



**Doncaster
Council**

Doncaster Local Plan

Homes & Settlements Consultation (March 2016)

Analysis of Responses

September 2018

Doncaster Local Plan – Homes and Settlements Consultation

Analysis of Responses

This is a Report on the main issues raised in responses to the Local Plan’s March 2016 Homes and Settlements Consultation.

Comments made have informed subsequent Local Plan preparation.

Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal of the 2016 Homes and Settlement Consultation is given in Appendix A of the Sustainability Appraisal Report accompanying the Local Plan’s Informal Consultation on Draft Policies and Proposed Sites, published September 2018, This also includes the Council’s response to comments made.

Table 1. Consultation Comments: Main Issues	
Comment	Response
<p>1. The Housing Requirement:</p> <p>Responses including from Barton Willmore; CPRE; East Riding DC; England Lyle; House Builders Federation; J10 Planning; Joint Rural Parishes; JVH Planning; Marr PC; Nathaniel Lichfield; Persimmon Homes; Selby DC; Sheffield City; Spawforths; Sprotbrough and Cusworth PC; Tickhill PC.</p> <p>Agents representing multiple developer/ landowner interest have criticised the objectively assessed need (OAN) of 920 new homes per year as too low and so not supporting the Sheffield City Region Economic Growth Plan. They criticise the methodology for calculating OAN. One alternative suggestion for the OAN is 1150 per year. Some support for proposed figure.</p> <p>The Joint Rural Parishes (and some individual PCs including Marr and Tickhill) say the housing requirement is too high/ not properly calculated, given affordability issues, the scale of empty properties and their view that the assumed economic growth will not happen. Sprotbrough and Cusworth PC point out that historically there has been an under delivery of housing and affordable housing</p> <p>The CPRE also say the housing requirement is too high and criticise the OAN for not</p>	<p>The Housing Needs Assessment is a robust piece of work that has been peer-reviewed; the criticisms of its assumptions and methodological approach are considered to have already been properly addressed in the Assessment (for example bringing empty properties back into use is factored in to the calculation). The OAN of 920 is considered to be aspirational (it depends upon significant planned for jobs growth) but also realistic. A larger figure would be less realistic and would increase the likelihood that a 5 year deliverable land supply could not be demonstrated and so run the risk of planning by appeal which would undermine the local plan and the neighbourhood plans that depend upon it.</p> <p>Subsequently the Government has announced its intention to introduce a standard methodology for the calculation of housing need to inform the setting of housing requirements in Local Plans, in conjunction with a revised National Planning Policy Framework. In this it is proposed the housing target for Doncaster would be 585 dwellings per annum. However, the draft methodology suggests Council’s may choose to adopt a higher figure taking into account local economic growth aspirations (which requires more housing).</p> <p>As a result, and to in order to generally update the Council’s evidence base for housing need, an independent report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates to inform the</p>

