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Doncaster Local Plan: Vision, Aims and Objectives and Issues and Options

1. Introduction

This document provides a summary of the responses made to the Vision, Aims and Objectives and Issues and Options documents which were produced to inform the development of the new Local Plan. These were published for consultation from the 13th July to the 7th September 2015.

The purpose of the Local Plan is to guide how the borough physically develops over the next 15 years. It will establish a vision for Doncaster, and the strategy for delivering that vision. It will identify the overall amount of different types of development needed to sustain the borough and where that development should, and should not take place. It will also identify land that should be protected for its environmental or social use and encourage high quality design and a regard for our valued heritage and landscape.

The new Local Plan is at an early stage in its production. The Vision, Aims and Objectives sets down a vision for the future of the borough and the aims and objectives we think are necessary to achieve this. It provides a portrait of the borough now and summarises the issues and other plans and strategies that the Local Plan needs to take account of. The Issues and Options sets out the scope and purposes of the Local Plan and the process for producing it. It sets out some important choices that need to be made about where development should take place. It proposes three broad options for where to locate growth across the borough and so meet the vision, aims and objectives. At the same time we published the responses from the Call for Sites consultation (October-December 2014) which was to establish which sites landowners and developers wish to see considered for development.

The documents were produced to enable the early involvement of the community and other stakeholders in the process so that their views can be taken into account when considering the overall Local Plan strategy and the different sites for development.

2. Consultation Responses

We carried out full consultation from 13th July – 7th September 2015 (extended 8 weeks rather than the statutory 6 weeks period) and we continued to receive comments until 11th September.

The consultation was carried out online (via Survey Monkey) however many responses were also received either by e-mail or letter.

By the close of the consultation the Council had received a total of 274 responses received via Survey Monkey and 336 responses sent to us via letter/e-mail. Giving a
total of over 600 responses, these responses are substantial letters from statutory agencies, individuals/residents, developers/land owners, elected members, town and parish councils and other local authorities.

All responses received following public consultation have been collated and analysed. In due course all responses received will be made available in full. During this consultation stage, although we hadn’t consulted directly on the results of the Call for Sites but made the information public, some Town and Parish Councils and members of the public submitted comments, therefore 158 letters were specific to these sites rather than the consultation issues we were seeking views on. Although these letters have been filtered out, some of them have still been analysed and the other site specific ones will be used for the site assessment stage of the Local Plan.

The comments received are being used to inform the emerging proposed of the Local Plan. Presently the responses and comments are summarised in charts showing support or otherwise for the questions posed. The use of the online survey - Survey Monkey, enabled quantitative responses to be identified but also enabled other comments and thought to be submitted. These have been assessed but because of the variations in questions and types of responses apart from the charts they will appear slightly differently for each question and depend on the number of responses received. In most cases a summary is provided of the comments sent to us.

Therefore, the following analysis includes charts and graphs indicating how many responses were received to each question/section, a combined total of online and written responses and a summary of the responses.

The Council wishes to thank those who have contributed to the consultation and for the thought and responses provided.
Summer Consultation 2015 - Vision, Aims and Objectives
Question 1 (a): The overall vision of the Borough Strategy has been translated into a series of outcomes. These paint a picture of how Doncaster will grow and develop over the next 15 years. Do you agree with the outcomes we are seeking to achieve? Do they provide clear direction to the Doncaster Local Plan? Do they reflect the overall vision set out in the Borough Strategy?

General comments
- Generally positive comments on the scope and content of the vision – broad consensus on the broad outcomes especially from statutory agencies
- Vision is positive, forward-thinking, succinct and aspirational – the majority of responses believe it provides clear direction.
- Doncaster’s role in the wider context such as northern powerhouse is welcomed
- Lack of emphasis on the quality and distinctiveness of the environment
- Doncaster’s role as an economic hub along with its transport connections should be exploited.
- General recognition of the need to raise aspirations and perform better compared to national average
- Some respondents did not give a clear response.
- Vision is difficult to quantify - needs to be based on measurable outcomes.

Doncaster will be an important economic hub between the coastal ports and city regions such as Sheffield, Leeds and Manchester at a key gateway into the north of England.

- High proportion of positive responses.
- Need to develop viable economic clusters of excellence in the town centre and reuse brownfield sites
- Expansion of airport and rail networks critical to achieving this outcome.
- Doncaster is already a hub and needs to be clear on its future role so that it is more distinctive.
- Provide further clarity on the definition of a “hub” and Doncaster’s future role.
- Major investment is needed in local infrastructure and services

Doncaster will be performing well compared to other places in terms of its economy and quality of life, including health and recreation

- Doncaster should not be in competition with other places but develop alongside neighbouring economies in Sheffield city region
- Quite aspirational in nature – more of a vision than outcome.
- Measure of success falls way short of the aspiration (e.g. sports facilities do not seem to compare well with neighbouring areas).
- Education should be included within the list
- Relies on significant investment in education and other local services
- Some respondents did not directly answer the question - need to provide hard evidence / benchmarking.
- Concern about heavy congestion and traffic through villages and towns

Doncaster will be a more distinctive and attractive place with better facilities and links between towns, villages and places of interest, helping to boost civic pride.

- Outcome appears mainly concerned with securing better facilities and connectivity including places of interest as opposed to ensuring that the distinctiveness of the area and the elements which contribute to its character are maintained
- Better facilities and links are needed between towns and villages (e.g. Askern)
• Need to retain physical separation between settlements

**Doncaster will be a leading centre in logistics, rail engineering, aviation, energy and construction, centred around the motorways, airport and Doncaster town centre.**

• The developers of the inland port welcome the prominence given to logistics but the focus is unduly limited as it omits the benefits of town as a nodal point in the rail network.
• Focus should be on town centre and rail links rather than the motorway network and airport that will increase traffic
• Doncaster needs a university specialising in engineering, carbon and aviation etc

**Doncaster will be a centre of excellence at the forefront of efforts to combat climate change and reduce carbon emissions.**

• Some mixed comments – both positive and negative. Concern about traffic and pollution in the borough and growth will increase carbon emissions.
• Climate change will happen anyway and is costing us bullions of pounds in wasted investment
• Some respondents emphasised the need to protect green open spaces and make best use of existing buildings and spaces

**Doncaster will be known nationally for the quality of its tourist attractions and greenspaces, including its nature reserves and railway heritage.**

• Wakefield MBC stress the importance of ensuring that green infrastructure networks are linked across local authority boundaries such as wildlife habitat networks and strategic leisure corridors. Wakefield would support the continuation of these corridors into Doncaster.
• Need to do more to ‘green’ the borough – e.g. community forests
• Outcome should also refer to historic parks and gardens, markets, the racecourse and Roman and Georgian heritage (English Heritage).
• Nature reserves are not defined - this needs to be clarified.

