

Summary Sheet

Council Report: Commissioner Kenny's Decision Making meeting 11 January 2016

Title: Response to consultation on the Sheffield Local Plan

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan? No

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Karl Battersby, Strategic Director Environment and Development Services

Report Author(s)

Ryan Shepherd, Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy

ryan.shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk

01709 823888

Ward(s) Affected

All wards

Executive Summary

This report seeks endorsement of the suggested response to Sheffield City Council on their current Local Plan consultation.

Recommendations

That the consultation response set out at Appendix 1 is endorsed for submission to Sheffield City Council before their consultation deadline of 15 January 2016.

List of Appendices Included

1. Suggested consultation response

Background Papers

Sheffield City Council - Citywide Options for Growth to 2034

<https://sheffield.citizenspace.com/place-planning/the-sheffield-plan-november-2015>

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

None

Council Approval Required: No

Exempt from the Press and Public: No

Title: Response to consultation on the Sheffield Local Plan

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 That the consultation response set out at Appendix 1 is endorsed for submission to Sheffield City Council before their consultation deadline of 15 January 2016.

2. Background

- 2.1 Sheffield City Council is preparing a new Local Plan. This will set out how much housing and employment growth the City will plan for and where this should be located.
- 2.2 The City Council is currently consulting on the first stage of Plan preparation: Citywide Options for Growth to 2034. Local authorities have a duty to co-operate on strategic, cross boundary issues. It is therefore important that Rotherham Council engage with the City Council on this consultation
- 2.3 The consultation document:
 - Sets out the challenges and opportunities for Sheffield to 2034;
 - Sets out the vision for Sheffield in 2034; and
 - Seeks views on a range of issues, including:
 - How much land for new homes and employment is required?
 - How and where this growth can be accommodated.

3. Key Issues

- 3.1 The consultation document sets out a number of questions on which views are sought. It is not considered necessary to respond to all of these; however it is suggested that the Council respond to key issues around housing and employment land issues. This is particularly important with regard to housing land, given that the consultation document indicates a provisional view that the majority of Sheffield's Green Belt is too environmentally sensitive to be suitable for development. This could have implications for Rotherham should the City Council seek to accommodate some of its growth within other districts.
- 3.2 Appendix 1 sets out the key questions which it is considered that the Council should respond to, along with a suggested response to each. For completeness the remaining questions in the consultation document are listed at the end of the appendix.
- 3.3 In brief, the suggested responses:
 - Highlight concerns with the use of Rotherham and Sheffield local authority boundaries as representative of the Strategic Housing Market Area;
 - Support the delivery of housing to meet Sheffield's own needs within its administrative boundaries;
 - Highlight the current lack of robust evidence which might demonstrate the need to consider whether any of the housing requirement should be accommodated in other districts;

- Recognise and support proposals related to the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District;
- Comment on the proposed employment land requirements, recognising that Rotherham and Sheffield represent a Functional Economic Area (as evidenced in the recent Joint Rotherham and Sheffield Employment Land Review.)

4. Options considered and recommended proposal

4.1 Alternative options considered are set out below:

No response provided to Sheffield City Council's consultation

4.2 Rotherham Council could provide no response to the current consultation. Local authorities have a duty to co-operate on strategic, cross boundary issues. The two councils will continue to co-operate as regards the preparation of Sheffield's Local Plan. However given the issues raised it is considered important that the Council submit representations to this consultation stage. Sheffield City Council will consider all responses received in taking forward preparation of their plan.

5. Consultation

5.1 Consultation on the proposed response to Sheffield City Council's Local Plan consultation has not been undertaken with other programme areas.

6. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

6.1 Consultation on the Sheffield Local Plan closes on 15 January 2016. It is important that the Council's response is submitted before this deadline to ensure that it is taken into account as the City Council continues to prepare their plan. In normal circumstance approval of comments on adjoining local authorities' plans would not be sought. However it is considered relevant in this case to raise awareness given the potential impact on Rotherham of the issues being considered by Sheffield City Council.