<p>being objective since it factors in policy-on growth.</p> <p>Clarification sought as to meaning of local need.</p> <p>Objection made to inclusion of 5% buffer (rather than 20%) to housing need in respect of past under-supply,</p> <p>Adjacent authorities, including Sheffield, Selby and East Riding, confirm Doncaster has its own housing market area.</p> <p>Peel (in advocating further development at the Airport) believe the evidence base demonstrating links between economic development and OAN is weak.</p> <p>Only limited consideration to how the needs of Gypsies and Travellers will be met.</p>	<p>Local Plan's housing (and employment land requirements) : 'Economic Forecasts and Housing Needs Assessments'. This concludes that in order to aim to achieve the Sheffield City Region's target of 1% economic growth per annum, the housing target should be 912 homes per annum</p> <p>The 912 target is marginally different to the 920 previously proposed and as a result it is proposed, based on an updated and robust evidence base, that the housing target should be retained at 920 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Local need is primarily that required to meet baseline growth in population.</p> <p>The 5% buffer is considered appropriate as the OAN takes account of past and future needs and supply</p> <p>The needs of Gypsies and Travellers will be taken forward via a specific policy based on published evidence base.</p>
<p>2. Housing Allocations and additional housing land supply:</p> <p>Responses including from CPRE, DLP; England Lyle; Environment Agency; House Builders Federation; J10 Planning; Johnson Brook; JVH Planning; Nathaniel Lichfield; Spawforths.</p> <p>Agents argue also that there is no justification for just 15 years' worth of allocations when the plan covers 17 years. Some also argue for an additional allocations buffer (e.g.10%) in case of non-delivery</p> <p>The Environment Agency point out that the NPPF does not necessarily require even 15 years' allocations and would be concerned if allocating for such a long period increased the conflict with flood risk and think that planning for fewer years might be prudent.</p> <p>There is general development industry support for the concept of Reserve sites but provided they are additional to the plan period supply and are not relied upon for years 16-17 of the plan. Some including CPRE and JVH Planning object, Windfalls are accepted as a source of supply provided the allowance made for them is properly</p>	<p>Two additional years' allocations would (assuming the OAN remains unchanged) amount to the need to find land for an additional 1840 dwellings which would most likely be required from the Green Belt or countryside (or a mixture of both).</p> <p>The local plan would meet NPPF guidance in adopting a 17 year plan period and identifying 15 years' worth of allocations. The NPPF states (paragraph 157) that Local Plans should: "be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date" and (paragraph 47) that local planning authorities should:" identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements...(and)... identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15."</p> <p>Given the above and the Environment Agency's concerns and the future uncertainty over the planning system (emergence of a Sheffield City Region plan and likely changes to national development plan processes and guidance) it is considered prudent to allocate no more than 15 years' sites</p>

<p>evidenced</p> <p>There are a number of responses seeking to play down the contribution of the additional sources of housing land supply and so strengthen the argument for more allocations.</p> <p>There is criticism from agents that relying on existing permissions will mean no new allocations in some settlements. HBF stress there should be credible evidence.</p> <p>The CPRE want more account taken of these sources and for them to be sequentially prioritised so as to aid regeneration and brownfield take-up and reduce the need for greenfield allocations.</p>	<p>No amendment is proposed. The Local Plan will plan for 17 years and 15 years' worth of housing allocations with clarification that additional sources of land supply together with the allocations will address the 17 year period. This will not include sources that are not considered developable in the plan period</p> <p>The proposal to allocate 17 years' worth of allocations is rejected as it would provide an unnecessary increase in housing land supply and require additional sites within the countryside and Green Belt. This would also take the plan away from the views of the Environment Agency who would clearly prefer a shorter plan period if that reduced potential conflict with flood risk areas.</p>
<p>3. Flood Risk and sequential approach to identifying sites for future development.</p> <p>Responses including from Environment Agency; Johnson Brook; JRA Moorhouse Planning; Nathaniel Lichfields; Pegasus Group; Persimmon Homes; Planning Prospects; Savills.</p> <p>The Environment Agency welcomes the intention to direct economic-led growth away from flood risk areas but stresses that the sequential approach must apply to all housing growth. It has asked for further justification of the settlement hierarchy in the context of a sequential approach to flood risk and clarification of how geographical boundaries will be applied to a sequential approach in respect of the local needs housing element. They welcome the fact that the flood risk constraint at Thorne is acknowledged.</p> <p>Many of the agents (those with clients whose land lies outside flood risk areas) say that a proper interpretation of the NPPF is that flood zones 2/3 should be avoided completely unless it is impossible to do so or flood zone 1 alternatives are unsustainable (not just less sustainable) and they don't see either of these scenarios as likely. Thorne/ Moorends and Carcroft/ Skellow are identified as heavily flood risk-constrained settlements</p> <p>Agents with potential development sites in flood risk locations (particularly in Thorne/Moorends) and others (including Thorne Moorends Town Council) stress the wider sustainability benefits of allowing housing growth here and press for an allocation that addresses economic growth and not just local needs provision; and that there should be a consistent approach across Borough.</p> <p>The Environment Agency is updating several hydraulic river models (Humber</p>	<p>A strategy that proposes any housing growth within flood risk areas (albeit on sites that are, or can be made, safe) carries significant risk given the opposition to it from many developers/ landowners, the concerns of the Environment Agency, differing interpretations of national policy and the failure of the Sites and Policies DPD on this issue.</p> <p>However, Thorne/Moorends is an otherwise very sustainable location for development as are a number of urban sites in flood risk zones elsewhere; avoiding development in such locations without proper justification could lead to a less sustainable development and travel pattern.</p> <p>The Thorne local community (who are preparing a neighbourhood plan) have clearly expressed their support for housing growth in Thorne/ Moorends. DMBC members have also made clear their commitment to Thorne/Moorends and to other otherwise sustainable sites in flood zones and the previous (Issues and Options) consultation response revealed wide-spread public (and Team Doncaster) support for using otherwise suitable sites in flood zones.</p> <p>The proposed approach seeks to balance the need to meet local needs locally and other sustainability issues with flood risk considerations. However, it is considered that to plan for anything more than local needs in Thorne/Moorends would run a very high risk of the plan being found unsound.</p> <p>Flood risk modelling has been undertaken using latest information. Further modelling is planned by the Environment Agency that may alter the current assessments. However, it cannot be certain that it will yield results that can inform the Local Plan without significant delays.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the draft overall approach policy to housing and settlement in</p>

