

22 October 2026

Dear Inspectors,

Sheffield Plan Examination – Representation on Proposed Further Main Modifications. Affordable Housing Supply: FMM33 (partly revising MM221, Annex C Monitoring Framework) and the evidence it relies on, EXAM 187A

1. Summary of representation

This representation concerns the soundness of FMM33, which amends the Annex C affordable housing target from 5,531 (325/yr) to 5,479 (320/yr) using EXAM 187A. FMM33's soundness depends on whether the EXAM 187A table behind it is justified and the homes in it deliverable.

Following my 5 May 2026 representation (REF5.0463), the Inspectors asked whether the original 5,531 target required adjustment (EXAM 217C, Q12.1–12.2). The Council agreed on 8 July 2026 that the revised capacities of three Green Belt sites should have been reflected in the monitoring target, leading to a further main modification (EXAM 217C, p.29 and paragraph 27). FMM33 applies this correction to four Green Belt sites. The urban rows are within scope as the Inspectors' question was whether the whole figure "should be adjusted", FMM33 adopts a total that contains them, and EXAM 187A postdates the Main Modifications consultation.

This representation does not support any of the additional allocations. My position remains that the Green Belt sites, and SES29 and SES30 in particular, should not be allocated.

Six points are set out in section 2:

1. SES29 is counted at 870 homes when the Plan allocates 735 within the plan period. This counts 41 affordable homes that the trajectory places after the Plan ends in 2039.
2. The urban total of 4,048 affordable homes has not changed since November 2024, although the Main Modifications have since deleted or reclassified 38 urban allocations.
3. None of the four urban rows in the update to Table 1 in EXAM 187A can be checked: no site list has been published and the completions row does not match the official record.
4. Opportunity Sites are now windfall (MM81, MM474), and the affordable table has no windfall row.
5. SS17, a Green Belt release with its own 25% requirement, is not in a Green Belt block; if its affordable homes are counted at all, they are counted as urban supply.
6. The 225 "policy plus" homes depend on Homes England funding. Homes England holds no funding commitment for them, and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) describes the prospectus figure EXAM 187 cites as an ambition, with no sites identified.

2. Relevant evidence

The supply table has been published three times, and the consultation documents provide a fourth set of figures.

Document	Urban	Green Belt	Policy plus	Total
EXAM 187, November 2025	4,048	1,248	235	5,531 (325/yr)
Council reply, 8 July 2026 (EXAM 217C, pp.29–30)	4,048	1,165	225	5,438 (320/yr)
EXAM 187A, 31 July 2026	4,048	1,206	225	5,479 (322/yr)
FMM33 and IIA note, September 2026	–	–	–	5,479 (320/yr)
Consultation FAQ, Q20, September 2026	"around 4,000"	1,165	225	"more than 5,400"

2.1 SES29: 41 affordable homes outside the plan period

EXAM 187A counts SES29 at 30% of 870 homes (261 affordable). MM410, EXAM 140 and EXAM 182 all put 735 of those homes in the plan period, leaving 135 after 2039; 30% of 735 is 220 (rounded down). EXAM 187A therefore counts 41 affordable homes that fall outside the plan period. No trajectory shows them arriving by 2039, unlike SES30 and NES37 (EXAM 187), and EXAM 140 shows the opposite.

The Council's 8 July figures appear to have made this correction: their Green Belt total of 1,165 (EXAM 217C, pp.29–30; FAQ Q20) is exactly 41 below EXAM 187A's. Three weeks later EXAM 187A counted SES29 at 870, raising the target to 5,479, without explanation; the Inspectors had asked only about NES37, SES30 and SWS19 (EXAM 217C, paragraph 28). The SES29 figure should be 220, or the Council should publish a trajectory that reconciles EXAM 187A with EXAM 140 and MM410.

2.2 The urban baseline in EXAM 187A and FMM33

FMM33 relies on an unevidenced urban capacity figure of 4,048 affordable homes in EXAM 187A. This figure was carried forward from November 2024 without accounting for subsequent site removals, so the monitoring target is not justified.

EXAM 187, paragraph 1, records that the urban figure of 4,048 was reported at the Stage 2 hearing on 5 November 2024, replacing the 3,003 in the Council's Matter 3 statement (WS3/1A, 21 October 2024). The same figure appears unchanged in the July 2026 reply and in EXAM 187A.

