

Questions for the Council Meeting on 3rd September

Reasons for Dismissed Sites

As part of the local plan process, a number of sites were assessed and dismissed with reasons such as 'fundamental constraint' or 'site not allocated'. We requested the detailed rationale behind these 'reasons' at the last council meeting and were promised this by Councillor Tom Hunt. We are still awaiting these. When will this information be made available?

Landowners not consulted

Some of the greenbelt sites assessed as options during the plan process were not allocated for reason of 'site promoter not in control of site.' Can you therefore explain how site NES36 (Smithy Wood) has made it into the plan sent to the planning inspectors when the site promoter (JEH Planning) is not and has never been in control of that proposed site with one of the landowners never consulted and continuing to make it clear he has no desire to sell once he was made aware of his land being put forward?

What is the Vetting Process / JEH Involvement

JEH Planning formulated a response to the initial plan back in 2023 expressing concern of the plan soundness due to a number of reasons, one being the robustness of the vetting process with site promoters re. land availability. Can you explain:

- a) The vetting process you undertake to de-risk the plan to ensure sites promoted are available.
- b) How JEH planning themselves have been now been allowed to promote a site (NES36) that is not available yet submitted on the plan to the inspectors.

Lack of Response to FOIs

A number of FOIs have been submitted by members of our community regarding key information around the Sheffield plan that have been acknowledged by SCC but not responded to. These FOI's are now many weeks overdue and thereby referred to the ICO. A report in the Sheffield Star back in January 2023 detailed the poor performance of SCC to respond to FOIs in a timely manner which is clearly still the case. Is this an ongoing process issue or an unwillingness to share certain information issue?

Voting on Plan

In some of her anonymous posts on our Facebook site, councillor Milsom mentioned that there had been a push by some of the Labour Party (including Tom Hunt) to get a better site distribution of proposed greenbelt sites, including far more in the South and West the but Lib Dems in Dore & Fulwood 'lost their minds' over this. Why do the Lib Dems in those constituencies have the final say over the Sheffield Plan and not The Leader of the council himself?

Green Party Voting

At the last full council meeting some members our group attended we called out the Green Party for voting in favour of Greenbelt as the consistently say 'they oppose they oppose building on the Greenbelt'. If that is so, why were the Green party voting in favour of option 4 (with 5000 homes in

the Greenbelt) way back in February 2022 when spatial option 3 (containing no development on greenfield in the greenbelt) was voted for?

Unfair Targeting of Working-class Communities

In his interview supporting opposition to Green Belt development, Sean Bean highlighted how Sheffield's more deprived, working-class communities are being unfairly targeted for large-scale Green Belt loss, while more affluent areas of the city are left wholly untouched. Independent analysis, supported by local experts and Councillor Ruth Milsom, confirms that Chapeltown/High Green, S5 communities and Handsworth bear the greatest burden of this loss i.e. 90%, despite already ranking among the city's most deprived areas where access to green space is essential for health and wellbeing.

Given that the Council has a legal Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010, and that Labour as a party has long stood for fairness and protecting working-class people, how can you justify a Local Plan that disproportionately removes green space from Sheffield's working-class communities, while safeguarding it in the most affluent parts of the city?

Lack of Consultation – Lessons learned

The Street Trees dispute showed the dangers of failing to collaborate with the public, and it led to a very public and costly apology from the Council. Our community action group is now working in liaison with leaders of that campaign to ensure those lessons are not forgotten. Yet with the Green Belt site allocations, residents again feel the consultation has been rushed and woefully inadequate.

In the last full Council meeting Tom Hunt acknowledged this by stating that you would 'do better next time'. How many times do you need before you get it right? When will the Council finally learn from past mistakes, or will communities continue to be told that you will do better next time?