7. Financial and Procurement Implications

7.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

8. Legal Implications

8.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

9. Human Resources Implications

9.1 There are no Human Resources implications arising from this report.

10. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

10.1 There are no direct implications for children and young people and vulnerable adults arising from this report.

11 Equalities and Human Rights Implications

11.1 There are no equalities or human rights implications arising from this report.

12. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates

12.1 There are no implications for partners or other directorates arising from this report.

13. Risks and Mitigation

13.1 The Council may find it more difficult to challenge any future Local Plan policies and proposals from Sheffield City Council if it does not provide appropriate responses to the current stage of consultation.

14. Accountable Officer(s)

Paul Woodcock
Director of Planning, Regeneration & Culture

Approvals Obtained from:-

Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services:- Named officer

Director of Legal Services:- Named officer

Head of Procurement (if appropriate):- N/A

Name and Job Title.

This report is published on the Council's website or can be found at:-

<http://modern.gov.rotherham.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>

Appendix 1: Rotherham MBC response to Sheffield City Council’s Local Plan consultation - Citywide Options for Growth to 2034

Question	Suggested response
<p>Q2 (a) Have we identified the right challenges for Sheffield between now and 2034? (b) If not, what other challenges does the Sheffield Plan need to address?</p>	<p>The issue of waste management is briefly mentioned but no specific question asked. The document acknowledges that landfill capacity on Sheffield will soon be no longer sufficient to meet needs. But the assumption is then made that capacity should be found in the wider city region area. The principle that waste is dealt with where it arises should be applied and Sheffield should seek first to accommodate its own waste within the city boundary and only then look further afield.</p>
<p>Q6: Should the employment land requirement in the Sheffield Plan be based on the Strategic Economic Plan jobs target of 10 hectares/year or a lower scenario of 8 hectares/year?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council would be supportive of an employment land requirement which accommodated the growth aspirations set out in the SCR Strategic Economic Plan. In this context, Rotherham Council’s employment land requirement as established in the adopted Core Strategy (2014) is considered to align with the SCR SEP growth aspirations for Rotherham.</p>
<p>Q7: (a) Should some of Sheffield’s land requirement for manufacturing, distribution and warehousing (B1c, B2 and B8) be accommodated elsewhere in Sheffield City Region? (b) If so, where could Sheffield’s needs be accommodated?</p>	<p>Rotherham and Sheffield Councils have co-operated in the production of a joint Employment Land Review (ELR, 2015).</p> <p>Whilst noting that the ELR indicates that there may be a potential surplus of employment land within Rotherham, Rotherham Council is satisfied that the employment land requirement established in the Core Strategy (2014) remains appropriate. This is also endorsed by the ELR. As such, the Council has sought to meet these established requirements in its Publication Sites and Policies document. It has not sought to provide additional land to meet the needs of other districts. However Rotherham Council acknowledges and supports the conclusions of the ELR that the two authority areas should be considered as a single functional economic area. In this respect employment land provision within each authority area will provide employment opportunities for residents of both Rotherham and Sheffield. Therefore, it is recognised that the employment land provision within Rotherham will contribute by providing some opportunities for Sheffield residents (the reverse will also be true of employment</p>

Question	Suggested response
	<p>opportunities with Sheffield).</p> <p>In particular the Council recognises the cross boundary benefits of continued co-operation regarding Advanced Manufacturing, focused on the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District.</p>
<p>Q8: (a) Should employment land requirements be expressed as a single figure? (b) If not, should they be separated out by employment type, either: - 2 hectares for B1a/b and 8 hectares for B1c, B2 and B8; or - 2 hectares for B1a/b and 6 hectares for B1c, B2 and B8 Please provide reasons for your answers</p>	<p>In determining Rotherham's employment land requirement, previous evidence work established a requirement for B1 office uses separately to B1, B2 and B8 business and industrial uses. Recognising the differing nature of office uses as opposed to more general industrial and business uses (including the requirement to satisfy the sequential test set out in NPPF given their identification as main town centre uses), Rotherham Council would continue to advocate an approach which identified these requirements separately. In line with our response to Q6, the Council would be supportive of an approach which identified 8 hectares of land for B1c, B2 and B8 uses.</p>
<p>Q9: (a) Do you agree with the Council's assessment of housing need in Sheffield local authority area and the Sheffield/ Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Area? (b) If not, what are your reasons for suggesting different figures?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council agrees that the assessment has drawn appropriately upon the existing evidence; in particular the 2013 Sheffield Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the 2015 Joint Sheffield-Rotherham Housing Market Area Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>
<p>Q10: Is the Council right to use the Sheffield and Rotherham local authority areas as being representative of the Strategic Housing Market Area?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council has some concerns at the use of the Sheffield and Rotherham local authority areas as being representative of the Strategic Housing Market Area. Rotherham Council considers that any analysis should take full account of the nature and relationship of housing market areas across relevant local authority boundaries.</p> <p>Section 4.3 of the consultation document recognises that Sheffield's housing market area extends beyond the local authority area, though only for certain housing types and for</p>