While the Council corrected Green Belt site figures for FMM33, it failed to re-evaluate urban allocations despite removing supply:

	Autumn 2024 baseline (EXAM 7A, EXAM 187)	**Current position (MMs, EXAM 187A)**	**Net change**
Status of 38 urban allocations (EXAM 7A, EXAM 116)	Included in supply	23 deleted (e.g. SES11) 15 moved to Appendix 2 (e.g. SV07)	−1,528 homes
Estimated affordable output lost	~150 affordable homes	Excluded from allocations	~150 homes unadjusted
Urban affordable supply (EXAM 187, EXAM 187A)	4,048 homes	4,048 homes	0 (unchanged)

Because the 4,048 figure has not been published as a site-by-site breakdown, it is impossible to verify whether these deleted sites are still being counted in the affordable homes total.

To make FMM33 sound, the Council must either publish a site-by-site breakdown of the 4,048 urban affordable housing supply to demonstrate that the 1,528 homes on the deleted or reclassified sites (about 150 affordable homes) are excluded; or recalculate and reduce the urban baseline figure to reflect post-November 2024 changes in allocations and update FMM33 accordingly.

2.3 The urban rows in the update to Table 1 cannot be verified

No site list has been published for the urban rows. WS3/1A showed how its 3,003 was derived, by supply category and the share of the NC3 requirement assumed (Table 4). EXAM 187 gives only totals for the 4,048 that replaced it at the hearing fifteen days later, attributing the 1,045-home increase to "significant work … on the Integrated Affordable Housing Programme" (paragraph 1).

The completions row does not match the record. MHCLG Live Table 1011C (25 June 2026) records 740 affordable completions in Sheffield from 2022/23 to 2024/25 (528 new build, 24 Social Rent, 10 through section 106). The table gives 393 for the same period without saying what it measures. WS3/1A itself gave two figures for 2022/23: 373 (Table 1) and 140 new build (Table 4). A figure reported in November 2024 could not include completions to March 2025.

The 2,047-home programme row, 39% of the 5,254 baseline, has no published sites, delivery years or funding sources. It is described only in narrative (EXAM 187, paragraphs 4–11), and none of the documents EXAM 187 cites for the programme (EXAM 90, 91, 92 and 121) contains the figure. EXAM 187 gives very different figures: "c.1,000 new affordable homes by 2029/30" (paragraph 7) and "over 4,500 … over the next five years" (paragraph 10). The Housing Growth Delivery Plan limits the Council's Stock Increase Programme to five sites and "c.500 new homes" by 2029 (EXAM 121, March 2025, p.32), yet the 2,047 is unchanged.

The Inspectors should require the Council to publish site-by-site trajectories that reconcile EXAM 187A with EXAM 140, MM410 and EXAM 121.

2.4 Opportunity Sites are now windfall, and windfall has no table row

The affordable housing supply table behind FMM33 (the update to Table 1 in EXAM 187A) fails to account for windfall capacity and Opportunity Sites created by the modifications.

Under MM81 and MM474, supply from "Opportunity Sites" (listed in Appendix 2 to Part 1 of the Plan) is windfall: MM474 defines the sites as "not allocated for development in the Plan", and MM81 counts them as "potentially contributing to the supply of larger windfalls", the 4,675-dwelling allowance in Annex C. However, the update to Table 1 in EXAM 187A contains no windfall row:

- WS3/1A (Table 4) originally counted 468 affordable homes on large windfall sites (10% of 4,675). EXAM 187A excludes this category without explanation, although the housing trajectory still counts 4,675 large-site windfall homes (EXAM 140, PDF p.6).
- The ~75 affordable homes (10% of the 754 homes Appendix 2 gives them) on the 15 reclassified Opportunity Sites are either still included in the allocations or moved into a windfall category that EXAM 187A does not include. The Council has not clarified which.

The Inspectors should require the Council to show in EXAM 187A the affordable housing from windfall and Opportunity Sites, or to exclude it and say why.

2.5 SS17: Green Belt release not recorded in the Green Belt sites

The update to Table 1 in EXAM 187A fails to show how affordable housing from SS17 (former Norton Aerodrome) is accounted for. The site delivers 270 homes on mainly previously developed land that the submitted Plan takes out of the Green Belt.

