

**REPORT TO FULL COUNCIL 6<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2023**

**APPENDIX 2g**

**Responses to Comments on Part 1 of Other Submission Documents (relating to the  
Publication Draft Sheffield Plan)**

### Comments on the Habitat Regulations Assessment

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Habitat Regulation Assessment	The land on Norton aerodrome is protected and should be cleaned up to be a green space where trees and plants can be planted, where the common unity, old and young can be catered for.	It is the intention that a large proportion of the former aerodrome site will kept open/improved as open space, taking into account ecological interests on the site. A masterplan will be drafted in accordance with the site's status as a strategic housing and open space site.	No	PDSP.298.002	Kimbo

### Comments on the Integrated Impact Assessment

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Integrated Impact Assessment	Comment suggests that the IIA assessment of smaller Green Belt sites should be redone and the Spatial Strategy redrawn.	No change needed. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) confirms the impacts of developing smaller urban extensions in the Green Belt, considered in the 2015 Citywide Options for Growth (introduced as option E in 5.3.5). It also reiterates the findings of the Interim IIA Report 2020 that sat alongside the 2020 Issues and Options Consultation and included both spatial options B and C that could have resulted in smaller Green Belt sites being released. Paragraph 7.1.9 of the IIA explains the rationale for the alternative strategic growth approach	No	PDSP.042.198	Hallam Land Management, Strata Homes, Inspired Villages and Lime Developments Limited (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		considered in relation to potential larger Green Belt releases, as opposed to smaller sites.			
Integrated Impact Assessment	IIA does not assess smaller Green Belt sites with capacity of less than 1,000 homes.	No change needed. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) confirms the impacts of developing smaller urban extensions in the Green Belt, considered in the 2015 Citywide Options for Growth (introduced as option E in 5.3.5). It also reiterates the findings of the Interim IIA Report 2020 that sat alongside the 2020 Issues and Options Consultation and included both spatial options B and C that could have resulted in smaller Green Belt sites being released. Paragraph 7.1.9 of the IIA explains the rationale for the alternative strategic growth approach considered in relation to potential larger Green Belt releases, as opposed to smaller sites.	No	PDSP.065.011	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Integrated Impact Assessment	IIA does not assess smaller Green Belt sites with capacity of less than 1,000 homes.	No change needed. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) confirms the impacts of developing smaller urban extensions in the Green Belt, considered in the 2015 Citywide Options for Growth (introduced as option E in 5.3.5). It also reiterates the findings of the Interim IIA Report 2020 that sat alongside the 2020 Issues and Options Consultation and included both spatial options B and C that could have resulted in smaller Green Belt sites being released. Paragraph 7.1.9 of the IIA explains the rationale for the alternative strategic growth approach	No	PDSP.065.012	Mr R Cooling (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		considered in relation to potential larger Green Belt releases, as opposed to smaller sites.			
Integrated Impact Assessment	IIA does not assess smaller Green Belt sites with capacity of less than 1,000 homes.	No change needed. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) confirms the impacts of developing smaller urban extensions in the Green Belt, considered in the 2015 Citywide Options for Growth (introduced as option E in 5.3.5). It also reiterates the findings of the Interim IIA Report 2020 that sat alongside the 2020 Issues and Options Consultation and included both spatial options B and C that could have resulted in smaller Green Belt sites being released. Paragraph 7.1.9 of the IIA explains the rationale for the alternative strategic growth approach considered in relation to potential larger Green Belt releases, as opposed to smaller sites.	No	PDSP.066.025	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)
Integrated Impact Assessment	Email is the cover submission for E48-10.	No change needed. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) confirms the impacts of developing smaller urban extensions in the Green Belt, considered in the 2015 Citywide Options for Growth (introduced as option E in 5.3.5). It also reiterates the findings of the Interim IIA Report 2020 that sat alongside the 2020 Issues and Options Consultation and included both spatial options B and C that could have resulted in smaller Green Belt sites being released. Paragraph 7.1.9 of the IIA explains the rationale for the alternative strategic growth approach	No	PDSP.066.026	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
		considered in relation to potential larger Green Belt releases, as opposed to smaller sites.			