Question	Suggested response
	<p>certain households and that Sheffield's strongest relationship is with Rotherham. However the 2013 Sheffield Strategic Housing Market Assessment also reveals important migration flows between Sheffield and other local authority areas including Barnsley, North East Derbyshire and Leeds.</p> <p>Rotherham Council supports the findings of the most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment evidence base, including the 2013 Sheffield Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the 2015 Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the 2015 Joint Sheffield-Rotherham Housing Market Area Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Whilst this indicates that Rotherham and Sheffield do share elements of a housing market area, the Joint SHMA (2015), at paragraph 2.1, notes that separately, Sheffield and Rotherham both represent self-contained housing markets in that more than 70% of moves to an address in each local authority's area originate from the same area. The evidence shows that the flows between Sheffield and Rotherham are dominated by two different groups: younger households who move from Rotherham to Sheffield, and families who move from Sheffield to Rotherham. As such Rotherham Council is concerned with, and does not support the use of, Rotherham and Sheffield local authority areas as representative of the Strategic Housing Market Area unless this is accompanied with appropriate caveats and clarification as regards the precise nature of the relationship (i.e. that the shared housing market is for certain households and housing types).</p>
<p>Q14: Should the Plan focus advanced manufacturing development in and around the area around the Sheffield Business Park and Advanced Manufacturing Park?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council recognises the cross boundary benefits of continued co-operation regarding Advanced Manufacturing, focused on the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (which is centred on the Advanced Manufacturing Park at Waverley, and Sheffield Business Park). As such it would be supportive of the Sheffield Local Plan confirming and reflecting this approach.</p>
<p>Q20: Should there be a target for office development in the Sheffield Business Park / Advanced Manufacturing Park area on the Sheffield and Rotherham boundary?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council considers that the identification of a target for office space provision to support Advanced Manufacturing, focused on the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District, could be acceptable provided that this is supported by robust evidence base. Furthermore, in line with Chapter 2 of the NPPF, the identification of areas suitable for office floorspace outside of defined centres should be supported by evidence regarding</p>

Question	Suggested response
	<p>the sequential / impact test approach to site selection (having particular regard to paragraph 23 and Planning Practice Guidance paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 2b-009-20140306.)</p>
<p>Q22: Should areas such as Meadowhall Shopping Centre and retail parks be identified as commercial centres and preferred locations for retail and leisure development, if no in or edge-of-centre sites are available?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council does not support the identification of Meadowhall or other retail parks as centres for the application of sequential / impact tests for all main town centre uses.</p> <p>In the first instance, the Council considers that options to accommodate any future floorspace for main town centre uses within or on the edge of defined town, district or local centres should be explored in line with Chapter 2 of the NPPF (having particular regard to paragraph 23 and Planning Practice Guidance paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 2b-009-20140306.)</p> <p>The Council does recognise that retail parks can play an important role in accommodating new bulky goods development, and recognises the benefits that can be achieved by directing development to existing locations rather than increasing the number of sporadic, out of centre, standalone developments. This approach has been adopted by Rotherham Council in Core Strategy Policy CS12 'Managing Change in Rotherham's Retail and Service Centres' (The Sequential Approach, criterion b). The Council would be supportive of a similar policy approach within Sheffield.</p> <p>Sheffield's Local Plan should be based on an up to date, robust evidence base. Acknowledging the cross boundary relationships between the two authority areas (in particular recognising the impact of Meadowhall, located close to the Rotherham / Sheffield boundary) the two Councils are currently exploring the potential to undertake a joint retail study. Rotherham Council will continue to work with the City Council to consider this opportunity further, recognising the benefits that would result from a joint evidence base.</p>
<p>Q26: (a) Should the densities required by the current Local Plan on sites outside the City Centre be</p>	<p>Rotherham Council is supportive of encouraging increased densities for new development where this means that the most efficient use of land can be made, whilst also ensuring that development provides appropriate levels of amenity, both for individual</p>