Estuary, Lower Don & Isle of Axholme) in and around the borough as many existing models are considered out of date. These updates will be used to update the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning (flood zones 1,2 and 3) and also the functional flood plain which are the starting point for applying the flood risk sequential test.

Some criticism that can't apply flood risk tests in absence of SFRA Level 2.

line with the Environment Agency's comments so that it is clear that a sequential approach is being applied to all housing development and that in terms of geographical boundaries this means urban sites or sustainable urban extensions to that settlement.

An option of including allocations in Thorne & Moorends to provide for economic led housing in addition to providing for local needs is rejected as it would be contrary to local plan strategy to avoid flood risk unless required to meet local need and national guidance leading to the likelihood of the plan being unsound.

An option to avoid any allocations in Thorne & Moorends altogether is rejected as this would significantly reduce future housing opportunities in what is an otherwise sustainable community and would likely lead to its economic decline.

4 Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Distribution

Responses including from Barnburgh & Harlington PC; Barton Willmore; CPRE; Cushman & Wakefield; David Lock Associates; DLP; England and Lyle; Frampton Planning; Hickling Gray Associates; ID Planning; J10 Planning; Johnson Brook; JVH Town Planning; Nathaniel Lichfield; Pearce Bottomley Architects; Peel Land and Property Ltd; Pegasus Group; Persimmon Homes; Planning Prospects; Rollinson Planning; Rural Parishes JRC; Savills; Spawforths; Sprotbrough & Cusworth PC; various parishes and individuals.

There is general support for the settlement strategy which is seen as logical, sensible and sustainable. There are one or two calls for the balance of distribution to be shifted further to Doncaster Main Urban Area but others that there should be more directed to Service Towns and Villages. There is one call for Thorne and Mexborough to be recognised as the only 2nd tier settlements. Some criticism of settlement groupings not recognising role and performance of Thorne. One objection that there were too many settlements.

The proposal to meet local needs locally gets general support; treating economic-led growth differently gets support and some objections. Objection to adding the balance of the local need figure (that which relates to villages without a service function) is 524 to economic-led housing growth.

The CPRE are generally supportive but want more of an emphasis on regeneration priorities: Doncaster riverside, Rossington, Unity area (and they ask why this is not reflected in a larger requirement) and Thorne/Moorends; that the proportion of development that does not support Strategy should be minimised and should relate better to public transport accessibility.