**Question 1 (b): Is there anything you think we have missed which should be included? If 'Yes' please say what is missing.**

• Respondents from the development industry e.g. (HBF, DLP, Muse, IP Planning and JVH Planning) suggested that greater focus should be placed on addressing housing needs. Doncaster needs a range of new homes (including affordable homes) across all types and tenures to meet current and future needs of the population and help promote economic growth and investment. In doing so, it will help contribute to the vision of the borough. It is also important to ensure that communities have good access to housing and services.
• The vision does not adequately address the natural environment (Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England). Most conservation work now occurs on a landscape scale and outside of existing nature reserves.
• Outcomes need to focus on raising educational standards, training and skills etc
• Outcomes should more closely reflect the vision of the Borough Strategy (English Heritage) which seeks to create a high quality and distinctive built and natural environment
• Waystone sought the inclusion of a reference to DN7/Unity within the outcomes.
• Individual responses also sought the inclusion of the following.
  • Quality of life / place
- Links to Barnsley and Rotherham.
- Northern growth point around Adwick to help reduce the imbalance between north and south
- Overcoming deprivation
- Health and air quality
- Good access to a range of transport modes within Sheffield city region.
- The need to deliver new transformational projects.

- Town centre regeneration should be an overriding aim (e.g. Doncaster should become more family orientated and culturally vibrant, with a more diverse range of uses and activities).
- Outcomes are too economic driven. Greater coverage needs to be given to social and environmental issues such as
  - the protection of the rural landscape, green belt, villages, farmland and wildlife etc
  - cycling and walking
  - community cohesion
  - improving incomes/wages and expectations;
  - advancing justice and building a fairer Doncaster
- More emphasis should be put on improving communication/digital technology links especially within remote areas.

General comments
- Focus is too narrow and should cover a broader range of issues.
- Outcomes should refer to the borough of Doncaster rather than just Doncaster itself (the town).
- The plan should take a strategic approach to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment and aim for a net gain for biodiversity considering opportunities for enhancement and improving connectivity (Natural England).
- Some villages should be protected from development (e.g. High Melton)
- Some respondents highlighted the importance of specific schemes as economic drivers such as Doncaster Sheffield Airport, A635 (Marr and Hickleton), Unity/DN7 and Balby Carr Bank.
Question 2 (a): Do you agree with the proposed aims and objectives set out below? If not, what changes would you like to see? (b): Are they sufficiently distinctive and locally specific? Is there anything you think we have missed which should be included? If ‘Yes’ please say what is missing.

Aim 1: Jobs and growth: Support the conditions and opportunities for attracting high quality inward investment and jobs including green and high-tech industries and other innovative sectors that will help grow and diversify Doncaster’s economy and support its role as a sub-regional centre.

- A general consensus has emerged on the need to grow and diversify the economic base.
- Directing new development to emerging growth corridors …the wording of this suggests that new development and growth should be actively encouraged near motorway junctions which may not bring forward development in the most sustainable locations.
- Reference should be made under this aim to deliver the appropriate level and types of housing to attract and retain a diverse workforce and ensure the district meets its economic growth aspirations. It is vital that the district’s housing targets are aligned with its economic growth aspirations.
- The aim should seek to direct new development to the airport itself and its surrounding areas as well as to growth corridors around it.
- The main aim of securing and maintaining a steady and consistent supply of minerals. There must however be progress on mineral site allocations for future supply not only for the long term but also the short to medium term.

Aim 2: Regeneration and community pride: Support regeneration in all our communities to tackle deprivation and promote civic pride.

- Support given in favour of reusing brownfield land especially within existing urban areas provided there is a balanced approach to housing delivery and no prioritisation
- Reference should be made to measures that will serve to enhance community sustainability and in particular to tackle the most acute areas that suffer from the highest levels of deprivation.
- It is suggested adding a new objective to ensure regeneration is fully reflected in the objectives. It should refer to the upgrade and renewal of town centres, public transport facilities and the attractiveness and quality of development. The regeneration role of major developments via direct and indirect effects needs to be stated.
- Clarification is sought on the meaning of ‘well located’ and a suggestion made replacing with ‘sustainably located sites’.
- Support is given to the objective to ‘secure training and local employment provision’. It recommends that priority and support should be given to training in sectors where Doncaster has particular strengths, including high speed rail and aviation.
- Development will be required on a combination of sustainable greenfield and brownfield sites in line with paragraph 14 of the NPPF.
- The objective to re-use sites and buildings should lead to an improved environment through the remediation of sites which may have suffered from land contamination issues. This aim will need impacts of climate to be balanced against the need to mitigate against the change i.e. flood risk.
Aim 3: Quality of place: Make sure that our towns, suburbs, villages and countryside benefit from high quality development that reinforce distinctive and vibrant places and conserve the built and natural heritage.

- More emphasis should be made on the value of local landscapes and the enhancement of the natural environment, including consideration of the protection, management and enhancement of green infrastructure and ecological networks.
- Specific reference should be made here to paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that ‘development should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural settlements’.
- Reference should be made to ensuring all rural communities have the opportunity to enhance their sustainability ranking. Also that finding the optimum viable use for heritage assets will be important for conservation interests.
- Disappointing that there is no mention of ecosystem services or green infrastructure within the aims and objectives.
- Broad support of vibrancy of all of the boroughs settlements with the focus on those settlements having well established infrastructure.

Aim 4: Natural environment and countryside: Maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the countryside and the natural environment, including areas of landscape and biodiversity value.

- Broad support from developers and environmental bodies (e.g. Natural England, RSPB and Environment Agency) subject to minor suggested changes, as suggested below.
- Welcome the aim and the associated objectives but would like to see specific reference to the Humberhead Levels Nature Improvement Area (NIA) and Dearne Valley Green Heart NIA. In addition, we should aim for a net gain for biodiversity considering opportunities for enhancement and improving connectivity.
- Reference should be made here to supporting development that delivers a net ecological/arboricultural gain.
- The first objective needs to recognise that there will need to be some loss of Green Belt.
- There will be a need to build on both greenfield and Green Belt land to meet objectively assessed needs.
- Requires some qualification: minimising the loss of open countryside is not necessarily compatible with aim 3.
- The aim could also include specific reference to the need to improve ecological status of waterbodies providing a clear link to the council’s commitment to fulfilling the obligations of Water Framework Directive.

Aim 5: Energy and climate change: Support the transition to a low carbon borough in a way that reduces emissions and energy use, combats the impacts of climate change and exploits its natural resources, such as energy, water and minerals.

- The phase – “direct development away from areas at risk of flooding as far as possible” should read something like “as far as is reasonably practicable” or even “Direct inappropriate development away from flood risk areas.
- Welcome and support is given to the first part of the aim but the second part lacks clarity and is ambiguous. The exploitation of natural resources, such as energy, water and minerals needs to be carefully considered in the same context - not all exploitation of natural resources will be compatible with aim 5. The current wording requires amending to achieve clarity and consistency.
Aim 6: Transport and movement: Improve travel choice within the borough and to the wider city region and beyond to address congestion, improve journey times and improve access to services and jobs, especially by accessible public transport, cycling and walking links.

