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Schedule of Suggested Changes to the Local Plan Publication Version (June 2019)

This table sets out a number of suggested changes to the Publication (Regulation 19 – June 2019) version of the Doncaster Local Plan. It is intended to assist the Inspector in understanding the Council’s position. The suggested changes are considered as being a material change to the policy, for example rewording policies to change their meaning or application, including revisions to the supporting text. Any changes, if agreed by the Inspector, will be subject to public consultation after the Examination Hearings and before the adoption of the Local Plan through the Main Modifications process. This is in line with the guidance as set out below.

The Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 054 Reference ID: 61-054-20190315 Revision date: 15 03 2019) includes a section on what a local planning authority can do if they wish to make changes to the Publication version of the plan before it is submitted for its Examination. It confirms that the Local Planning Authority can include any changes in an addendum to the plan. Where the local planning authority intend the changes to be treated as part of the submitted plan, the addendum, together with any necessary sustainability appraisal of it, should be subject to further consultation (equivalent to the consultation on the publication version) before submission. Where such consultation has not taken place, their proposed changes will be considered by the Inspector during the examination process, but will not be treated as part of the submitted plan.

The PINS procedure Guide for Local Plan Examinations (June 2019 5th Edition) also reiterates this para 1.5 stating “LPAs sometimes submit to the examination a list of proposed changes to the published plan that have not been the subject of consultation. The Inspector will not treat those proposed changes as part of the plan to be examined. However, the Inspector may consider it appropriate for some or all of the LPA’s proposed changes to be discussed at the hearing sessions, and in appropriate circumstances they may form the basis for MMAs.”

The table identifies any new/additional text in red, with deleted text being shown as struck through. The table should be read in conjunction with the Local Plan (Regulation 19 – Publication June 2019) and are set out in document order. These proposed changes have been screened and, where applicable, the changes have been identified as significant in terms of the need to review the Sustainability Appraisal of the policy, this has been undertaken through the Addendum to the Sustainability Report. The Addendum has been published at Submission stage (See Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK – Doncaster Local Plan – Sustainability Appraisal - Submission Addendum) and provides the Inspector, as well as other participants to the Examination, an upfront understanding of the likely effects should such changes be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Section/ Policy Number/Ref</th>
<th>Para Ref</th>
<th>Amendment required</th>
<th>Reason for amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 – Meeting the Need for New Homes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Policy 10 – Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)</td>
<td>Policy 10 – Part D</td>
<td>The existing dwelling or building is capable of conversion without causing harm to the area or the amenity of nearby residents particularly with noises or disturbances or over looking, and in areas of flood risk or not result in grounded or basement level self-contained rooms, and</td>
<td>Responds to objection raised by Environment Agency to Reg 19 Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Policy 10 – Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) – explanatory text</td>
<td>Para 6.16</td>
<td>This can be best achieved through preventing the over concentration of such properties in particular areas and encouraging a more even distribution across the Borough. Proposals that lead to self-contained rooms at ground floor or basement level in areas at risk of flooding are unlikely to be supported as such accommodation must be able to provide satisfactory mitigation against residual flood risk and there are likely to be challenges around providing a safe point of refuge.</td>
<td>Responds to objection raised by Environment Agency to Reg 19 Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Transport, Access &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Policy 17 – Cycling in Doncaster</td>
<td>Policy 17 – Part C1</td>
<td>Provide appropriate cycle access and sufficient secure cycle parking facilities in accordance with the latest national standards, and for new developments; provide changing and showering facilities; and</td>
<td>Responds to objection raised by CPRE to Reg 19 Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Policy 27 – Green Infrastructure (strategic policy)</td>
<td>Policy 27 – Part A</td>
<td>First sentence. All Major development proposals of 1 hectare or more will be required to provide a GI masterplan demonstrating how the development will clarify that all major residential and non-residential development proposals should contribute to GI</td>
<td>Clarify policy position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Policy 28 – Protecting Open Space &amp; Non Designated Open Space</td>
<td>Policy 28 – Part B</td>
<td>Criteria B – new part 6</td>
<td>6. The space does not contribute to the character of a Conservation Area or the setting of a designated heritage asset.</td>
<td>Representation from Historic England – Many of the Borough’s Conservation Areas are open spaces which are expected to make an important contribution to their character. The loss of these areas therefore would result in harm to their historic character and should be reflected in the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Policy 29 – Open Space Provision in New Developments – explanatory text</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>The policy indicates that proposals must address open space needs and deficiencies with developments of 20 family dwellings or more, providing either 10 or 15% of the red line boundary as open space per family dwelling.</td>
<td>Clarify policy position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>4th sentence. On larger applications where open space provision will equate to 0.4 hectares or more the amount of open space to be provided should be considered to be less than a minimum of 23% of the open space standard as calculated in the open space standard calculation. Children’s play in the first instance with the remaining time for recreation on open space, sports fields, woodlands, nature conservation areas, allotments, or green infrastructure corridors, depending on the type of identified need in the area.</td>
<td>Representation from DLP to help clarify policy position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.22 last line</td>
<td>Where three or more open space deficiency types are identified in the audit, 15% onsite open space must be provided, otherwise the requirement will equate to 10% of the calculated amount.</td>
<td>Clarify policy position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>As with the on site open space requirements, where three or more open space deficiency types are identified in the green space audit, 15% commuted sum will be required, otherwise the requirement will equate to 10% of the value of the red line boundary of the site (with the planning permission).</td>
<td>Add additional sentence at the end of paragraph 10.25 to clarify the amount of commuted sum required. (Identified through soundness self-assessment check list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Policy 31 – Vauling Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</td>
<td>Part C</td>
<td>Proposals that may either directly or indirectly negatively impact Sites of Special Scientific Interest will not normally be supported. Proposals should seek to protect and enhance Sites of Special Scientific interest (SSSI’s) and maintain, strengthen, and bridge gaps to link them to the wider ecological network wherever possible.</td>
<td>Representation from CPRE – changed to reiterate the importance of the ecological network with respect to SSSI’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>The use of the mitigation hierarchy will ensure that the most valuable ecological features of a site are protected and harm to biodiversity is minimised. In this with best practice. The provision of compensation to account for residual biodiversity impacts will not be allowed unless the prior steps of the mitigation hierarchy have been followed, and all opportunities to avoid and then minimise negative impacts have first been pursued. Impacts on irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and lowland raised mire will not be supported and cannot be accounted through a Net Gain approach. Using the latest DEFFRA biodiversity metric is an effective way of accounting for the impacts of a proposal on biodiversity and demonstrating that a net gain will be delivered. It also provides flexibility and encourages projects to consider biodiversity from the outset. Use of the metric rewards schemes that minimise their impacts but also gives options to developers in terms of whether necessary mitigation is delivered on or off site. A minimum 10% net gain will be expected unless national standards increase this in the future. In order to properly inform applications, surveys will be required in line with the latest British Standards (BS442020 or its replacement). It is expected that compensation will be directed towards projects that contribute to Doncaster’s Nature Recovery Network and other biodiversity and landscape scale conservation priorities. Proposals can sometimes affect land surrounding, or neighbouring, local sites as well as impacting them directly.</td>
<td>Representation from Natural England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Policy 34 – Landscape</td>
<td>Paragraph before Criterion F</td>
<td>Where development proposals will most likely result in a significant impact on the Borough’s landscape the proposals should assess the potential impact (including cumulative impact) and propose how any negative effects will be minimised. In doing so consideration should be given to:</td>
<td>Respond to suggestion made by CPRE to Reg 19 Publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2018 LAA identifies the limestone apportionment for Doncaster is healthy with a 51.7 Mt reserve and a
acCORDANCE with the figures in Table 10 and xx. **