Policy NC3(c), proposed by MM127 in March 2026, requires a minimum 25% affordable housing contribution, or about 68 homes. But SS17's 68 affordable homes cannot be in Table 1 of EXAM 187 as the urban area total of 4,048 was reported at the Matter 3 hearing on 5 November 2024 (EXAM 187, paragraph 1), sixteen months before MM127 set the 25% rate. As above, the urban supply total has not changed since and the update to Table 1 in EXAM 187A (July 2026) repeats it unchanged.

Therefore, SS17 is either missing from the table or counted at the 10% NC3(a) rate that would otherwise apply, which is 27 homes, not 68. In addition:

1. Table 1 has no row for SS17. It does not belong in the "Green Belt Additional Sites" block, but it is a Green Belt release and should be shown as one, not included in urban supply.
2. NPPF December 2024 paragraph 67 asks for "at least 50%" affordable housing on land released from the Green Belt, going lower only where testing shows 50% is unviable. The Council tested the eleven additional sites this way (EXAM 131, paragraphs 2.1–2.2), but not SS17, which is released from the Green Belt by the same Plan. Neither EXAM 131 nor the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (VI01) tests SS17 at 25% or 50%.
3. The SS17 conditions in MM424 omit the Golden Rules condition attached to every other housing site released from the Green Belt.

The Inspectors cannot find the affordable housing target in FMM33 justified while the one Green Belt housing site outside the eleven proposed additional sites is counted at an unknown rate, on a

requirement set by formula. The Council should state where SS17 sits in Table 1 and at what rate, publish the viability evidence for 25%, and add the Golden Rules condition to SS17.

2.6 Policy plus: the funding bodies' answers

Of the 5,479 affordable homes, 225 at SES30 and NES37 are "policy plus": housing above the 30% that Policy NC3(c) requires. These will be "enabled by Homes England funding opportunities" (EXAM 187, paragraph 11). The term "policy plus" appears in none of the Plan's policies and nothing in the Plan secures these homes.

My May representation enclosed Homes England's FOI reply RFI5626 (9 April 2026): Homes England holds no funding commitment, indicative allocation, letter of intent, heads of terms or general expression of funding interest for any of the Green Belt sites, and its reply states "we are not supporting any developments on green belt sites". The Council's answer (EXAM 217C, reply to 12.2) was that the likely route to funding is the Sheffield Together Partnership, the South Yorkshire Housing Partnership and the ten-year Homes England programme, and EXAM 187, paragraph 10, records a "prospectus bid" under which "over 4,500 new affordable homes would be supported in Sheffield over the next five years".

I asked SYMCA for that prospectus bid and the Sheffield pipeline behind it. SYMCA's reply (FOI 5617, 21 October 2026, enclosed) says:

1. the figure in the Homes England prospectus "was an ambition rather than a target and was based on the affordable housing need across the region. Delivery has historically fallen below the need identified in Local Housing Needs Assessments";
2. the Sheffield element was calculated from the 2024 Local Housing Needs Assessment and the Council's Housing Growth Delivery Plan projection of "900 per annum by 2030, note the delivery in years running up to 2030 are lower";
3. "Any Affordable Housing Pipeline to be considered by the SAHP will be held by Homes England"; SYMCA's Board approved a National Housing Delivery Programme in September 2026 that includes an Integrated Affordable Homes Programme for Sheffield, but "At this stage we have not received the Strategic Business case outlining the sites involved"; and
4. for SES30 and NES37: "SYMCA doesn't have details of sites at this stage, and we have no documentation of the sites referred to below".

So the "over 4,500" in EXAM 187 is an ambition, not a funded pipeline; the body that made the bid holds no site list; and neither Homes England nor SYMCA, both partners in the Sheffield Together Partnership (EXAM 187, paragraph 8), holds any record of funding for SES30 or NES37. A further request to Homes England (RFI5921) for the bid and any later pipeline is outstanding. Homes England has extended its response date to 4 November 2026 while it considers the public interest test, and I will send its reply to the Programme Officer when it arrives.