- Roads infrastructure in Doncaster which supports the logistics sector and many other businesses must be of high quality if growth is to be generated. The council should pursue roads improvement schemes and work with Highways England to ensure that upgrade schemes such as the A1 (M) and the M18 do progress so that the area becomes more accessible and better connected.
- The highways network needs more capacity to meet future demands arising from continued development along the A635 corridor (between Barnsley and Doncaster).
- The first objective should be amended to say that development will be encouraged where it is judged to be sustainable when tested against the NPPF. It should also recognise that transport accessibility is only one element of sustainability as set out in the framework.
- Reference should be made to making the best of the existing infrastructure highway and rail network and seeking enhancements (e.g. A1M to A19 link road) and ensuring new development and transformational growth capitalises upon such nodes.
- The third objective should refer to town centres in plural as this is not just a matter to be addressed in the context of Doncaster town.
- Support is given to this aim and recommends that recognition should be given to the importance of improving surface access to the airport, including by rail, bus and car.

Aim 7: Homes and communities: Increase the provision of new homes throughout the borough to meet future needs and create mixed and balanced communities, particularly in areas with access to existing services.

- Broad support and endorsement from statutory agencies and developers (HBF, Barton Wilmore, Arup, Johnson Brook, Spawforths, GVA and others)
- The smaller urban areas with 7 or more key services should be included to encourage a wider distribution of the benefits of growth rather than just being seen to be "Doncaster & large towns" centric.
- Directing most new homes to the main urban area of Doncaster and to the borough’s other large towns contradicts the overarching aim, which seeks to “increase the provision of new homes throughout the borough”. By restricting new housing to the main urban area and other large towns there are concerns that this would not ensure that growth occurs throughout the district.
- Meeting the housing needs of the area is a key element of the plan, which will not only provide social benefits but is required if the council is to meet its economic aspirations and therefore recommends reference be made to meeting the housing needs of current and future generations. Housing development also provides significant economic benefits.
- The aim should refer to meeting the full current and future needs of residents. The objectives supporting this should refer to directing development to sustainable locations. Reference should also be added to supporting developments that deliver affordable housing. It should be recognised that the delivery of affordable housing will be treated as a key benefit weighing in favour of a development.
- Location cannot be determined until the quantum of new homes required is known. Whilst Doncaster urban remains the largest settlement the distribution of growth is determined by many factors relating to the sustainability of locations and the availability of viable development sites.
- Aim 7 should cover a wider range of objectives. The objectives are narrow in their focus with emphasis being on the main urban area and large towns. Whilst it is appropriate and sustainable to direct housing development to the main urban areas,
the consultation documents acknowledge the rural nature of the borough and the many smaller rural settlements. These rural communities should be supported through appropriate levels of growth: the emphasis should be on making all communities “sustainable” as it is recognised that many rural areas have poor access to services and facilities.

- Clarification is sought on the role/meaning of the borough’s other large towns.
- The objective should be amended to read ‘the primary focus for new homes will be the main urban area’.
- New development should be directed to the main urban area and other large settlements.
- Reference should be made under this aim to deliver the appropriate level and types of housing to attract and retain a diverse workforce and ensure the district meets its economic growth aspirations. It is vital that the district’s housing targets are aligned with its economic growth aspirations.
- Reference should be made to new transformational projects and be specific to a Northern Growth Point at Adwick A1 (M) and potential link road corridor. It should also refer to the delivery of 20,000 new jobs.
- Development viability should be acknowledged within the wording of the aims and objectives. Many sites with planning permission remain unviable given market conditions.
- Aim 7 is unreasonable as it is asking people to support an increase in housing growth without any explicit information or guidance as to what the increase may involve.

Comments from health organisations and internal consultees have been received and although Health is covered under Aims 3 and 4 (see above) suggestions are that more emphasis needs to be placed on developing effective interventions to protect and improve health outcomes within the Local Plan because:

- obesity and ill-health rates pose a series risk to communities and individuals in Doncaster and continue to rise faster than the national average; and
- Government guidance states that health and wellbeing and health infrastructure should be embedded within local and neighbourhood plans.

The Doncaster Health and Well Being Strategy (first published in 2014 and updated in 2015) seek to improve the health and wellbeing of residents and reduce inequalities in health outcomes.

One of the core principles of planning (see paragraph 17 of the NPPF) is to deliver sufficient community facilities and services to meet local needs. In particular, local plans should “promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship”.

Tackling fuel poverty is a mayoral priority (see Doncaster’s Affordable Warmth Plan 2014-17). Fuel poverty rates in Doncaster are higher than the national average. People who live in cold, damp housing are more likely to experience health problems, winter deaths and impaired quality of life, especially households who have young children.
Question 3: Portrait of the Borough (a) Do you agree that this is an accurate reflection of the borough’s economic, social and environmental context? If not, please say why.

- Respondents were generally supportive of the spatial portrait, particularly the reference to lack of affordable housing, development viability and the recognition of the importance of its assets and resources.
- More information is sought on the borough’s environmental assets such as historic buildings and areas, biodiversity sites and nature improvement areas.
- Sport England wishes to see local authorities working with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population (e.g. sports and recreation). Sport England also considers that the council should carry out an up to date assessment of playing pitches and sports facilities – otherwise the plan will be considered unsound.
- Some respondents disagreed with our view that Doncaster’s housing market is self-contained. There are clearly cross boundary movements in terms of both commuting and migration as our evidence acknowledges. In addition, it is not considered that the vast majority of new households are unable to afford market housing.
- No detailed comments have been received from parish and town councils, councilors, ward members and developers.
- One respondent considers that the high birth rate is a weakness rather than a strength given unplanned pregnancies, energy and housing shortages and unemployment etc.
- Some respondents express concern about the potential impact of growth and development on carbon emissions and pollution.

Question 3 (b): Is there anything missing from the description of the borough’s economic, social and environmental context that should be added?

A relatively high proportion of the respondents put forward suggestions on how the description of the borough could be improved or strengthened. Suggestions included the following.

- Doncaster Sheffield Airport’s role as a catalyst for economic growth and connectivity should be emphasised/ highlighted.
- Opportunities should be taken to improve the diversity of the town centre offer and improve the attractiveness of surrounding areas such as Balby, Hexthorpe and Lakeside. However, a limit should be placed on the number of drinking establishments within existing centres to improve the health of the borough.
- Rural farming and food production - the heritage of farming (dairy herds, livestock, cereals etc) should be protected and encouraged.
- The character and quality of the landscape has not been adequately covered.
- Greater emphasis should be placed on the importance of protecting the green belt and high quality farmland (x6 responses). Where possible, existing brownfield land within existing urban areas such as colliery sites should be used in preference to greenfield locations.
- Educational attainment and outcomes should be addressed in more depth.

One respondent does not feel that the plan does enough to address the weaknesses which it acknowledges such as the diversity of the community and needs to be much more ambitious.

In relation to the list of weaknesses, other examples cited include low property values, slum landlords, number of wildlife sites in unfavourable management and viability of housing development with planning permission.
In addition, the statutory environmental bodies (Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England) sought further information on aspects of the natural and built environment such as the quality and status of water bodies (e.g. aquifers), nature improvement areas (Humberhead Levels and Dearne Valley Green Heart) and strategic green infrastructure.

