

Exam 196 – Response to Marie Tidball MP – Written Submission of Oral Presentation to the Planning Inspectors (2 October 2025)

CEG (Chapeltown, Ecclesfield & Grenoside) Community Action Group

1. Purpose of this response

This document is a formal community response to Exam 196, submitted on 12th December, by Dr Marie Tidball MP as a written version of her oral presentation to the Planning Inspectors on 2 October 2025.

Dr Tidball states repeatedly in Exam 196 that it is important to her to reflect the views of her constituents and that she is speaking directly to constituent evidence on specific sites.

The purpose of this document is to place on record where statements in Exam 196 attribute to residents a conditional acceptance of development (via mitigation, phasing, buffers, remediation, redesign or alternative delivery models) for which we can find no supporting evidence in residents' consultation submissions, community meeting records, correspondence, or subsequent engagement.

2. Community representation and mandate

The CEG Community Action Group represents residents across the S35 area who are directly affected by the Sheffield Local Plan proposals and associated Green Belt allocations.

Our established community reach includes:

- Weekly CEG Community Action Group Meetings;
- Community Green Belt events;
- Nearly 5,000 members on our Facebook group;
- Over 700 residents on our circulation/mailing list;
- Average 1 million views per month on our Facebook page and related content;
- 100's of visitors every week to our website – Save Chapeltown, Ecclesfield & Grenoside Greenbelt Community Campaign | Community Action

In addition, included in the standard letter responses that our residents have completed, around 600 have indicated in the tick-box checklist that Dr Tidball did not represent their views in her verbal submission to the Inspectors on 2 October 2025 (the oral presentation later submitted as Exam 196). This position was also placed on record at the hearing and reiterated in our community response to the late examination documents.

Residents note that Dr Tidball's written objection of 10 July 2025 was submitted following a community meeting on 3 July 2025 attended by approximately 60 residents, and during a consultation period in which she was copied into around 950 letters and emails from residents opposing Green Belt development. That written objection was widely understood by residents to reflect their views.

Following submission of the objection, a subsequent FOI response from Dr Tidball's office refers only to a small number of advice surgeries involving limited numbers of residents and does not identify any large-scale engagement that would explain a material change in the views attributed to constituents. Residents therefore question when, how, and on what evidential basis the positions later attributed to them in Exam 196 emerged, given that the objection letter itself was reflective of residents' expressed views.

Residents represented by CEG have consistently opposed Green Belt release and continue to support a brownfield-first strategy. Residents did not express support for mitigations, conditional acceptance, or alternative development models on the S35 Green Belt sites.

For clarity, this response relates solely to sites within the S35 area covered by the CEG Community Action Group. It does **not** make representations in respect of sites NWS30 or NWS31 (Wharncliffe Side and Oughtibridge), which fall outside the areas represented by the CEG Community Action Group. Any references to those sites in Exam 196 are therefore not addressed in this document.

3. Context: claims of representation in Exam 196

Exam 196 repeatedly frames site-specific comments as reflecting constituent views. Given this framing, accuracy in attributing views to residents is critical.

Across several Chapeltown, Ecclesfield and Grenoside sites, Exam 196 reframes residents' position from opposition in principle to conditional acceptability, presenting development as acceptable if mitigated, phased, redesigned or managed differently. This does not reflect the views expressed by residents.

4. Site-specific statements that do not reflect residents' views

NES37 (Town End Farm) – “smaller parcels of housing” and reallocation

Exam 196 states:

“Having spoken to a number of constituents with acute localised knowledge, there may be ways to do smaller parcels of housing on this site...”

Residents represented by CEG can find no evidence that constituents proposed or supported smaller parcels of housing on NES37. This position does not appear in consultation responses, meeting records or correspondence.

Exam 196 also presents reallocation of housing numbers elsewhere as a “remedy”. Residents did not propose or support redistribution of housing numbers; their consistent position was opposition to Green Belt release and opposition to housing on NES37 in any form.

CH03 (Warren Lane) – mixed use, buffers and “high-skilled jobs”

Exam 196 states:

“Local residents would like to see more innovative thinking around a mixed housing and employment site... with high-skilled, well-paid jobs...”

Residents state unequivocally that these views were not expressed by them.

At the meeting that Dr Tidball references that took place at the Miners' Arms on 12 August 2025:

- residents did not suggest openness to any development on CH03;
- the idea of mixed housing and employment was raised by Dr Tidball, not residents;
- residents stated that Sheffield City Council had already rejected housing on the site due to remoteness and lack of infrastructure;
- residents reiterated opposition to development on CH03 in any form.

Dr Tidball's written objection (10 July 2025) reflected opposition to development on this site. Residents therefore question how views explicitly rejected at the August meeting were later attributed to them in October.

CH05 (Land to East of Chapeltown Road)– transport phasing presented as acceptability

Exam 196 states:

“Deliverability here requires clear phasing: transport first, then housing.”

Residents did not frame their opposition as a sequencing or phasing issue. Their position was clear opposition to Green Belt release and to development on this site. Presenting development as acceptable subject to transport phasing does not reflect residents' views.

CH04 (Hesley Wood) – staged works and habitat remediation

Exam 196 states:

"Any works would need to be staged and fund remediation and ensure that habitat and management are locked in as a first phase."

Residents did not propose staged delivery or remediation-led development as a route to acceptability. Their position was opposition to development on this Green Belt site due to ecological value, community separation and cumulative impacts.

NES36 (Land south of M1 J35) – buffers, habitat creation and remediation

Exam 196 states:

"The remedy and ask is minimum buffers and habitat creation... standard remediation... phased plots for effective delivery."

Residents opposed development and did not propose mitigation, buffers, habitat creation or phased remediation as a basis for acceptance. The statement reframes principled opposition as a technical delivery issue.

5. Inaccuracy in housing waiting list figure

In her oral presentation, Dr Tidball referred to 26,400 people on the social housing waiting list. However following a Freedom of Information response from Sheffield City Council, we understand that the number of active households/applicants on the social housing list is approximately 13,000. This distinction matters, as waiting list figures are used to justify the scale and location of development, including Green Belt release.

6. Conclusion

CEG acknowledges Dr Tidball's stated intention in Exam 196 to reflect constituents' views. However, for multiple Chapeltown, Ecclesfield and Grenoside sites, Exam 196 attributes to residents positions involving mitigation, phasing, buffers, remediation, redesign or alternative development models for which we can find no supporting evidence in residents' submissions, meeting records or correspondence.

This risks giving the Inspectors an inaccurate impression that local opposition is negotiable through mitigation, when residents' consistent position has been opposition to Green Belt release in principle and support for a brownfield-first strategy.

This response is submitted to ensure that the community's position is clearly and accurately recorded as part of the Examination.

CEG Save Our Green Belt Community Action Group

18.12.25