for site SES14 be justified?

- 13.30 Would the development of these sites SES15 and SES27 be consistent with paragraphs 99 and 187 of the Framework?
- 13.31 What effect would the allocation of sites SES07, SES10 and SES28 have on best and most versatile agricultural land and how would this be consistent with paragraph 174 of the Framework?
- 13.32 Are there Heritage Impact Assessments available for sites SES02, SES04, SES05, SES10, SES17, SES19, and SES28?
- 13.33 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites SES01, SES04, SES05, SES08, SES09, SES10 and SES28 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?

Matter 14: South Sheffield Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA6 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 14.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 765 new homes in Policy SA6 a)? Is this figure justified?
- 14.2 With regard to Policy SA6 f), would the designation of a Local Green Space at Bolehill Woods at Norton Woodseats be consistent with paragraphs 101 and 102 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance?
- 14.3 Does Policy SA6 adequately address the addition and deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?
- 14.4 Is Policy SA6 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations SS01 - SS18 individually:

- 14.5 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- 14.6 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 14.7 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the mixed-use sites? Is it justified?
- 14.8 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- 14.9 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?

- 14.10 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 14.11 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 14.12 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 14.13 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
- 14.14 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 14.15 Would the allocation of sites SS01 and SS18 be consistent with paragraph 99 of the Framework?
- 14.16 Are there Heritage Impact Assessments available for sites SS01, SS03, SS14 and SS15?
- 14.17 Would the allocation of site SS06 be consistent with paragraph 187 of the Framework?
- 14.18 Should the conditions on development for Site SS17 refer to:
 - a) Moss Valley Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest;
 - b) Moss Valley Conservation Area within neighbouring North East Derbyshire;
 - c) Extension of the Herdings tram branch line and enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes?
- 14.19 What effect will the strategic allocation on site SS17 have on the local and strategic highway network and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 14.20 Would the allocation of site SS18 be consistent with paragraph 180 of the Framework in respect of ancient woodland?
- 14.21 Is it necessary to allocate site SS05 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Matter 15: Southwest Sheffield Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA7 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 15.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 755 new homes and 0.02ha of employment land in Policy SA7 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 15.2 Is the figure of at least 40 homes for the Dore neighbourhood plan area justified? Where does the figure come from? Does it

- relate to the whole of the neighbourhood plan area, including that within the national park boundary?
- 15.3 Is the figure of at least 224 homes for the neighbourhood plan area of Broomhill, Broomfield, Endcliffe, Summerfield and Tapton justified?
 - 15.4 Does Policy SA7 adequately address the addition and deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?
 - 15.5 Are any main modifications needed to make the Plan sound?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations SWS01 - SWS17 individually:

- 15.6 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- 15.7 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 15.8 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the mixed-use site SWS01? Is it justified?
- 15.9 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- 15.10 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 15.11 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 15.12 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 15.13 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 15.14 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
- 15.15 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 15.16 Details for site SWS01 within Annex A show that 0.02ha would be allocated for employment uses (Class B2, B8 & E(g)(iii)). Is this correct?
- 15.17 It appears that residential development on part of site SWS02 has already been completed. Should this area be excluded from

- the allocation? Does the 369 units figure include the completed units?
- 15.18 Is the loss of the publicly available pay and display car parking on site SWS01 justified? What are the implications for the overall availability of car parking within the Southwest area?
- 15.19 With regard to sites SWS06 and SWS10, would the allocation of these sites be consistent with paragraph 187 of the Framework?
- 15.20 With regard to site SWS11, would the allocation be consistent with paragraph 99 of the Framework?
- 15.21 Is it necessary to allocate sites SWS02, SWS07, SWS08, SWS09 and SWS14 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Matter 16: Stocksbridge/Deepcar Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA8 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 16.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 928 new homes and 0.89ha of employment land in Policy SA8 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 16.2 The total capacity of the housing allocations is shown in Annex A as 914. Why is this different from the figure in Policy SA8 and which is correct?
- 16.3 Is the figure of at least 983 homes for the Stocksbridge neighbourhood plan area justified? Where does the figure come from?
- 16.4 Sites SD02, SD03 and SD05 are all identified as strategic sites in Policy SA8 c), but only site SD02 is identified on Map 13 and the Policies Map. Which is correct?
- 16.5 Does Policy SA8 set out a positive strategy for the delivery of sustainable transport improvements in the Sub-Area?
- 16.6 Does Policy SA8 adequately address the addition and deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?
- 16.7 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations SD01 - SD03 and SD05 - SD13 individually:

- 16.8 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

- 16.9 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined on the housing sites?
- 16.10 What is the basis for the scale type/mix of uses proposed on the employment site? Is it justified?
- 16.11 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?
- 16.12 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 16.13 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 16.14 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 16.15 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 16.16 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?
- 16.17 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?