Question	Suggested response
increased? (b) If so, by how much?	households (in terms of the layout and design of housing schemes) and the wider community (in terms of appropriate provision of green space, highways requirements, community facilities and other infrastructure.)
Q33: Subject to fitting in with the local character and site conditions, should developments on greenfield or Green Belt sites generally be required to a higher density such as above 40 homes per hectare? Please provide reasons for your answer	Rotherham Council is supportive of encouraging increased densities for new development where this means that the most efficient use of land can be made, whilst also ensuring that development provides appropriate levels of amenity, both for individual households (in terms of the layout and design of housing schemes) and the wider community (in terms of appropriate provision of green space, highways requirements, community facilities and other infrastructure.) Consideration will also need to be given to the wider Green Belt and how policies and proposals mitigate the impact that development will have on open countryside. High density development may not be appropriate on the edge of the urban form.
Q34: Do you agree that surplus open space should be developed for housing, with the proceeds of development invested in improving remaining open space? Please provide reasons for your answer	Rotherham Council is supportive of encouraging the redevelopment of surplus open space, where such an approach is justified by robust, up to date evidence (for example through green space / green infrastructure reviews or audits). It is recognised that such an approach can ensure that the most efficient use of land can be made, whilst also ensuring that development provides appropriate levels of amenity, both for individual households (in terms of the layout and design of housing schemes) and the wider community (in terms of appropriate provision of green space, highways requirements, community facilities and other infrastructure.) Criteria for determining the nature of surplus Open Space should be carefully considered.
Q39: Do you support the option for a large urban extension in East Sheffield (as an extension to the Waverley development in Rotherham Borough)? Please provide reasons for your answer	Rotherham's adopted Core Strategy identifies Waverley as a Principal Settlement, recognising the extant planning permission for a new community (development of which is underway). Rotherham Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional development within Sheffield, which is well related to the development currently underway at Waverley. It is recognised that further consideration and exploration of cross boundary issues would be required. This would need to take account of the land uses identified in the Waverley area and the infrastructure requirements for the area as a whole (and relevant planning policies) in the Rotherham Local Plan. RMBC supports the delivery of housing to meet Sheffield's own needs within its administrative boundaries.
Q42: Are there any other areas where	The area to the south west of Sheffield should also be considered if a comprehensive

Question	Suggested response
a large urban extension should be considered? Please provide reasons for your answer	assessment of all options to accommodate growth is to be made. This area is particularly attractive to the market and is therefore more likely to contain viable and deliverable sites.
Q43: Do you support the option of multiple smaller urban extensions around the built up areas? Please provide reasons for your answer	Rotherham Council would be supportive of smaller urban extensions where such sites could deliver sustainable development. Larger urban extensions should also be considered to enable the delivery of housing to meet Sheffield's Objectively Assessed Housing Need within its administrative boundaries.
Q44: Should redevelopment of existing previously developed (brownfield) sites within the Green Belt for housing be permitted? Please provide reasons for your answer	Rotherham Council would be supportive of redeveloping brownfield sites within the Green Belt where such sites could deliver sustainable development. However the Council is concerned that sites are not promoted that are in unsustainable locations and remote from existing services and facilities.
Q45: What factors should be given greatest weight when deciding which sites should be allocated for development?	<p>The Council notes that section 5.2 of the consultation document indicates that "Our provisional view is that much of Sheffield's Green Belt is too environmentally sensitive to be suitable for development. Areas bordering the Peak District National Park are particularly valuable, and the countryside around Sheffield is one of the city's distinctive characteristics which make it a great place to live."</p> <p>The need to protect valuable countryside (based on appropriate, robust evidence base) is acknowledged; however Rotherham Council considers that this is just one issue which should be taken into account when balancing a range of factors in determining site allocations. The need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be given appropriate weight in identifying future growth areas. The City Council should explore all reasonable options to accommodate its objectively assessed development needs within its boundaries.</p> <p>Rotherham Council is supportive of taking a range of considerations into account when allocating sites for new development including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • status as previously-developed (brownfield) land • proximity as prospective housing land to services, facilities and employment opportunities

