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I. **Introduction**

1.1. This is a Hearing Statement prepared by Spawforths on behalf of Metroland in respect of:

   **Matter 12: Transport and Access**

1.2. Metroland has significant land interests in the area and has made representations to earlier stages of the Local Plan process.

1.3. The Inspector’s Issues and Questions are included in **bold** for ease of reference. The following responses should be read in conjunction with Metroland comments upon the submission version of the Doncaster Local Plan, dated September 2019.

1.4. Metroland has also expressed a desire to attend and participate in Matter 12 of the Examination in Public.
2. **Matter 14 – Transport and Access**

Q12.1. Is the support for each of the eleven road improvements listed in policy 13 part A and Table 7 ("major road network enhancement priorities") and indicated on the Key Diagram ("transport proposals") and Figure 6 ("proposed infrastructure") justified and consistent with national policy? In particular:

a) Do these elements of the Plan serve a clear purpose, and is it evident how a decision maker should react to a proposal to deliver one of the schemes or, alternatively, react to a development proposal that could compromise the delivery of one of the schemes?

b) Are the schemes based on robust transport evidence in accordance with national policy and guidance?

c) Were reasonable alternatives to the schemes considered during the preparation of the Plan including through the sustainability appraisal?

d) Have the environmental impacts of the schemes been identified, assessed and taken into account?

e) Is there a reasonable prospect that each of the schemes will be delivered during the Plan period?

2.1. Metroland have no specific comments in relation to this issue.

Q12.2. Is it necessary to modify the Plan for it to set out requirements for any allocated sites to secure or contribute towards improvements to A1(M) or M18 junctions?
2.2. Metroland have no specific comments to make on this issue.

2.3. 

Q12.3. Is the support for each of the rail and bus improvements listed in policy 13 parts B and C justified and consistent with national policy? In particular:

a) Do these elements of the Plan serve a clear purpose, and is it evident how a decision maker should react to a proposal to deliver one of the improvements or, alternatively, react to a development proposal that could compromise the delivery of one?

b) Are the improvements based on robust transport evidence in accordance with national policy and guidance? c) Are the improvements needed to facilitate development proposed in the Plan?

d) Have the environmental impacts of the improvements been identified, assessed and taken into account?

) Is there a reasonable prospect that each of the improvements will be delivered during the Plan period?

2.4. Metroland have no specific comments on this issue.

Q12.4. Is the approach to freight transport and lorry parking set out in policies 13 part D and 16 justified and consistent with national policy, and will it be effective in improving the efficiency of transport and encouraging alternatives to the use of roads?

2.5. Metroland have no specific comment in relation to this issue.
Q12.5. Are the requirements of policy 14 justified and consistent with national policy and guidance? In particular:

a) The parking standards for cars, disabled motorists, electric vehicles and motorcycles for different types of development in appendix 6.

b) The thresholds for transport statements, transport assessments, and travel plans in appendix 7.

2.6. Metroland has no specific comment in relation to this issue.

Q12.6. Are policies 17 to 21, and the cycle parking standards in appendix 6, justified and will they be effective in providing high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities? In particular:

a) Is the Council’s suggested change to policy 17 part C.3 necessary to make the Plan sound, and is it justified?

b) Is the requirement in policy 19 part D for unrecorded public paths that cross development sites to be treated in the same way as definitive rights of way justified?

c) Are the specific requirements in policy 20 parts B and C relating to the access, design and layout of public rights of way on development sites justified?

Part A

2.7. Metroland has no specific comment in relation to this issue.

2.8. Part B and C

2.9. Metroland considers that Part D of the policy which states that unrecorded routes or desire lines that cross development sites will be treated in the same way as definitive public rights of way is onerous and restrictive and could hinder the delivery of schemes, particularly when
combined with the requirements established in policy 20, and in its present form it is not justified.

2.10. The requirements in policy 2 that Public rights of way avoid estate roads, and where the path is enclosed to be of 3-5 meters is over engineered and beyond what is required in most circumstances. There is no justification for the distances within the explanatory text. These requirements are not justified and are not considered sound in their present form.

2.11. Metroland are concerned that the effect of such a restrictive approach coupled with other Plan requirements could have implications for site capacity and their delivery.

**Proposed Change**

2.12. To overcome the objection and address soundness matters, the following changes are proposed:

- Review the requirements in policy 19 and either increase its flexibility, combined with more flexibility in Policy 20, or remove part D.
- Amend the requirements in Policy 20 part C and D to provide greater flexibility.