In addition to the above questions, the following questions relate to specific sites:

- 16.18 For site SD03, is the condition requiring riverside open space overly prescriptive? Is the requirement for new or rerouted bus services to be provided through the site justified?
- 16.19 With regard to site SD11, would the allocation of this site be consistent with paragraphs 99 and 187 of the Framework?
- 16.20 What effect will the strategic allocations on sites SD02, SD03 and SD05 have on the local and strategic highway network(s) and how would these effects be mitigated?
- 16.21 Is it necessary to allocate sites SD06 and SD12 as works on site are either underway or substantially complete?

Matter 17: Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area

Issue 1: Is Policy SA9 justified, effective, and in line with national policy?

- 17.1 What is the basis for the proposed requirement of approximately 25 new homes on large sites and 1.03ha of employment land in Policy SA9 a)? Are the figures justified?
- 17.2 Is the figure of at least 145 homes for the Ecclesfield Neighbourhood Plan area justified?

- 17.3 Does Policy SA9 adequately address the addition and deletion of Green Belt land within the Sub-Area?

Issue 2: Whether the proposed allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Taking the following proposed site allocations CH01 and CH02 individually:

- 17.4 What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?
- 17.5 How were the site areas and dwelling capacities determined?
- 17.6 What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions, and completions/construction?
- 17.7 What would be the potential adverse impacts of development and how would these be mitigated, e.g. levels of open space, air quality etc?
- 17.8 What are the findings on flood risk for the site and can any identified risk be appropriately mitigated?
- 17.9 What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 17.10 Is the site available, realistically viable and deliverable?
- 17.11 What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- 17.12 Are there any main modifications required for the Plan to be found sound?
- 17.13 Is it necessary to allocate site CH02 as works on site are underway?

Matter 18: Housing Supply

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

- 18.1 What is the up-to-date position regarding actual housing completions within the Plan period?
- 18.2 For each of the following sources of supply for the Plan period, please provide the assumptions about the density/capacity, lead-in times, timing, and annual delivery rates. What is the basis for these assumptions and are they realistic and justified?
- a) Dwellings completed since the start of the Plan period;
 - b) HELAA (EXAM 3A and 3B) sites under construction;

- c) HELAA sites with outline planning permission, but not yet commenced;
 - d) HELAA sites with full planning permission, but not yet commenced;
 - e) Small windfall sites;
 - f) Large windfall sites;
 - g) Allocations within each Character Area or Sub-Area (inclusive and exclusive of Priority Locations and Catalyst Sites);
 - h) Each Priority Location;
 - i) Each Catalyst Site;
 - j) Each Broad Location for Growth;
 - k) Any other sources of supply.
- 18.3 Would there be an adequate supply of housing land throughout the Plan period to meet the Plan's requirement? Has sufficient land been identified to ensure that housing needs will be met, including an appropriate buffer for changing circumstances?
- 18.4 How is purpose built student accommodation and other forms of specialist housing factored into supply?
- 18.5 Regarding paragraph 69 of the Framework, would at least 10% of the housing requirement be from sites no larger than a hectare?
- 18.6 Has allowance been made for non-implementation or for estate demolitions? If so, is this justified?
- 18.7 The HELAA refers to sites where construction has been suspended (977 dwellings in Table 17). What are the sites' circumstances and how should they be considered as part of supply?
- 18.8 With regard to paragraph 71 of the Framework, is there compelling evidence that the windfall allowances for large and small sites would represent a reliable source of housing supply? Does the approach to windfall sites avoid double-counting?
- 18.9 Would the Plan provide for a robust five year supply of deliverable housing land on Plan adoption?
- 18.10 What flexibility does the Plan provide if some of the larger sites do not come forward to the Council's estimated timescales?
- 18.11 Does the Plan identify a developable supply and/or broad locations in years 6 – 10 and, where possible, years 11 – 15 necessary to maintain continuity of deliverable supply?
- 18.12 Having regard to paragraph 74 of the Framework, what buffer should be used?
- 18.13 Should the Plan include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the Plan period?
- 18.14 Is it appropriate to include allocations within the Plan which have been completed since the beginning of the Plan period?
- 18.15 Are the 311 homes on site NWS09 within Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council's area intended to contribute towards Sheffield's

- housing supply? Is this clearly set out in the Plan, agreed with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, and is this justified?
- 18.16 Is Policy H1 b) realistic in respect of brownfield land? Is this 85% of total supply?
- 18.17 Should the figures within Table 2 at Policy H1 be consistent with the housing figures set out within Policies SA1 – SA9?
- 18.18 Do the neighbourhood planning area housing figures in Policies CA1 b), SA7 b), SA8 b) and SA9 b) form part of the headline housing figures set out in criterion a) of each of those policies?

J Gilbert

R Morgan

D Troy

INSPECTORS