3. Soundness concern

The test is realism, not precision. A seventeen-year forecast of affordable housing cannot be perfect, and the Council is entitled to describe its site capacities as indicative. What the September 2023

NPPF asks is that the forecast be realistic: paragraph 71 uses that word for a windfall allowance, and paragraph 16(b) asks that a plan be "aspirational but deliverable". The Council's answer, that funding is likely to come through its partnerships over ten years (EXAM 217C, reply to 12.2), is an expectation, not a reasonable prospect (NPPF, Annex 2, "developable"): Homes England says it is "not supporting any developments on green belt sites" (RFI5626), and SYMCA holds no sites or business case (FOI 5617).

Estimates. The Council describes the supply as "estimated" (EXAM 187, paragraph 3). But an estimate is only as sound as its inputs. The Council re-estimated four Green Belt sites for changes of between one and 24 affordable homes (EXAM 187A, p.1). Three of the four urban rows are counted on proposed site allocations (EXAM 187A, p.2), yet they have not been re-estimated on the current site list, from which 38 urban sites had gone by December 2024 (EXAM 7A, EXAM 116). The completions row is not an estimate at all: it records past delivery, and it does not match the official figure. Calling a figure an estimate explains why it is uncertain. It does not explain why it has not been re-run on the sites the Plan now allocates. If it is an estimate, it should be presented as one, rounded or as a range.

Justified. NPPF paragraph 35(b) requires a plan to be "based on proportionate evidence", and paragraph 31 requires that evidence to be "relevant and up-to-date".

FMM33 adopts a target whose largest part, the 4,048 urban homes (74% of the total), rests on a site list from November 2024 that the Main Modifications have since changed, and does not match the official completions record.

The Council accepted in July 2026 that the revised capacities of three Green Belt sites should have been reflected in the target (EXAM 217C, p.29). It has applied that to four sites but not to the 38 urban sites the Main Modifications deleted or reclassified. A target constructed without evidence that the Inspectors, or anyone else, can check is not justified.

Effective. NPPF paragraph 35(c) requires the Plan to be "deliverable over the plan period".

Of the 5,479: the 2,047 programme row has no securing mechanism in the Plan, no site list and no funding award; the 225 policy plus homes depend on Homes England funding (EXAM 187, paragraph 11), for which SYMCA holds no sites and Homes England no funding record.

The official record is 247 completions a year over 2022/23 to 2024/25 (90 in 2024/25) against the 347 a year that the table's future rows require over the remaining fourteen years, or 363 with policy plus. Sheffield has reached 347 in only two of the last 27 years (2014/15 and 2022/23), and has averaged 210 a year over the last ten (MHCLG Live Table 1011C). The table assumes 347 every year for fourteen years.

The monitoring trigger in MM221, "failure to deliver policy compliant affordable housing … on 20% of allocated sites that receive planning permission", tests compliance on *permissions*, not *completions* against the target: completions can run at a fraction of 320 a year without anything in Annex C responding. This is not effective monitoring.

NPPF paragraph 74 expects a trajectory "illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery"; there is none for urban affordable housing.

Why this matters for the Green Belt release. The affordable homes are part of the case for releasing the Green Belt sites (FAQ Q20 and Q22; the Golden Rules conditions in MM410 and MM411), and NPPF paragraph 140 requires exceptional circumstances to be "fully evidenced and justified". The evidence supports no more than 1,165 of the 1,431 affordable homes counted on those sites (EXAM 187A, p.2), the Council's own 8 July figure (EXAM 217C, p.30).

4. Changes sought

I request that the Inspectors find FMM33 unsound as drafted, and that the Council be required, before the Inspectors report, to publish the derivation of each row of the EXAM 187A table, site by site, with the capacity, rate and year assumed, re-run on the March 2026 site list with 2025/26 completions, and reconciled to MHCLG Live Table 1011C and to the Council's own October 2024 breakdown (WS3/1A, Table 4).

The target in Annex C should then be restated on that evidence, with SES29 at its plan-period capacity, and without the 225 policy plus homes until their funding is evidenced.

Where that evidence is not produced, the target should be limited to the affordable housing the Plan itself secures through Policy NC3, with programme and policy plus delivery reported separately.