Question	Suggested response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to public transport routes and the frequency of services • potential to relieve deprivation • quality of design and its respect for heritage assets and the open countryside • effect on other environmental matters • potential to maintain and create links to green infrastructure • potential to benefit from, support and improve existing infrastructure • ability to limit the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a) although this is not a determining factor • contribution to the creation of mixed and balanced communities • ability to avoid, or suitably reduce the risk of, flooding <p>Rotherham Council considers that any conclusions regarding the Green Belt should be based on a robust, up to date Green Belt Review. The Council looks forward to the opportunity to comment on any Green Belt Review.</p> <p>The Council considers that all councils will search for sites not within their Green Belt or valuable countryside in the first instance; however there will be instances whereby each council will need to undertake a Green Belt Review and potentially allocate sites currently within the Green Belt for development in their Local Plans. It is noted that environmental sensitivity is not one of the five purposes of Green Belt as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
<p>Q46: Should Sheffield seek to meet all its own housing needs within the district?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council supports the delivery of housing to meet Sheffield's own needs within its administrative boundaries. The City Council should explore all reasonable options to accommodate its objectively assessed development needs within its boundaries. Rotherham Council's response to Q43 & Q45 is also relevant to this issue.</p> <p>Rotherham Council considers that any conclusions regarding the Green Belt should be based on a robust, up to date Green Belt Review. It also notes that the current Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2015) does not consider sites within the Green Belt. Rotherham Council considers that Green Belt sites should be considered as</p>

Question	Suggested response
	<p>part of the SHLAA to establish how suitable, available and achievable they are in contributing towards meeting the Council's housing need. SHLAAs should be policy neutral in order to provide objective evidence for later policy decisions taken by the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council looks forward to the opportunity to comment on any Green Belt Review and updated SHLAA evidence base.</p> <p>The consultation document suggests that a strategic review of the South Yorkshire and North Derbyshire Green Belt is required. Rotherham Council has prepared a Strategic Green Belt Review (2012) and more recently a Detailed Green Belt Review (2015) to support Rotherham's Local Plan which will allocate new sites for housing development. Along with existing commitments, windfalls, and safeguarded land, the proposed allocations will provide sufficient long term flexibility for Rotherham to meet its own needs and contribute to those of the wider Rotherham and Sheffield housing market area. The Council is however supportive of additional Green Belt Review work to supplement existing Green Belt evidence base documents within South Yorkshire and North East Derbyshire. As such Rotherham Council considers that the work already undertaken by Rotherham Council could feed in to any wider review.</p>
<p>Q47: How much of the housing need within the Sheffield/Rotherham housing market area could be accommodated in other districts in Sheffield City Region (i.e. outside Sheffield and Rotherham districts)?</p>	<p>Rotherham Council considers that a sufficient, robust evidence base is not yet in place to identify how much of Sheffield's objectively assessed housing need may be required to be accommodated in other districts.</p> <p>Rotherham Council's responses to Questions 45 and 46 are relevant in this respect. In particular the Council is concerned that any consideration of how the City Council may meet its housing need is based on a sufficiently robust Green Belt Review and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>
<p>Q48: What would be the social, environmental and economic consequences of meeting some of</p>	<p>Please refer to the Council's response to questions 45, 56 and 47.</p>