Doncaster's Local Provision for the plan period is based on ten year average sales (as required by national
planning policy) and refer to the contaminated land pages on GOV.UK for more information.

Policy 66 – Contamination & Unstable Land – explanatory text

National planning policy states that any potentially contaminated or unstable land being assessed for
development through the planning process should be dealt with at this stage ensuring that it poses no
unacceptable risk to future occupiers of the water environment. Adequate site investigation information,
prepared by a competent person, is required to consider the requirements of Policy 56. Should any
proposed site, currently or previously, have been subject to land use(s) which have the potential to have
cauSed contamination of the underlying soils and groundwater then any planning application must be
supported by a Preliminary Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the risks posed to ‘controlled waters’ by
any contamination are understood by the applicant and can be safely managed. It is recommended that
developers consider using the National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management which
involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed
and refer to the contaminated land pages on GOV.UK for more information.

Policy 62 – Providing for & Safeguarding Mineral Resources – Table 10

Table 10 identifies the mineral requirements Doncaster can supply during the Local Plan period using the
2018 LAA (and 2017 data). The table below shows a reserve of 5.6Mt (all 2017), plus additional sand and
gravel provision from Local Plan allocations (see table below for further details). Further to changes in
Table 10 above additional wording is required in the explanatory text. To address issue
discussed on page 41 of the consultation document.

Policy 62 – Providing for & Safeguarding Mineral Resources – additional table explanatory notes

Notes for Table 10

Notes:
1. The reserve at 2017 is taken from the 2018 LAA, which reports on minerals monitoring for the year
2017.
2. The landbank of permissions at 2017 is taken from the 2018 LAA.
3. The Local Provision for the plan period is based on ten year average sales (as required by national
planning policy and identified in the 2018 LAA) multiplied the remaining life of the plan (in this case 18
years).
4. The ‘remaining provision’ is the estimated reserve (what we have now) minus the apportionment for the
plan period (what Doncaster can supply).
5. Note - figures are also given based on three year annual sales for comparison (required for
consideration by national policy to gauge short term fluctuations,
6. Mt = Million tonnes.
7. Not achievable. Landbank will deplete in 11.2 years, without new proposals

Further to changes in Table 10 additional wording is required in the explanatory text. To address issue
discussed on page 41 of the consultation document.