If the Inspectors retain FMM33, my objection stands, but FMM33 should be amended in three ways:

1. SES29 should be counted at 735 homes (220 affordable homes, not 261). That restores the Council's own 8 July totals of 1,165 on Green Belt sites and 5,438 overall, or 5,213 without policy plus.
2. The target should be a rounded figure or a range, consistent with MM223, and should leave out the policy plus homes until their funding is evidenced.
3. A second trigger should test *completions* against the target, not only *permissions*.

Points 2 and 3 would change the target and add a new trigger, so I ask that the amended modification be published for comment.

Annex C states the affordable housing target twice: under the health and wellbeing objective (Main Modifications schedule, p.248) and under the affordable housing objective (p.254). FMM33 changes the target without saying whether it amends one entry or both; its indicator wording matches only the first. Whatever target is adopted, both entries must change, or the Plan will carry 5,479 and 320 in one place and 5,531 and 325 in the other.

The IIA note (p.35) and the consultation FAQ (Q20: 1,165 and "more than 5,400") should carry the same figures. The housing trajectory (MM92) and supply tables (MM90–MM93) should reflect any change, and the justification for the Green Belt releases under Policies SP1 (MM10) and SA5 (MM68) should be reassessed if the affordable housing benefit falls.

5. Conclusion

I object to FMM33 as drafted. The Council accepted in July 2026 that revised site capacities should have been reflected in the affordable housing target. It should now apply that principle to the whole table, publish the derivation, and restate the target on evidence the Inspectors can verify. Until it does, the modification is neither justified nor effective.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Parkin

Enclosure: South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority, response to request FOI 5617, 21 October 2026. (Homes England's response RFI5626 of 9 April 2026 was enclosed with representation REF5.0463 of 5 May 2026.)

Our Ref: 5617

21 October 2026

South Yorkshire
Mayoral Combined Authority
11 Broad Street West
Sheffield, S1 2BQ

Dear Michael Parkin,

Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding to your request.

I am writing further to your request for information regarding South Yorkshire affordable housing pipeline and SAHP prospectus. We have considered your request, and we are providing you with the following information in bold.

YOUR REQUEST:
Please could you provide:

1. **The prospectus, bid, submission or equivalent document referred to above that was submitted to Homes England, including any appendices, schedules or accompanying site lists.**
2. **The Sheffield element of any housing growth or affordable housing pipeline which supported the statement that more than 4,500 affordable homes would be supported in Sheffield.**
3. **Any version of that pipeline supplied to or discussed with Homes England as part of the Social and Affordable Homes Programme 2026-2036.**
4. **For sites SES30 (Land between Bramley Lane and Beaver Hill Road, Sheffield) and NES37 (Land between Creswick Avenue and Yew Lane, Sheffield), any record showing:**
    - **whether either site has at any time been included in the regional or Sheffield affordable housing pipeline;**
    - **the number of affordable homes attributed to the site;**
    - **any proposed funding requirement or allocation;**
    - **any Registered Provider or housing association associated with the site; and**
    - **the site's status within the pipeline.**
5. **Any correspondence between SYMCA and Homes England which specifically mentions SES30, NES37, Bramley Lane / Beaver Hill Road, or Creswick Avenue / Yew Lane, in connection with affordable housing funding or the Social and Affordable Homes Programme.**

For items 1-3, please provide the documents themselves rather than summaries of their contents.
For items 4–5, the relevant period is 1 January 2025 to the date of this request.

If SES30 and NES37 do not appear in the relevant pipeline, bid or associated records, I would be grateful if you could confirm that no such recorded information is held.

OUR RESPONSE:

1. **Prospectus bid** - Homes England's SAHP Prospectus included EMSA Mayoral ambitions for increasing affordable housing in their regions. It should be noted that this was **an ambition** rather than a target and was based on the affordable housing need across the region. Delivery has historically fallen below the need identified in Local Housing Needs Assessments.

Prospectus - Social and Affordable Homes Programme (SAHP) 2026 to 2036 - GOV.UK
See extract below for South Yorkshire Mayor's **ambitions** for more affordable housing in the region, the full document can be found in here . Note this is not a target but was based on the ambition for more affordable housing in the region to meet needs and find ways of exceeding projections in 2025 for new affordable housing in the region.

South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA)
Overall ambition for affordable housing delivery and the role of the SAHP
The South Yorkshire mayor has an overall ambition to deliver 9,000 new affordable homes over the next 5 years.