RSPB supports the overall findings of the report but considers there is insufficient background information regarding the borough’s natural assets and green infrastructure. The report should provide further information on the various types of green infrastructure and biodiversity areas such as Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Local Nature Reserves, Local Sites of Wildlife Importance, irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and Nature Improvement Areas. As such, it will be difficult to assess whether policies are sound or feasible at a spatial scale.

English Heritage believe the spatial portrait provides a good overview of the current situation but it should also reiterate the heritage assets identified in the Core Strategy under policy CS15 (English Heritage).

HBF suggest tweaking the wording of the homes and communities section, placing emphasis on the need to work collaboratively to provide viable sites in sustainable locations to increase of the delivery of new housing.

Sheffield City Council would like Doncaster to make some contribution to meeting some of Sheffield’s housing needs, particularly if public transport connections between the two districts are improved. Net-migration could be more significant in the future as the local economy becomes less self-contained.
Summer Consultation 2015 - Issues and Options
**Question 1: In general, where should new homes be provided?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Most new homes should be provided in the Main Urban Area of Doncaster and this area should be defined as the continuous built up area from Bentley in the North to Bessacarr and Cantley in the South and from Warmsworth in the West to Edenthorpe and Kirk Sandall in the East</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Each town and village should get sufficient new homes to meet the needs of its own population</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The larger and more sustainable towns and villages should have proportionately more new homes because they have better services and facilities</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Land for new homes should be provided where housing developers most want to develop so that new homes are more likely to be built</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Brownfield sites and sites close to shops, jobs, community facilities and public transport should be prioritised for the development of new homes</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 245  
**skipped question** 90

Respondents’ comments included:

- brownfield sites should be prioritised; brownfield sites should not be prioritised unless they are deliverable; housing allocations should include a mixture of greenfield and brownfield sites; better use should be made of the existing building stock;
- most people travel to work and are happy to do so; the Council does not have control over transport options;
- the Main Area of Doncaster should be the main focus for new housing,
• other sustainable towns and larger villages with services should also have some housing (provided it is proportionate to size and service levels and in character)
• the smaller villages lacking services should continue to be restricted to infill; on the latter point, the Call for Sites had caused a lot of concern with parish councils and individuals strongly opposing the sites put forward.

The above comments were made by 8 rural parish councils/ meetings, the Joint Rural Councils, Selby Council and 50 other letters from individuals and one elected member. Of the 14 letters from landowning/developer interests addressing Question 1, 8 agreed with the settlement hierarchy approach above i.e. support for growth in the Main Urban Area. Additional points made by these 8 included:
• a focus of the Main Urban Area will maximise the economic potential of the borough as a whole
• there is a need to redress a north-south balance in terms of recent house building levels
• Adwick/Woodlands/Carcroft/Skellow should be treated as one sustainable area for growth
• some small villages with few services should also have some small-scale development so they don’t “wither on the vine”
• there are small sites suitable for development constrained by green belt and other policy which should be allowed to come forward
• flood risk is problematic but not insurmountable

Of the 6 letters from landowning/developer interests that did not explicitly register support for the settlement hierarchy approach above the following comments were made:
• new homes should be provided where there are no significant constraints such as the Main Urban Area, Armthorpe and Edenthorpe
• brownfield sites should be prioritised where they are close to facilities and public transport
• brownfield land should be considered before greenfield sites but also distributed across the borough to help support services in smaller settlements such as Blaxton and Finningley.
• sites outside settlements should be favoured where deliverable
• national house builders will only develop where there is market demand.
• the development of greenfield sites should be linked to the development of brownfield sites
• a range of types and sizes of housing allocation are necessary to ensure delivery
• housing should be directed outside the green belt to areas with no special landscape value
• settlements should have housing to meet their needs
• greenfield sites are likely to be more viable than brownfield. Parts of the borough have low property values which makes housing delivery challenging and this needs to be factored into the plan.
• flood risk zones should be avoided; Green belt and countryside designations are plan imposed and should not be regarded as absolute constraints

The Environment Agency stressed the need to apply the sequential and exception tests Askern Town Council supports housing in Askern provided there is sufficient infrastructure in place to support it including bus services and schools capacity and provided that existing community assets are protected.

Two letters from individuals said that to some extent development land should be provided where developers want to build.
**Question 2: Where, more specifically, should new homes be built?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should the Local Plan promote housing growth here?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Urban Area of Doncaster</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunscroft, Dunsville, Hatfield &amp; Stainforth</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorne &amp; Moornds</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conisbrough &amp; Denaby</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexborough</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armthorpe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossington</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwick &amp; Woodlands</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcroft &amp; Skellow</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprotbrough</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprotbrough</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askern</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tickhill</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawtry</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnby Dun</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckley</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnburgh &amp; Harlington</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayfield Green</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finningley</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll Bar &amp; Almholme</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 large villages with 3 or less key services: Hatfield Woodhouse, Highfields, Wadworth (3 key services each), Branton, Norton (2 each), Campsall, Arksey, Blaxton (1 each), 30 smaller Villages with 2 or less key services (most have 1 or none) plus even smaller hamlets that are “washed over” with Green Belt or Countryside Policy designation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere else? Please specify in comments box.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Urban Area of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunscroft, Dunsville,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorne &amp; Moorlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conisbrough &amp;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexborough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airmthorpe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwick &amp;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcroft &amp; Skellow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprightholm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spritham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askarn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tickhill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowtry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamby Dun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aukley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnburgh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayfield Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fittiley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll bar &amp; Almholme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 large villages with</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 smaller Villages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere else?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Totals: 132
Answered question: 171
Skipped question: 109
Respondents’ comments included:

- villages should not be turned into towns; concentrate (90%) of new homes in the existing main urban areas, use brownfield sites and build upwards
- places like Balby and Hyde Park need to be rejuvenated
- there is no need to change the proportions of housing set out in the Core Strategy
- a proportion of growth should be directed towards Armthorpe in recognition of the aspirations of the local community as set out in the neighbourhood plan
- Tickhill has a neighbourhood plan that proposes infill only
- the two areas of Sprotbrough should not be considered for house building but should be considered in the same way as the 30 smaller villages
- Bawtry and Tickhill have horrendous traffic problems; their roads (and other services) cannot support new housing without radical changes
- development in some of the smaller villages may be appropriate
- build on brownfield land and not in the green belt
- Thorne, Adwick, Woodlands are accessible and would support new housing and industry
- High Melton should not be considered for development because it is Green Belt; Finningley should be a major development area
- Wadworth, Hooton Pagnell are not appropriate for growth (concerns generated by the Call for Sites)
- between 1 and 2% of new homes should be built in Bawtry (Bawtry Residents Group) but for affordable homes and no 4 bedroom executive homes
- Hayfield Green/Auckley is becoming over run with new housing
- Edenthorpe, Dunsville, Kirk Sandall, Armthorpe, Hatfield etc. have all seen a significant increase in housing
- Hatfield and Stainforth are two separate places with different needs and should not be put together

A number of responses were from developer/agent/landowner interests promoting specific sites and so referenced these locations as places for growth; this included Adwick/ Woodlands/ Carcroft/ Skellow, Askern, Armthorpe, Conisbrough, Bawtry, Blaxton & Finningley and Dunscroft, Dunsville, Hatfield & Stainforth.