The general support is welcomed; the various competing calls for different settlements to have a "bigger slice of the cake" do not amount to a more justified or coherent strategy.

The regeneration areas identified by CPRE are supported through the proposed approach which seeks to balance such considerations with the need to allocate sites in areas that the housing market (house buyers as well as developers) will support.

The Unity initiative has a large number of houses approved but many of these will only be developed beyond the plan period.

The need to redistribute any capacity in the event of there being insufficient suitable sites at a particular settlement may not arise but will be reviewed once the site assessment work has been completed.

It is proposed to propose to produce settlement profiles that will expand upon the settlement audit; this will not be new evidence but will pull together the evidence from existing sources for each of the growth settlements.

It is also proposed to review whether there have been any changes to services that would justify any changes to the list of Service Towns and Villages or other settlements in the hierarchy.

The details of the settlement approach could be altered to meet the particular points made. This is rejected as consistency is lost, the resultant strategy would lack rationale and the preparation of the plan would not be justified i.e. found unsound. The Settlement Audit is sufficient to identify sustainable settlements and previous experience has shown that a fully comprehensive exercise can be time consuming and expensive adding to cost and delays. Comparison with other local plan work identifies that the settlement audit is

There is still some developer concern about deliverability in some places i.e. the requirement might be larger than the sub market will support in the combined Doncaster, Armthorpe & Barnby Dun area and also for Adwick and Askern (upper range only), Stainforth/Hatfield, and Thorne/Moorends.

There are various calls (from development interests) for higher settlement requirements or flexibility to facilitate the allocation of more sites/ specific sites in various settlements (e.g. Doncaster, Tickhill, Adwick, Thorne, Armthorpe and Rossington). Peel Land and Property Ltd argue that there should be much more housing growth around the airport – see below.

There is general support for the Defined Village concept (the Rural Parishes JRC and individual parish councils for example are supportive) but there is also a developer criticism that these villages have no real infill opportunities left. There is a call for Arksey to be reclassified as a Service Town/ Village.

There are calls for any necessary redistribution from Service Towns and villages (in the event that insufficient suitable sites are identified) to go to Doncaster Main Urban Area and the Main Towns (and for this to be enshrined in policy). However, there is also a call for any such capacity to be directed to the nearest settlement.

Some call for distribution to be applied more flexibility (not pro-rata) to allow additional growth for Main Towns.

There is a call for small scale growth to be located in/ adjacent to smaller rural villages

There is some criticism of the Settlement Audit being too limited in scope.

comparable to practice elsewhere.

5 Housing Development around the Airport

Peel Land and Property Ltd is currently preparing its 30 year Airport Master Plan; it is expected to be published in September 2016 (Update: was published in April 2018 for consultation) and will update its current plan prepared in 2008. They have indicated that it will include more employment areas around the south west of the runway creating 7000 jobs with logistics and manufacturing units and housing (approx.. 1500 to 2000) growth proposals on their land holdings around the airport together with a community hub. The most significant of these were not submitted (for housing) through the Call for Sites. Their consultation response to the Homes and Settlement paper does however make clear their case for major housing growth around the airport because of the scale of jobs growth and infrastructure investment and the sustainability argument for a co-location of homes with jobs. No evidence is presented on the spatial distribution of anticipated economic growth and its implications for housing and so the role of the Airport in creating economic growth is

Job delivery related to the airport is factored into jobs projections in the boroughs economic forecasting. In short, it is assumed that the airport will contribute towards the projected 1% jobs growth in the borough, and workers that will benefit from the employment opportunities also benefit from related housing opportunities across the borough, as per the settlement strategy.

However, the council wants to ensure the growth and success of this important economic asset can continue to be supported through the local plan in acknowledgement that an airport is a relatively unique economic advantage for an area with huge importance and a catalyst for both the local and wider regional economy.

