Dear Dr Tidball,

<u>Community Response to Exam 196</u>

We are writing on behalf of the Chapeltown, Ecclesfield and Grenoside (CEG) Action Group to enclose our Community Response to Exam 196, your written submission following your oral presentation to the Planning Inspectors on 2 October 2025.

This document is provided as a community record to support clarity and transparency in the Examination process. It sets out areas where the views described in Exam 196 differ from those consistently expressed by residents.

Scale and significance of this issue for S35

The Sheffield Local Plan proposals, and in particular the release of Green Belt land in S35, represent the single most significant planning issue to affect our communities in living memory. The proposed allocations would have permanent impacts on landscape, infrastructure, health and welfare provision, farming, ecology and the character of our communities.

Residents are also deeply concerned about the duration of the impact. The Sheffield Local Plan spans approximately 17 years, meaning that communities across the S35 area face the prospect of sustained construction activity, increased heavy goods vehicle movements, traffic congestion, noise and air pollution and environmental disturbance for almost a quarter of a lifetime.

This is particularly significant in an area with a large elderly population, for whom prolonged exposure to disruption, reduced accessibility, and increased traffic presents heightened risks to health, wellbeing and quality of life. Many residents feel that being expected to endure these conditions over such an extended period is neither reasonable nor acceptable.

Given the scale of this impact, residents have been surprised and disappointed that the proposed Green Belt development in S35 does not feature on your website or in your stated priorities, nor is there any visible evidence of sustained public lobbying on behalf of S35 communities comparable to that undertaken by Clive Betts MP in relation to his area.

Representation of residents' views

Residents have consistently and clearly stated that they are not opposed to development per se and in fact we have had a number of developments in S35 over the last few years. However, they are opposed to the release of Green Belt land and continue to support a brownfield-first strategy. This position was expressed during the consultation period, at the community meeting you held on 3 July 2025, in the substantial volume of correspondence you were copied into, and in subsequent community engagement.

Your written objection of 10 July 2025 was widely understood by residents to reflect those views. It is therefore particularly difficult for residents to understand how, in your later submission to the Inspectors, positions involving mitigation, phasing, redesign, mixed use or conditional acceptance came to be attributed to constituents, when those positions were not expressed by residents and were, in several cases, explicitly rejected.

We have enclosed our response to Exam 196 to explain this in detail, by site.

Impact on trust and confidence

Residents feel increasingly abandoned and unsupported in a process where Sheffield City Council has been experienced as hostile and dismissive of community concerns. In that context, it is essential that any representation made on behalf of S35 communities clearly distinguishes between:

- your own policy views or judgement; and
- verified constituent views.

When those two are blurred, residents feel not only unheard, but misrepresented.

What residents are seeking

Residents are not asking for blanket opposition to development to be voiced in Parliament or to the Inspectors. They are asking for accurate and transparent representation of their views, which have consistently supported a brownfield-first approach, including the release and prioritisation of brownfield and land-banked sites held by developers, rather than the permanent loss of Green Belt land.

Where you state that you are reflecting constituents' views, residents expect those views to be conveyed as they were expressed, particularly on an issue of such lasting and irreversible consequence for S35 communities.

Given the scale of the impact on S35 communities, we would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss this response, to better understand how constituent views were interpreted and to explore how future representations can accurately and transparently reflect those views.

We look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,

Gill Travis, Chair of CEG Community Action Group