### Comments on supporting documents

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Supporting Documents	Plan is currently unsound due to lack of evidence of flood risk on Site Allocations and a Level 2 SFRA.	The lack of a Level 2 SFRA is acknowledged. The Council is proactively working with the Environment Agency on producing a Level 2 SFRA.	No	PDSP.002.018	Environment Agency
Supporting Documents	It would be helpful to include the Sheffield Midland and Sheaf Valley Development Framework, and emerging Interim Planning Guidance.	Disagree - these have not been published yet.	No	PDSP.015.028	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority

Page 5

### Comments on IDP Part 1: Infrastructure Needs Assessment

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
---------------	-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	-----------------

IDP Part 1: Infrastructure Needs Assessment	Support the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and are working with the Council on Part 2 of the IDP.	The comment is noted and we welcome the ongoing collaborative working	No	PDSP.005.008	National Highways
IDP Part 1: Infrastructure Needs Assessment	It is yet to be ascertained whether the traffic impact of the site allocations will be in line with the scale presented within Part 1 of the IDP and also whether the impact will be limited to the SRN junctions listed or whether other individual junctions will be impacted upon. However, we will continue the collaborative working approach we have.	The comment is noted and we welcome the ongoing collaborative working	No	PDSP.005.009	National Highways

### Comments on Green Belt Review

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
Green Belt Review	Propose removal of site from the Green Belt for development. Site does not perform strong Green Belt function.	No change needed. The proposal would not be consistent with the spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.034.015	Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estate (Submitted by JEH Planning Limited)
Green Belt Review	Disagree with Green Belt Review scoring of site. Propose removal of site from the Green Belt and allocate for housing.	No change needed. The site is not considered previously developed and allocation would be inconsistent with the spatial strategy.	No	PDSP.066.027	Mr T Kelsey - Landowner of Moorview Golf Driving Range (Submitted by DLP Planning Limited)

## General Comments

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
General Comment	No comment made. References comments for Part 1 of the Plan.	See response to comment E40-1	No	PDSP.058.003	Meadowhall South Ltd (Submitted by Jigsaw Planning and Development Ltd)
General Comment	No comment made.	Noted. No comment made.	No	PDSP.114.001	Jamia Masjid Anwar-E-Mustapha
General Comment	Rep mentions that there should be a new strategic policy addressing culture within the Local Plan.	Comments noted. The emerging Sheffield Design Guide will provide further details along side the emerging Culture Strategy. It is considered that in accordance with the NPPF, the Plan (see policies NC11 and NC13) seeks to make sufficient provision and protection of community facilities including cultural infrastructure.	No	PDSP.116.109	Joined Up Heritage Sheffield
General Comment	No comment made.	Noted. No comment made.	No	PDSP.193.006	Caroline Quincey
General Comment	General comment concerning the public consultation. Issues raised cover: poor quality presentation, inadequate briefing of staff, unco-ordinated collecting feedback forms.	Comments noted and will be fed into any future consultations.	No	PDSP.236.008	Glyn Hawley

Plan Document	Main Issues Summary Comment	Council response	Potential to Change Plan?	Comment reference	Respondent Name
General Comment	The ground floor of the Cole Brothers building should be used as an accessible children's space incorporating a children's library, a toy library and indoor play space, to avoid having to carry babies and toddlers up and down stairs as is currently the case in the Central Library.	The former Cole Brothers building is located within the Primary Shopping Area. Agree that such uses should be included as Acceptable.	Yes	PDSP.350.006	Polly Blacker
General Comment	Comment suggests that consultation was not as inclusive as it could have been and states he wasn't able to engage with the plan in the time that was given.	Comments and observations noted. The Consultation Statement shows that all Local Plan consultations have been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.	No	PDSP.388.001	Stephan Ball
General Comment	Resident suggests that there are not enough attractions/retail/leisure facilities in the city centre to want people to commute there. Comments also seem to suggest that they do not like the scale of new buildings being built.	Comments and observations noted.	No	PDSP.388.002	Stephan Ball