Other comments made by these respondents included:

- given the level of services in Bawtry it is perverse to restrict development to infill
- Conisbrough has a level of services that would justify a higher share of housing growth
- homes should be built in settlements with 7 or more key services
- the share of homes in each settlement should be informed by the housing needs assessment
- housing as small natural extensions should be allowed in the smaller villages with few or no services; many of these (e.g. Clayton) can readily access services in nearby settlements; no consideration has been given to this sort of functional relationship

To the suggestion of “Anywhere Else” (last point) 10 responses where received, however the locations given where individual sites within areas already suggested such as Sheffield Road/Old Road, Conisbrough and Melton Road, Sprotbrough.
Question 3: Where should new employment opportunities be provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) New major sites for job creation should always be close to major residential areas.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) It is acceptable for some jobs to be provided at locations that are less suitable for new homes (for example at some motorway junctions) provided good transport links are in place.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Some reserve employment sites should be identified that would only be granted permission in the plan period if and when employment allocations were substantially used up.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Certain types of employment uses should be clustered together for example hi-tech and air related uses at the Airport and low carbon technology uses at Unity/DN7 (Hatfield/Stainforth)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Jobs arising from the growing rail engineering industry should be concentrated in certain locations e.g. Doncaster Main Urban Area or Lakeside.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 162
skipped question 118

General comments made as part of the responses to this question included:

- Some employment developments have particular locational needs and these should dictate the location of sites.
- In principle development which generates significant amount of movement should be located where travel is minimised however the NPPF says to prove a sufficient supply of the right type of land in the right locations at the right time to support growth and innovation. There is therefore a conflict.
- Major sites should be kept away from residential areas, unless utilising brownfield sites.
- It is good for travel to work but does have a significant effect on local infrastructure and opposition from residents.
• There should be a focus on sustainable locations with a focus of market demand and deliverability.
• If there are good transport links then sites can be anywhere.
• New employment opportunities should be located on sites with good access to public transport and / or residential development.
• Local Plan needs to be able to prioritise developments that create a good quantity and quality of jobs over those which simply occupy land.
• It depends on how ‘major site’ is defined.
• People no longer want to live next to their place of work.
• It depends in the type of employment use. For example, call centres can be located near to residential areas, but quarries should not be. Only good neighbour uses close to close to residential areas.
• Brownfield sites should be developed first.
• Local roads need to be able to cope with an increase in traffic.
• Reducing commuting times helps improve economic performance and reduces negative impacts on the environment.
• People have always travelled to work.
• Transport links are generally better close to residential areas.

Eight agents acting on behalf of land owner/developer interests (a number of times) disagreed to some degree with the question saying that some uses have particular locational needs and that a sufficient supply of land should be provided in the right locations at the right time. Three stated that major sites should be close to existing residential areas.

Three councillors responded by saying that new sites should be linked to good transport infrastructure and therefore can be anywhere where this criteria is met.

The Parish Council responses generally agreed that major sites have an impact on infrastructure and that people oppose them. One states that they should be close to residential areas that need jobs.

The CPRE support the focus for job creation being as close as possible to residential areas but question the need for any further major new sites. There is a need to look at the relationship between location of new employment opportunities and locations where employment need is greatest - for example, Adwick, Carcroft, Stainforth, and Thorne.

A large amount of responses were received from members of the public with a split between those in favour of new sites close to residential areas and those who disagree. Most, however, disagree that major new sites should be close to major residential areas.

Q3 (b): It is acceptable for some jobs to be provided at locations that are less suitable for new homes (for example at some motorway junctions provided good transport links are in place)

General comments made as part of the responses to this question included:
• There should be a focus on sustainable locations as well as market interest and deliverability.
• Policies should have sufficient flexibility to provide sufficient land to support new and emerging sectors.
• The road network should be able to cope with the additional traffic. The A1m could provide sites for retail and entertainment.
• Businesses require good transport links.
• It is not acceptable for traffic to impact on an already busy junction or if workers have to travel through residential areas.
• The Green Belt and rural areas should be protected.
• Ribbon development should be avoided such as the M18 corridor.
• Unused industrial areas/brownfield land should be utilised.
• Should move away from communities being linked to specific employment opportunities.
• The Core Strategy jobs target and Sheffield City Region jobs target are at odd with each other.
• Jobs are motorway locations may not be taken up by local residents due to accessibility.

Three agents acting on behalf of land owner/developer interests (a number of times) logistics jobs need to be at major transport infrastructure modes and should be located at or close to motorway junctions.

One councillor agreed that these are the best locations for employment sites. Another stated that it should not be assumed that motorway junctions are suitable for development particular the Green Belt in the west of the borough.

Two parish councils responded stating that brownfield land should be utilised first and that adequate public transport facilities are required. Another two are concerned that that sites need to be accessible to residential areas as motorway junctions are accessible to those with their own transport.

Highways England responded saying that opportunities should be prioritised in fully sustainable locations which are accessible by a range of transport solutions CPRE would welcome a presumption against employment developments that are remote from residential.

Regarding sites, one respondee supports Marshgate for retail, employment and leisure uses and one objects to the proposed site at Wadworth.

Q3 (c): Some reserve employment sites should be identified that would only be granted permission in the plan period if and when employment allocations where substantially used up

General comments made as part of the responses to this question included:
• If there are acceptable sites and there is demand, they should not be held back from development.
• There needs to be further detail submitted to see if this approach would be achievable.
• As many sites as possible should be identified which are linked to existing infrastructure.
• There are brownfield sites available in the town centre.
• Green Belt and Countryside Policy Area should be protected and reserve sites should be identified outside of these areas.
• If the plan is subject to regular review then reserve sites are not necessary.
• This would help balance the supply and demand equation.
• Must include developer’s contribution to connectivity, infrastructure and wellbeing of local residents.
• Impossible to define when employment allocations are used up.

The above points were mainly made by members of the public and from land owner/developer interests (representing many different clients). Two elected members made comments as well as two parish councils.
**Q3 (d): Certain types of employment uses should be clustered together for example high-tech and air related uses at the Airport and low carbon technology uses at Unity/DN7 (Hatfield/Stainforth)**

General comments made as part of the responses to this question included:
- It should not be used to overdevelop some areas.
- This would help to build a new town around the airport.
- Should not impose clustering. It could be counter-productive.
- Could create centres of excellence.
- High technology developments benefit from being next to each other.
- This makes sense but is not a necessity for all businesses.
- Requirement for high-tech employment rather than warehousing.
- It could help regenerate old mining sites along with new housing stock attract the right people.
- Can it be controlled in terms of policies and development control practice?
- Should not be on greenfield sites.