SYMCA aims to maximise delivery through other routes, including Section 106, but the SAHP will play a key role in delivery of new social and affordable homes in the region.

Tenure and type of affordable housing the SAHP should deliver
SYMCA's ambition is for 60% of homes delivered to be for Social Rent, with 40% for other affordable housing products including Affordable Rent and Shared Ownership.

SYMCA have an ambition for 10% of SAHP in the region to be directed to the delivery of supported or specialist housing to ensure vulnerable households, particularly those with complex needs, can live independently and so reduce the numbers falling into homelessness.

There is a need across all South Yorkshire local authorities for 1-bedroom accommodation, level access and 3 or 4-bedroom family homes.
Wider priorities for SAHP delivery
SYMCA encourages partners to bring forward proposals that help to regenerate existing estates, including as part of wider packages of funding and investment to deliver wholescale estate renewal, which may involve demolition and replacement. SYMCA also supports the use of targeted acquisitions.

SYMCA supports local authority partners to unlock council led delivery and will work closely with them to develop plans for growing the council housing portfolio.
L
SYMCA welcome schemes which utilise and encourage the development of local construction and green skills, including apprenticeships. SYMCA supports the use of Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) and community-led initiatives.
Priority sites and growth areas 'a0
SYMCA encourages proposals for delivery of Housing Pipeline identified Catalyst Sites within priority growth locations that are considered to have the greatest potential impact on the acceleration of regeneration:
· Barnsley — Hoyland (North and South) and Royston and Carlton 'a0

- Doncaster — Unity and Doncaster Waterfront 'a0and city centre emerging sites
- Rotherham — Bassingthorpe Farm and Rotherham town centre sites 'a0
- Sheffield – Neeps End and Furnace Hill and Moorfoot

SYMCA's Local Growth Plan has also identified:

- Don Valley Corridor — including the Catalyst Sites of:

- Bassingthorpe Farm
- Rotherham town centre
- Attercliffe Waterside
- Gleadless Valley
- Sheffield city centre and Innovation Spine — including the Catalyst Sites of:

- Neeps End
- Furnace Hill
- Moorfoot

SYMCA support

SYMCA is keen to see the effective use of the region's Housing Revenue Accounts and Right to Buy Receipts to enable council-led delivery. They will also continue to identify private finance opportunities, like the South Yorkshire Pension Authority Housing Fund, to complement SAHP funding.

SYMCA will also prioritise investment from its integrated settlement to deliver good quality, sustainable affordable housing, including on identified Catalyst Sites.

SYMCA encourage partners to work closely with the 4 local authorities, Homes England and the South Yorkshire Housing Partnership via its Strategic Place Partnership.

2. **Sheffield element for calculating overall Prospectus Ambition for South Yorkshire –** this was based on the Local Housing Needs Assessment (2024) carried out by SCC which identified the need for 2,032 new affordable homes per annum together with **SCC's projections** for new affordable housing which can be found in its Housing Growth Delivery Plan (Appendix A - HGDP Post IHB - Draft.pdf) including on p39. These projections identify a delivery of 900 per annum by 2030, note the delivery in years running up to 2030 are lower.
3. Any Affordable Housing Pipeline to be considered by the SAHP will be held by Homes England.
4. SYMCA Board approved its National Housing Delivery Programme in September 2026 which includes an Integrated Affordable Homes Programme for Sheffield, National Housing Delivery Funding will be considered along with other forms of finance such as SAHP, private finance etc. At this stage we have not received the Strategic Business case outlining the sites involved.
5. SYMCA are working with partners such as the four Local Authorities, Homes England and South Yorkshire Housing Partnership to explore ways to accelerate delivery of affordable housing across the region to support the Mayor's ambition for 9000 new affordable homes in the region.
6. SYMCA doesn't have details of sites at this stage, and we have no documentation of the sites referred to below

This completes our response to your information request.

If you believe your request for information has not been handled properly, you can request an internal review of our decision. Internal review requests should be submitted within two calendar months of the date of this letter. If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:
Information Commissioner's Officer
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
SK9 5AF
Tel: 0303 123 1113
Website: www.ico.org.uk
Yours sincerely,
Information Governance Team
Informationrequests@southyorkshire-ca.gov.uk