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INSPECTOR’S NOTE NO. 9:
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS FOR MATTERS 4 TO 7

Introduction

I have read all of the written statements for matters 4 to 7 which are due to be considered at the second week of hearing sessions. In order to inform the discussion at those sessions, the Council is requested to submit a brief written response to the following supplementary questions to the Programme Officer by **midday on Thursday 1 October 2020.**

**M4. Green Belt**

*Accommodating development in non Green Belt locations: windfalls*

SQ4.1. If 200 windfalls per year could be assumed to contribute towards supply during the Plan period, how many of those would be likely to be in the main urban area and each of the other six settlements where the Plan proposes to remove land from the Green Belt to allow housing development? Please express the estimate for each settlement as a total number of dwellings for the period 2018 to 2035.

*Compensatory improvements to remaining Green Belt*

SQ4.7. Could the provision of landscaping, open space and public rights of way on any of the housing allocations removed from the Green Belt be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land?

*Exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt: Rossington country park*

SQ4.9. Why is it necessary to include the proposed country park at Rossington in the Green Belt? Has its role in performing Green Belt purposes been assessed? Would its future role as a country park not be adequately safeguarded if it were designated as open space as is the case with Holme Carr Wood immediately to the east?

**M5. Housing supply**

*Reserve housing sites*

SQ5.3. Paragraph 4.82 refers to capacity on “reserve” sites for 1,438 dwellings, but goes on to make clear that they are not currently developable due to flood risk or the HS2 safeguarding route. They cannot therefore reasonably be regarded as reserve sites in the
sense that they could be released if monitoring indicated a shortage of supply. So, would they not be better described as “potential development sites” or similar?

**Five year housing land supply**

SQ5Q.7. Your statement seems to indicate that the 3,685 dwellings on sites with planning permission in categories A and B on 1 April 2019 also includes sites with outline planning permission for 10 or more dwellings. But category C includes 1,183 dwellings on sites with outline planning permission for 10 or more dwellings. Please clarify.

SQ5.9. NPPF 73 requires a supply of specific deliverable sites to be identified each year sufficient to provide a minimum of five years’ plus an appropriate buffer. What is the justification for including a windfall allowance in the five year supply, as by their very nature they are not specific sites?

**M6. Housing development requirements**

**Affordable housing**

SQ6.4. Your statement seems to indicate that the identified need for affordable homes will be met by the requirements of policy 8 part B along with other sources of supply, including the Council’s own programmes. If the requirement for affordable housing provision on sites in lower value areas was reduced to a level that would indicate that some or all types of site would be viable, how would that affect the aim of meeting the need for affordable homes?

SQ6.5. NPPF 64 requires 10% of dwellings on major sites to be available for affordable home ownership. The tenure split proposed in paragraph 6.9 of the Plan would not seem to achieve that. For example, in higher value areas a development of 100 dwellings would need to provide 23 affordable homes, of which only 6 would be for affordable home ownership (ie 6%). Is this departure from national policy justified?

**Housing for older people and people with disabilities**

SQ6.9. The viability assessment included additional costs to meet the requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings [M4(2)] and wheelchair adaptable dwellings [M4(3)]. Please respond to the claim that these costs are understated as they assume an increase of 6% since 2014 (based on the retail price index) whereas BCIS shows costs increased by 30% between 2014 and 2019.

**M7. Specific types of housing**

**Houses in multiple occupation**

SQ7.3. Your statement did not seem to respond to question SQ7.3 part (a) ie will policy 10 allow the housing needs of all members of the community to be met, including students, young professionals and individuals on low incomes?

**William Fieldhouse**
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