Policy 62 – Providing for & Safeguarding Mineral Resources – additional table explanatory notes

14.46 Figures from the 2018 LAA (see Table 10 above) indicates that the Council may not be able maintain a
supply of sand and gravel to meet our provision up to the end of the plan period. **
BASED on ten year average extraction levels (of 0.31Mt), the reserve of 5.6Mt and the landbank of permissions equals to
consider now 18 years in 2017. Should extraction levels continue at three year average sales (of 0.5Mt), the
5.6Mt reserve will last 11.2 years. Two allocations in the Local Plan (see table 10) will provide for an
additional 1.9Mt of sand and gravel during the plan period. The allocations will provide an additional six
years of supply, based on ten year average sales or 3.8 years supply based on three year average sales.
Doncaster’s Local Provision to 2018 Local Plan (see table 10) will provide for an
additional 1.9Mt of sand and gravel during the plan period. The allocations will provide an additional six
years of supply, based on ten year average sales or 3.8 years supply based on three year average sales.

The text explains and clarifies the changes to table 10 and additional table.

Further to changes in Table 10 minor amendments are required to the notes supporting the table.

Policy 62 – Providing for & Safeguarding Mineral Resources – Table 10

Para. 14.45 This table identifies the mineral requirements Doncaster can supply during the Local Plan period using the
2018 LAA (and 2017 data). The table below shows a reserve of 5.6Mt (all 2017), plus additional sand and
gavel provision from Local Plan allocations (see table below in this document).

Further to changes in Table 10 additional wording is required in the explanatory text. To address issue
discussed on page 41 of the consultation document.

Policy 62 – Providing for & Safeguarding Mineral Resources – Table 10

Para. 14.45 This table identifies the mineral requirements Doncaster can supply during the Local Plan period using the
2018 LAA (and 2017 data). The table below shows a reserve of 5.6Mt (all 2017), plus additional sand and
gavel provision from Local Plan allocations (see table below in this document).

Further to changes in Table 10 additional wording is required in the explanatory text. To address issue
discussed on page 41 of the consultation document.
Appendix 1 – Glossary

251 Policy 65 Glossary text

Conventional Hydrocarbons. Reservoir. Delete the previous definition and replace with... A reservoir in which buoyant forces keep hydrocarbons in place below a sealing caprock. Reservoir and fluid characteristics of conventional reservoirs typically permit oil or natural gas to flow readily into wellsbores. The term is used to make a distinction from shale and other unconventional reservoirs, in which gas might be distributed throughout the reservoir at the scale, and in which buoyant forces or the influence of a water column on the location of hydrocarbons within the reservoir are not significant. (Sourced from the Schlumberger Oilfield Glossary: https://www.glossary.oilfield.slb.com/)

Amend reference in response to UKOOG / Igas / Ineos comment

252 Policy 65 Glossary text

Unconventional Hydrocarbons. Resource. Delete the previous definition and replace with... An umbrella term for oil and gas resources that is produced by means that do not meet the criteria for conventional production. Which has qualified as unconventional at any particular time is a complex function of resource characteristics, the available exploration and production technologies, the economic environment, and the scale, frequency and duration of production from the resource. Perceptions of these factors inevitably change over time and often differ among users of the term. At present, the term is used in reference to oil and gas resources whose porosity, permeability, fluid trapping mechanism, or other characteristics differ from conventional sandstone and carbonate reservoirs. Coiled methane, gas hydrates, shale gas, fractured reservoirs, and tight gas sands are considered unconventional resources. (Sourced from the Schlumberger Oilfield Glossary: https://www.glossary.oilfield.slb.com/)

Amend reference in response to UKOOG / Igas comment

Appendix 2 – Development Requirements

266 Site 133 – St Nicholas Rd, Thorne Conservation & Heritage Requirements

Conservation & Heritage

The site makes an important contribution to the conservation area and the setting of Thorne House (key unlisted building). The contribution of the site to the significance of these heritage assets will need to be assessed in a heritage statement where it should also be demonstrated that 24 units would not result in harm to this significance. Potential tree planting and landscaping should...

Representation from Historic England - The Grade II Listed Headstocks. Headstocks are the defining feature of this area and their future conservation together with how any future development relates to them are matters which all development in the area needs to consider. Policy 70 therefore needs to set out a framework to secure their future and how they will be incorporated into development proposals to maximise their potential. Table 247 and amendment to Policies Map...