One response from land owner/developer interest’s states that some clustering should be supported e.g. energy related at DN7, air related at Finningley, and rail engineering at Doncaster. This is supported by paragraph 21 of the NPPF (bullet 4).

Another three (representing many clients) state that care should be taken to not limit economic growth and innovation allowing flexibility at Unity and the airport business parks. Development should respond to market demand.

Three councillors supported this as it is good way for one business to attract similar businesses to area and create synergy and new opportunities. However another said it should not be at the exclusion of other businesses.

Two parish councils state it is advantageous to build hubs of related businesses. Existing properties should be used first. Another states that there is no case to direct low carbon technology to Hatfield. Another says that it depends on type and scale of operation and is subject to skills availability.

The CPRE states that a strategy should be included to attract local people to the jobs.

**Q3 (e): Jobs arising from the growing rail engineering industry should be concentrated in certain locations e.g. Doncaster Main Urban Area or Lakeside**

General comments made as part of the responses to this question included:
- There is logic to having them grouped centrally as clustering improves labour market flexibility and competitiveness.
- Development should respond to market demand.
- Jobs should be located where there is demand but support roles can be located elsewhere.
- There were a number of queries as to the purpose behind the question as it is felt that there is no growing rail industry. However one person was pleased to hear of the rail industry growing.
- Suggested locations where: the proposed area adjacent to Doncaster to Leeds railway line from Toll Bar to Doncaster; existing brownfield sites close to the railport; or existing locations around Hexthorpe. There were a number of responses who mentioned utilising brownfield land first.
The above points were mainly made by individuals together with one town council. Nine responses were received from land owner/developer interests (representing many different clients) stating that undue regulation is like to be a disincentive and that the Council should put policies and actions in place to enhance the preferred locations.

One councillor stated that the rail college should have been located near the railway.

**Question 3 (f): New office developments should only be allowed in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) town centres so that they can support other town centre uses or</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) there should be a more flexible approach and allow out-of-town Offices</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 160
skipped question 120

General comments made as part of the responses to **option a)** for this question included:

- Existing town centre developments and empty buildings should be brought back into use and used to regenerate the town centre.
- There are a lot of vacant office spaces currently around Doncaster i.e. Lakeside and Woodfield Way, Balby.
- Marshgate is a prime location for new high quality office development.
- Developments should be limited to town centres. Doncaster is vulnerable to work gravitating towards the larger centres of Sheffield and Leeds.
- Larger office developments need to be close to their likely source of employees.
- Town centre offices would make full use of transport infrastructure such as rail.
- The amount of public houses should be reduced as they have a negative effect on any potential investment in the town.
- Doncaster town centre requires greater employment to support the shops by creating demand.
- Out-of-town offices cause transport problems for workers, customers and visitors.
Sustainable development requires us to consider mixed neighbourhoods where people can live near work such as Lakeside. This should be done elsewhere.

The above points were mainly made by individuals. The two parish/town councils who responded supported office development in town centres and believe that working from home should be encouraged where possible together with more flexible working patterns. One councillor responded stating that Doncaster’s town centre has a falling footfall which the conversion of flats above shops could help address. Sustainable connectivity issues should also be addressed and supported.

The CPRE highlighted that if Doncaster wishes to have an economy which compares positively to bigger cities it needs to put emphasis on its town centre. There is too much vacant office space in Doncaster centre and in the smaller town centres. The Local Plan should have a clear, strong policy in favour of office uses being located only in town centres, and against any out-of-town offices.

Natural England states that the plan’s development strategy should seek to avoid areas of high environmental value.

General comments made as part of the responses to option b) for this question included:

- Appropriate infrastructure and transport links need to be in place to encourage a wider spread of employment opportunities.
- Out of town offices encourage small businesses.
- Office workers would find it easier to commute by avoiding the town centre and it would help reduce congestion in the town centre.
- Locations such as Lakeside and the Airport have good link roads to the M18.
- This would allow parking facilities for workers and visitors.
- Modern technology allows for offices to be located anywhere.
- It depends on the scale of the proposed offices.
- If transport links and infrastructure are in place then out of town developments should not be ruled out on brownfield land.
- New office developments should be located in sustainable locations with access to public transport. This may be the town centre or other locations.
- All businesses and communities need support not just town centre areas.

Two parish councils responded staying that the current parking and public transport infrastructure in Doncaster town centre does not support additional offices. Two parish councils replied saying that a flexible approach is needed to allow in town and out of town office developments and that opportunities should be available for local small scale businesses to invest and create local employment.
Question 4: To what extent should land be taken out of the Green Belt to meet the borough’s housing and employment needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The west side of Doncaster and towns in the west of the borough (like Mexborough, Adwick, Askern and Conisbrough) should be allowed to expand into the Green Belt so as to at least meet their own housing and jobs needs or..</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The borough’s overall housing and employment needs should be met outside the Green Belt as far as possible so as to help protect the Green Belt</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 284  
skipped question 118

Respondents’ comments included:
- the Green Belt should be protected; no land should be taken out of the Green Belt; once it is gone it is gone forever; green areas are extremely important to communities etc.
- we should not take any land out of cultivation/countryside
- Green Belt land should only be used as a last resort
- all needs must be met outside the Green Belt and conservation areas
- the local plan needs to allocate land that is sustainable and deliverable and there is green belt land that meets these requirements
- brownfield sites (such as Brodsworth colliery site and Waterfront) should be developed are adequate; greenfield sites like Broadaxe should be avoided
- the CPRE call for a comprehensive review of the Green Belt covering the whole borough
- a Green Belt review should look at all parts of the borough and provide for appropriate distinction for all settlements
- Mexborough Adwick Askern and Conisbrough all really need additional housing but land should only be taken out of the greenbelt as a very last resort.
• Green Belt should be kept permanently open but building here is preferable to building on flood risk land
• there is an argument for using up low grade land in Green Belt /Countryside Policy areas, in particular quarried land which remains poor agricultural land evermore

The Green Belt issue generated concern particularly from residents and parish councils west of the A1. Letters were received from the Joint Rural parishes as well as 6 individual Parish Councils/Meetings, 4 borough Councillors and 50 members of the public all opposed to or very concerned about any proposed erosion of the Green Belt. Most of the letters made the following main points:
• the Green Belt should be protected
• the availability of brownfield land and land in the east of the borough means that there is no justification for releasing green belt land
• all non-green belt opportunities should be explored and/or exhausted first
• carrying out a Green Belt review before choosing a strategy is wrong; where are the exceptional circumstances to justify a review?