As well as land to deliver ambitious economic growth and significant jobs potential, the draft Airport masterplan (covering the period 2018-2037) also identifies several potential

<p>not reflected in the distribution of housing.</p> <p>They consider that the Strategy would not accommodate their plans – currently Hayfield Green/ Auckley is identified as a Service Town and Village based on its existing facilities and services and is therefore allocated an allocation of 105 dwellings and there are already permission to meet this.</p> <p>They contend that DSA is realistic and deliverable being free from technical constraints and with one landowner.</p>	<p>sites for housing development around the Airport site. This housing land equates to far more land than required in order to deliver the local plan settlement strategy, even when taking into account that the masterplan runs for an extra period of 5 years beyond the local plan period (which ends in 2032). The scope and potential for an East Coast Main Line connected rail station serving DSA are starting to gain momentum with initial estimates being that the scheme would cost £280m and could be operational as early as 2024, but is not yet funded.</p> <p>This alone would significantly increase the economic potential of the airport itself as well as providing direct sustainable travel choice to current and future residents in the vicinity of DSA, and wider region. Given sufficient housing supply has been identified to meet the settlement strategy for the plan period, including for Auckley & Hayfield-Green, the local plan is proposing that there are unique circumstances that warrant support for some of the potential housing identified in the masterplan, but that this can only be justified in tandem with delivery of significant jobs as set out in the masterplan.</p> <p>In order to do this, the council are proposing an additional and conditional allocation of up to a maximum of 1,200 houses on land at the airport. The release of housing will be strictly related to the clearly demonstrated delivery of jobs at the airport, based on draft local plan Policy 7 – Doncaster Sheffield Airport.</p>
--	---

Table 2. Other Consultation Comments	
Comment	Response
<p>Green Belt and Countryside Policy Area</p> <p>Responses including from Barton Willmore; CPRE; Hampole and Skelbroke PC; House Builders Federation; Marr PC; Nathaniel Lichfield; Oxails Planning; Persimmon Homes; Spawforths.</p> <p>Developer/ landowning interests are supportive of the Review and generally of its methodology (and the need for Green Belt boundary amendments and safeguarded land) but reserve final judgement until the sites-based work is done.</p> <p>The Rural Parishes (and some individual PCs such as Marr and Hampole and Skelbroke) and CPRE argue that there is no justification for a Green Belt review.</p>	<p>It is understandable that a Green Belt Review will attract a great deal of concern but the support received for the Review and its methodology is welcomed. The Review addresses directly the issue of whether there is any case for an extension to the Green Belt and rejects it. The criticisms of the Countryside Policy Area approach, particularly given the findings of the Green Belt Review about the past success of the CPA policies, is noted and a revised policy approach will be investigated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>NPPF policy refers to allowing development under very special circumstances in the Green Belt, not taking any land that is brownfield out of the Green Belt.</p>