Appendix 3 – Proposals

181 Policy 67 – Developer Contributions (Strategic Policy)

Part A4

New Part A4 as follows. 4. pooled contributions for schemes necessitated as a result of the cumulative impact of a number of developments.

Representation from Highways England to reinstate akin to previous wording of the policy and now that limitations on pooling have been lifted.

212 Policy 70 – Unity Regeneration Project

Part D & new criteria G

Part D Criteria 4 & new Part G

4. other uses, including leisure, which will be supported where they lead to the long term conservation of the Grade II Listed headstocks.

G) Development of the site should help to secure the long term conservation of the Grade II Listed headstocks. Detailed Masterplanning should seek to maximise the potential of the headstocks as a focal point for the development and place-shaping.

Representation from Historic England - The Grade II Listed Headstocks. Headstocks are the defining feature of this area and their future conservation together with how any future development relates to them are matters which all development in the area needs to consider. Policy 70 therefore needs to set out a framework to secure their future and how they will be incorporated into development proposals to maximise the potential of the headstocks as a focal point for the development and place-shaping.

Appendix 4 – Map


— landbank. The additional mineral allocations (preferred areas) listed in Table 12 are Doncaster’s best options for increasing controlling towards the landbank of permissions during the plan period. The ‘preferred areas’ will potentially provide 1.5Mt of sand and gravel increasing the landbank by 6 years based on ten year average extraction rates of 0.33Mt or 3.8 years based on the three year average extraction rate of 0.5Mt.

Additional text identifies quantity of additional sand and gravel to contribute toward landbank of permissions. To address issue identified by East Riding of Yorkshire Council (rep number 0009)

225 Main Town – Rossington – Table H2(g) - Housing Allocations without planning permission (as at April 2018)

Table H2(g)

Rossington Colliery Housing Allocation (Site Ref: 247) – amendment to the boundary of the site to align with the Outline permission site (Ref:662) due to the permission boundary being incorrectly mapped as part of the Development Management process. Consequential changes to the site area and capacity as necessary, including revised site plan for Appendix 2 – developer requirements pg.275 and amendment to Policies Map...

Representation from landowner (Harworth Group) identifies correction required to southern boundary of the permitted site and therefore the remaining site area/capacity has been understated.

Policies Map

Hooton Pagnell

Green Belt boundary for the Defined Village of Hooton Pagnell does not reflect the existing Green Belt boundary as defined on the UDP. This is a misinterpretation rather than an intended change. Correct UDP version...

Correction to reflect current statutory development plan/ existing Green Belt boundary.
Incorrect Local Plan interpretation...
**Table 10: Locally Sourced Mineral Provision for the Plan Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral</th>
<th>Reserve at 2017 (Mt)</th>
<th>Landbank of permissions at 2017 (years)</th>
<th>Local Provision 18 year remaining plan period (Mt)</th>
<th>Remaining provision at 2035 (Mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated sand and gravel (based on 10 year average)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.31Mt x 18 year plan period</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated sand and gravel (based on 3 year average sales)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.5Mt x 18 year plan period</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone (crushed rock) (based on 10 year average)</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1.7Mt x 18 year plan period</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone (crushed rock) (based on 3 year average)</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>2.3Mt x 18 year plan period</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The reserve at 2017 is taken from the 2018 LAA, which reports on minerals monitoring for the year 2017.
2. The landbank of permissions at 2017 is taken from the 2018 LAA.
3. The Local Provision for the plan period is based on ten year average sales (as required by national planning policy and identified in the 2018 LAA) multiplied the remaining life of the plan (in this case 18 years).
4. The remaining provision is the estimated reserve (what we have now) minus the apportionment for the plan period (what Doncaster can supply).
5. Note - figures are also given based on three year annual sales for comparison (required for consideration by national policy to gauge short term fluctuations).
6. Mt = Million tonnes.

**Locally Sourced Mineral Provision for the Plan Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral</th>
<th>Reserve at 2017 (Mt)</th>
<th>Average sales at 16 years (for information only) (Mt)</th>
<th>Landbank of permissions at 2017 (years)</th>
<th>Local Provision Plan period (Mt) (Plan period 2015 to 2035)</th>
<th>Additional provision (Local Plan proposals) (Mt)</th>
<th>Additional years on landbank (P=50C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated sand and gravel</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated crushed sand and gravel*</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>11.2*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone (crushed rock)</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone (crushed rock)*</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
<td>22.9*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For information only (as required by the NPF)

**Additional to clarify average annual provision during the plan period**

Add Table 10

**Doncaster Local Provision**

Sand and gravel local provision = 5.6Mt x 1.9Mt/7.5Mt/10 = 0.42Mt per annum
Crushed rock local provision = 2Mt per annum (based on historic extraction figures)