There were 7 letters from landowning/developer interests supporting Green Belt review and Green Belt land release, making the following points:
• a Green Belt review is necessary
• land must be released from the Green Belt to accommodate new housing and employment growth in a sustainable way, together with a need to “safeguard” land for future release beyond this plan period
• Green Belt designation is a policy rather than a technical constraint and it is more important to avoid flood risk areas and sites that are not viable

There were also 7 letters from landowning/developer interests opposed to the above position making the following points:
• non Green Belt opportunities should be explored before green belt land is released
• land should only be taken out of green belt in exceptional circumstances

Selby Council made the point that development distribution should be driven by sustainable strategy and that Green Belt decisions should then follow this. One parish council in the east of the borough stated that if Option 3 were preferred then they would support a comprehensive Green Belt review. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust pointed out that Green Belt land can have less environmental value than brownfield land.
Question 5: To what extent should development avoid flood risk areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) All new homes and other vulnerable development should be steered away from flood risk areas even if those areas are protected by flood defences and/or can be made safe or</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) It is acceptable to use Brownfield and other well-located urban centre sites in flood risk areas provided existing or proposed flood defences/mitigation measures would make the development safe</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 276  
**Skipped question:** 110

**Question 5 (a):** All new homes and other vulnerable development should be steered away from flood risk areas even if those areas are protected by flood defences and/or can be made safe.

- we do not want a repeat of the summer 2007 flooding and devastation this caused
- flood risk areas can never be guaranteed to be safe and it’s against NPPF to develop in them
- flood defences may not withstand future flood events when factoring in climate change
- why take the risk if it can be avoided
- no excuse to be using areas at risk of flooding
- common sense dictates this answer
- this option accords with NPPF. Although flood defences can mitigate the risks, NPPF is clear that housing should be directed to FRZ1 first and foremost and FRZ2/3 should only be considered where this is not possible; this sequential test must drive the Local Plans’ spatial strategy
- the Sites & Policies DPD Inspector was clear that flood risk areas should be avoided and full consideration must be given to countryside and Green Belt sites
• flood mitigation is very expensive and will impact on development viability and deliverability of sites
• developers will not be able to obtain loans from banks and buyers will not be able to obtain mortgages for homes in flood risk areas making sites undeliverable
• developing in flood risk areas is not consistent with the principles of sustainability
• the need to build flood defences to make development safe may impact on wildlife habitats

Question 5 (b): It is acceptable to use Brownfield and other well-located urban centre sites in flood risk areas provided existing or proposed flood defences/mitigation measures would make the development safe.

• it may be necessary to use FRZ2/3 sites in settlements which are completely constrained providing they can be made safe, but in settlements where flood risk is avoidable then non-flood risk sites must be utilised first and foremost, including Green Belt
• some flood risk sites are inevitable in order to meet the regeneration needs of the borough and new development can facilitate mitigation and defences to improve the flood resilience of the borough as well as itself
• brownfield sites must come forward in order to regenerate the town centre and previous applications and flood risk assessments have shown this is possible (e.g. Marshgate Mixed Use)
• avoidance of flood risk would see further decline of Thorne & Moorends with few opportunities left for development. A balance is therefore needed that ensures flood mitigation and new development can be delivered
• avoidance would skew growth and regeneration to non-flood risk areas. If the location is right then the development values should allow for necessary flood mitigation works, but viability varies from site to site. Should not allow ‘less vulnerable’ employment in flood risk and not the ‘more vulnerable’ housing to go with it as this is unsustainable and imbalanced
• not as straightforward as this as some areas are more at risk than others and should be a last resort. SUDs should be required
• the Plan’s Aims & Objectives can never be met if derelict flood risk areas of the borough remain undeveloped. Therefore flood defence funding and provision must sit at the heart of the plan
• if priority is to be given to brownfield flood risk sites then we must also ensure we manage our flood water storage areas better
• questions the accuracy of the flood map given vast areas have never flooded in living memory so is it over-cautious? A map that shows where has actually flooded should be used instead and these areas avoided unless new defences and mitigation has been put in place since that flood event to ensure they are safe
• the borough experiences flooding from sources such as surface water and groundwater flooding which is sometimes more significant and common than fluvial flooding and must be considered. Flood defences and infrastructure are already in need of investment (e.g. Keadby Pumping Station needs replacing)
• we are already building in flood risk areas and this is a good use of land. Technology exists to ensure that mitigation is in place to ensure homes are safe; this must continue and our flood risk managed
• support as long as affordable home insurance can be obtained and flood defences do not impact on wildlife habitat
• Sheffield & Rotherham should contribute towards the costs of defences for the River Don
• preferable to use flood risk areas and mitigate the risks rather than use Green Belt
• given the extent of flood risk constraints in the borough it is unrealistic to avoid so
development is acceptable as long as the mitigation/flood defences are in place to
ensure it will be safe
• the Borough’s flood risk constraints have been overcome in the past and can be in the
future
• avoidance of flood risk will stifle much needed housing in parts of the borough and it’s
likely that we will not be able to meet our housing need without using such sites
• brownfield and other well-located urban sites are acceptable providing the sequential
and exception tests are met
• partly agrees with this statement in that avoidance of flood risk will undermine
regeneration needs in the north-east of the borough and M18/M180 corridor and result
in a skewed distribution of homes and jobs to the west. However, this would not just be
restricted to brownfield and other well located urban sites
• partly agrees with this statement, but it should not be restricted to brownfield and urban
sites as unlikely the borough’s housing requirement can be met solely on such sites
• partly agrees with this statement in that they would be concerned to see extensive
growth in the east of the borough given flood risk constraint so growth should be
steered away from such areas, unless it can be proven that adequate flood risk
defences are in place or can be provided
• partly agrees with this statement, although FRZ1 areas should be considered first and
any development to flood risk areas should be restricted to the Main Urban Area or
Main Towns (both urban and extension sites)
• currently developing flood risk sites in Askern and Bentley
• site specific FRA’s can demonstrate development will be safe
Question 5 (c): If you have selected (b) do you agree or disagree with the following statement: (c) Any housing allocation in flood zones should be additional to the borough-wide housing requirement because the necessary flood mitigation requirements to make sites safe could render them unviable and their delivery uncertain during the plan period.

**Answer Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 165
skipped question 161*

**Key messages from those that said ‘agree’ were as follows:**
- we must consult with the banks and insurance industry as to whether mortgages and affordable insurance can be obtained
- it should be compulsory for the development industry to bring forward flood risk sites and not just ones with highest profit margins
- viable flood risk brownfield sites should be the priority
- it is for developers to decide if sites are viable

**Key messages from those that said ‘disagree’ were as follows:**
- there shouldn’t be any housing allocation additional to the requirement
- flood risk sites should be a last resort and we need to understand what flood mitigation is required and the quantum of development needed
- the viability of such sites needs to be properly understood before they can be allocated and supporting infrastructure identified alongside delivery mechanisms, such as CIL. Urban brownfield sites at risk of flooding should not be avoided over greenfield sites outside of urban area.
- if site specific FRAs can demonstrate they are safe then they shouldn’t be an additional supply
- if flood risk sites are surplus to requirement then they shouldn’t be built at all
- there needs to be a balance of flood risk sites and more profitable ones
- we can never guarantee such sites will be safe and shouldn’t therefore be allowed
- we are already building in flood risk areas e.g. Woodfield Plantation
• if developers wish to bring forward such sites then they should pay for flood defence improvements
• there should be a reserve list of sites that could come forward if flood risk ones are not delivered
• flood risk sites should come forward after non-flood risk sites
• effective flood management is key to the prosperity of the Town Centre
• where are the proposals for flood defence improvements and mitigation needed to support bringing forward flood risk sites
• housing in flood risk areas has been delivered previously without viability issues
• it is too easy for developers to use the viability argument
• flood risk areas can always be made viable with investment
• reusing flood risk brownfield land over release of Green belt must take priority and there are examples of flood risk sites that have been developed successfully