<p>Should reflect NPPF policy which recognise circumstances for taking Brownfield land out of Green Belt.</p> <p>The CPRE is still pushing for an extension of the Green Belt eastwards; one agent agrees with the Review conclusion that this would not be justified but no one else has raised this issue.</p> <p>There is a criticism of the retention of Countryside Policy Area as a blanket restriction and a suggestion that limited strategic gaps could instead be identified</p>	
<p>Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>Responses including from CPRE; David Lock Associates; Persimmon Homes; Rollinson Planning.</p> <p>There is support for the idea of Local Plan preparation working alongside Neighbourhood Plans so that the two are mutually supportive. There is general support for adopting the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan figure but one call for the Local Plan to also allocate the Neighbourhood Plan sites and another for Plan to be flexible in case of non-adoption.</p>	<p>Support for working alongside neighbourhood plans is welcomed. There is no need for the Local Plan to duplicate the content of neighbourhood plans; to do so would not be in accordance with national guidance and could be seen as undermining the status of neighbourhood plans.</p>
<p>Town and Parish Council Responses:</p> <p>Thorne MoorendsTown Council stresses the wider sustainability benefits of allowing housing growth here and presses for an allocation that addresses economic growth and not just local needs provision which would threaten the economic prospects and vitality of Thorne and Moorends. A balanced approach is needed which tackles flood issues without acting as a bar on development.</p> <p>Askern Town Council are content with their target on the understanding this will mean no new allocations over and above existing permissions.</p> <p>Tickhill Town Council support the principle of meeting local housing needs but object to their housing requirement of 165 which they see as unjustified and lacking definition (what does “local” mean and will affordable homes form a significant element?) and is opposed to amendment to Green Belt boundaries. There is also the issue of the capacity of the town’s infrastructure (including the 4 main roads through Tickhill and the schools) to cope with any significant expansion.</p>	<p>Thorne TC’s point about flood risk is addressed above in Table 1.</p> <p>Some of the JRP (and individual PCs) criticism stems from not being able to see the housing distribution in the wider context – this is understandable and is addressed below. Their concern about the economic aspirations being unrealistic is not shared however.</p> <p>The housing requirement is properly assessed (see above) and to rule out the accommodation of any of this within the Green Belt would not be compatible with demonstrating a sustainable plan. A Green Belt Review is therefore essential to help support decisions about allocations. The results of the Review will be used alongside the sustainability appraisal of sites to inform decisions about the Green Belt but changes to the boundaries of Defined Villages are not expected unless there are small indefensible boundary anomalies that need to be addressed.</p> <p>The principle that sustainable settlements like Tickhill should at least meet their own existing population’s projected housing needs over the plan period is an important one; no economic growth-led housing is proposed for Tickhill. Concern about loss of Green</p>

Bawtry TC considers the proposal for 105 new homes is reasonable but is concerned that this may mean the need to use Green Belt or flood risk sites. The Motor Auctions site is appropriate for a mixed housing retail scheme but with additional visitor parking. Transport (congestion) and other infrastructure issues associated with major development in the vicinity (Harworth-Bircoates, 'Great Yorkshire Way' linked developments at Rossington, the Airport and Rossington Hall) need to be addressed. The town should not be allowed to merge with Harworth-Bircoates. DMBC should work with Bassetlaw to address the impact of Harworth's expansion on Bawtry's resources and services.

Auckley PC support concentrating most new housing in the Main Urban Area and Main Towns where there are brownfield sites, more services and better transport links. Development in rural villages should be accompanied by a radical improvement in the road infrastructure and the provision of services such as schools, surgeries and retail outlets. Auckley has seen a significant increase in house building plus the establishment of the airport with enormous increases in traffic through the village but without improvements to roads, school pedestrian crossings, etc.

Sprotbrough and Cusworth PC (and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) supports a settlement hierarchy, appreciates that even some villages will need development and that there are significant environmental constraints, especially flood risk and local ecology, as well as heritage assets that will need to be conserved. Some small scale alterations to the Green Belt may be necessary. A specific site is favoured to accommodate the requirement.

The Joint Rural Parishes (JRP) are unhappy with the scale of the proposed housing, the lack of justification for it, and for the Green Belt review and think the economic growth planned for is unrealistic. Disagree with building on the green belt or reclassifying it as "safeguarded". The scale of new housing is predicated on the assumption that 20,000 new jobs will be created but no assessment of demand for housing has been undertaken. No assessment of the needs of the elderly, vulnerable or disabled populations or for social housing has been undertaken. Support limiting development in Defined Villages to proportionate and sympathetic infill, object to any removal or reduction in the protection offered by conservation status, Green Belt or countryside policy area and to Gypsy and Traveller sites in countryside locations. Support upgrades of the A1(M) and M18 provided it does not adversely affect the Green Belt or rural villages. Oppose the A1 development corridor and believe there is no evidenced requirement for a A1-A19 link. Strongly support a bypass on the A635 (Barnsley Rd). Strongly support the improvement of bus and rail connectivity across the borough.