Question	Suggested response
the housing need in Sheffield/Rotherham in other districts in Sheffield City Region?	
Q51: Do you support the principle of segregating the cycle network from other traffic?	Rotherham Council is supportive of segregating the cycle network from other traffic where this will improve the safety and amenity of road users. It may also contribute to delivering sustainable development by improving accessibility and connectivity

Other consultation questions not addressed in this document

- Q1: Does this document raise any specific equality impacts which would affect particular groups or communities of people in Sheffield?
- Q3 Have we identified the right opportunities for Sheffield between now and 2034? If not, what other opportunities
- Q4: Do you support the Sheffield Plan Vision, Aims and Objectives?
- Q5: Do you think anything is missing, and if so, what?
- Q11: How many years' supply of housing sites should be allocated in the Plan?
- Q12: Should the Plan identify only the City Centre, the Upper Don Valley, the Lower Don Valley and the Outer South East as the main locations for new offices and manufacturing, distribution and warehousing? If not, please provide reasons for your answer
- Q13: Should the Plan acknowledge the Strategic importance of Chapeltown/Ecclesfield, Stocksbridge/Deepcar, Sheaf Valley, Blackburn Valley, Holbrook and Orgreave for B-class uses in terms of providing some employment opportunities close to new homes?
- Q15: Should this require the identification of land not currently designated for business and industrial use?
- Q16: Should targets for office development be for both B1a and B1b uses, rather than just B1a?
- Q17: (a) Should the City Centre continue to be the main location for new office development? If so, is the target of 65% appropriate, or should this be different?
- Q18: Should the approach to identifying Priority Office Areas in the City Centre be continued?
- Q19: Should we promote higher density office development on sites within the Priority Office Areas?
- Q21: Should the Plan promote a limited amount of office development in other outlying areas or well-connected locations to help reduce the need to travel and support sustainable housing growth in those locations (e.g. Hillsborough, Crystal Peaks, Chapeltown, Stocksbridge)?
- Q23: If so what types of retail or leisure development should be acceptable under the sequential approach?

- Q24: (a) Do you agree with our estimate that 4,000 homes will come forward on small windfall sites over the period 2014-2034? (b) If not, what is your evidence for suggesting a different figure?
- Q25: (a) Do you agree with our estimate that 2,000 homes will come forward on larger windfall sites (excluding the City Centre, Kelham Island and other areas covered under Option C) over the period 2014- 2034? (b) If not, what is your evidence for suggesting a different figure?
- Q27: Will there be sufficient demand for higher density housing in the locations suggested (City Centre, around District Centres, close to railway stations and other public transport hubs)? Please provide reasons for your answer
- Q28: What are the main barriers to delivering higher densities?
- Q29: What would encourage people to choose to live in higher density housing?
- Q30: (a) Do you agree with our estimate that 10,000 more homes could be provided in the City Centre by 2034? (b) If not, what evidence do you have to justify a different figure?
- Q31: Whereabouts in the City Centre should tall buildings be located?
- Q32: Should parking policies be changed so that less off-street parking is required (meaning more parking on-street)? Please provide reasons for your answer
- Q35: (a) Do you support the option of significant urban remodelling at Neepsend/ Shalesmoor? (b) What would be the main challenges to delivering this option and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?
- Q36: (a) Do you support the option of significant urban remodelling at Attercliffe? (b) What would be the main challenges to delivering this option and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?
- Q37: (a) Are there other locations where the urban remodelling approach should be considered? (b) What would be the main challenges to delivering this option and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?
- Q38: (a) Do you support the option of focusing major growth at Stockbridge and in the Upper Don Valley (including land in Barnsley Borough)? (b) What would be the main challenges to delivering this option, and the most effective way for the Council to enable the development?
- Q40: Do you support the option of focusing major growth in South East Sheffield?
- Q41: Do you support the option for a large urban extension to the east of Norton (Sheffield District only)?
- Q49: Where should the Supertram network be extended?
- Q50: Do you support the proposal to expand Park and Ride in the south of the city?

11 January 2016