Marr PC raises similar points to the JRP; there is no justification for a Green Belt Review; Green Belt should only be used as a last resort once all other options (including sites in flood risk areas) have been exhausted; safeguarded land is

Belt is understandable but the proposed scale is modest.

The support for quality infill in Defined Villages is welcomed.

The affordable housing element of the overall housing requirement has been assessed and is set out in the Housing Needs Assessment

The draft Local Plan will address the full range of planning issues including the need for transport and other infrastructure and service improvements

unjustified. Strongly support Defined Villages and sympathetic infill. Priority should be given to brownfield sites and reusing empty properties. There is no need for any additional employment land. Strongly object to the rural exceptions proposal; any need for affordable housing would be best met in urban areas. Support the 10% greenspaces requirement. Service provision must be properly planned for. Support the renewable energy aim but object to wind turbines, fracking and solar panel farms that scar the Green Belt; opportunities on buildings should be used. Doncaster Town centre needs to be made more attractive with the development of a café culture and a student quarter. A solution to flood risk must be found to enable use of brownfield land in flood risk areas. Raise similar points to JRP regarding the A1(M) and A1-A19 link. Supports upgrades to Westmoor link and M18 and a bypass on the A635 which should be prioritised in the local plan. The preferred option is essentially a dispersal rather than hybrid option to satisfy developers and landowners and a better balance with the wider interests of the borough and its residents is needed.

High Melton PC makes similar points to the JRP about the lack of justification for the scale of the proposed housing: no accurate assessment of current housing stock, property market performance, or the reality of current and future demand for housing. Doncaster already has a depressed housing market. Sympathetic infill only is acceptable. The plan does not seem to have recognised the increasing need for additional social housing.

Clayton with Frickley PC supports sympathetic infill in rural villages proportionate to the size of the village; this and a brownfield-led approach should take priority rather than where developers wish to build and current Green Belt restrictions should remain

Barnburgh and Harlington PC supports the distribution of housing across the borough and the proposed 60 houses but strongly believe that this should be achieved without any incursion into Green Belt

Hampole and Skelbroke Parish Meeting supports quality infill for Defined Villages but argues that the proposed housing growth is huge with little justification and no recognition of the potential from empty properties. It is essential that a review of services is undertaken in the context of the proposed increase in population and Green Belt should not be used in preference to land in the east of the borough or brownfield land. Concerned about proposals for safeguarded land and the lack of transparency as to how the Green Belt Review results are to be used. Any development within the proximity to the A1 should be put on hold until Highways England has assessed where the expansion of the A1 is to be located.

Brodsworth PC is sympathetic to infill development but restates its vehement opposition to development of Broadaxe Field. Also endorse Joint Rural Parishes response.

<p>Edenthorpe PC Concerns regarding housing developments planned on surrounding area and impact on countryside, infrastructure, schools, doctors and other services. Impact on large housing sites in Armthorpe and knock-on effect to Edenthorpe services.</p>	
<p>Sites</p> <p>Although this was not a sites-based consultation there were many responses promoting particular sites and agents have reserved some comments on the approach until they see what sites are generated; how bold the plan is with green belt removals, how much reliance is placed on sites with existing permissions, etc.</p>	<p>Submitted comments and evidence pertaining to sites have been noted.</p>
<p>Scope of the consultation, evidence</p> <p>There was some criticism (e.g. by the Rural Parishes and by Peel Land and Property Ltd) that the scope of the consultation was too limited and that the settlement and housing distribution is insufficiently backed by evidence and by consideration of economic growth factors, infrastructure and service capacity, etc.</p>	<p>This is accepted to some extent (although various evidence documents are published). The decision to consult early on this part of the plan was primarily to give local communities (and particularly those preparing or contemplating neighbourhood plans) an important early strategic planning context for their work. The Local Plan and its evidence base will of course address the full range of issues that the JRP and others refer to.</p>