Key messages from those that said ‘don’t know’ were as follows:
• although housing should not be excluded from flood risk sites, the difficulties with delivering vulnerable uses must be recognised and housing not the main element of such sites
• there should be no development in flood risk areas

Other:
• did not state whether they supported this statement, but question whether flood risk sites are viable and deliverable
• all new homes can be identified within a flood risk area to help meet the housing requirement if it is within an area protected by defences and can be made safe
### Question 6: How can we best protect, maintain and improve Doncaster town centres?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) There should be a flexible approach towards the use of land and buildings to encourage mixed-use development and town centre uses across key development sites and opportunity areas within existing town centres as set out in the current plan</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Greater emphasis should be placed on the specific opportunities and requirements that will inform the redevelopment of key town centre sites and areas of change (e.g. the waterfront and other prime brownfield sites in Doncaster town centre should be given a particular focus in terms of future activity and land use mix to maximise development opportunities and create a stronger sense of place).</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Current town centre boundaries should be amended to reflect changing shopping patterns and associated usages</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) No further retail and leisure development should be allowed outside of existing centres (except furniture, DIY and other bulky goods within existing retail warehouse parks).</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Land within existing retail warehouse parks that has remained vacant over a long period should be developed for other uses such as leisure and community facilities</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Non bulky goods uses (e.g. food and clothing) should be permitted within existing retail warehouse parks so long as they do not detract from the character and appearance of the area and are ancillary to bulky goods non-food retailing</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 172

skipped question 118
Overall, the response to the questions relating to town centres was relatively positive. In general, very limited feedback was received in relation to questions 6 and 7 and the sub-questions set out above.

Some respondents made general comments about how we can protect, maintain and improve Doncaster town centres. Suggestions included the following.

- more greenspaces and places of interest.
- a mix of high quality and affordable housing and commercial uses (e.g. offices) to support the function and viability of town centres including existing services and facilities
- developing and building on the existing infrastructure both in the town centre and the other major centres.
- creation of a mixed-use student village to help breathe new life into the town centre
- heritage-led approach to regeneration (e.g. restore St James, Grand Theatre etc)
- promote the distinctiveness and character of specific streets and areas of interest such as Hall Gate, Silver Street and the markets.
- transform the old art college into a 'historical research centre' to include the museum, archives and hidden war room
- construct a railway museum to showcase Doncaster’s long-standing links with the industry and convert the existing museum into a leading art gallery.
- encourage the use of space above shop premises as living accommodation
- housing is key to economic growth and housing that meets the needs of all of Doncaster’s residents will ensure a wider range of potential customers at all ends of the market that will use the shops and services in Doncaster’s town centres.

**Question 6 (a):** There should be a flexible approach towards the use of land and buildings to encourage mixed-use development and town centre uses across key development sites and opportunity areas within existing town centres as set out in the current plan

No comments received

**Question 6 (b):** Greater emphasis should be placed on the specific opportunities and requirements that will inform the redevelopment of key town centre sites and areas of change (e.g. the waterfront and other prime brownfield sites in Doncaster town centre should be given a particular focus in terms of future activity and land use mix to maximise development opportunities and create a stronger sense of place)

3 respondents (including Indigo Planning and Johnson Brook) supported option a (flexibility) but just one response in favour of option b. One respondent recognised that successful town centre regeneration depends on a number of approaches such as high quality masterplanning and comprehensive redevelopment. Another respondent suggested undertaking further research on the factors (other than competition) which are hindering the performance of town centres such as public realm management and car parking.

**Question 6 (c):** Current town centre boundaries should be amended to reflect changing shopping patterns and associated usages

Just two responses to this question.

- Existing boundaries should be extended to accommodate larger footprint retail and commercial outlets.
• Existing centre boundaries should flexibly respond to changes over time as new development demands.

**Question 6 (d): No further retail and leisure development should be allowed outside of existing centres (except furniture, DIY and other bulky goods within existing retail warehouse parks)**

Just 2 responses to this question (both for and against). The owner of the Wheatley Road retail park believes that the option (which is based on policy CS7 of the Core Strategy) is unduly restrictive and contrary to the provisions of the NPPF - proposals for main town centre uses outside of existing centres should only be considered with regards to the sequential and impact tests. As such, the policy should be worded to reflect the positive aims of the NPPF which encourages growth and is consistent with the national retail guidance. For the same reason, option f is also dismissed.

**Question 6 (e): Land within existing retail warehouse parks that has remained vacant over a long period should be developed for other uses such as leisure and community facilities**

One respondent supported option e.

**Question 6 (f): Non bulky goods uses (e.g. food and clothing) should be permitted within existing retail warehouse parks so long as they do not detract from the character and appearance of the area and are ancillary to bulky goods non-food retailing**

No comments received
**Question 7:** What approach should be taken to developing a hierarchy of town, district and local centres across the borough?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The following centres should be ranked according to the following hierarchy (based on the current plan): (i) Sub-Regional Centre: Doncaster Town Centre (ii) Town Centres: Thorne, Mexborough (iii) District Centres: Adwick, Armthorpe, Askern, Bawtry, Conisbrough, Tickhill (iv) Local Centres: Woodfield Plantation, Rossington, Carcroft, Skellow, Bentley, Hatfield, Dunsbroft, Intake, Balby, Moorends, Edlington, Stainforth, Edenthorpe, Denaby Main (v) Neighbourhood Shopping Parades</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Some centres should be moved up or down the hierarchy  (please say which in the comments box below)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Additional centres which are proposed within emerging growth areas (e.g. Rossington and Unity/DN7 at Stainforth/Hatfield) should be named within the hierarchy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Neighbourhood shopping parades should be individually identified and listed within the hierarchy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question** 152

**Skipped question** 128

Of those that responded to question 7, the general consensus is that the current hierarchy (based on the Core Strategy) should be maintained and should be brought forward into the Doncaster Local Plan. Specific comments have been retrieved on the need to support the growth of district centres such as Bawtry and Armthorpe which are currently designated as principal towns. However, the planning of retail and service centres should be linked to the settlement strategy and objectively assessed needs to ensure that policies are based on robust evidence.
In relation to part C of the question, the response is more mixed but both Peel and Waystone supported the identification of additional centres within emerging growth areas within the retail hierarchy such as DN7 and Rossington. In addition, Peel recommends that the village of Hayfield Green should be moved up the settlement hierarchy in recognition of future housing growth around the airport and its planned and proposed increase in key service provision. As such the policy wording should recognise that there will be a requirement to define and provide new centres in line with new growth corridors such as the airport. However, one respondent has questioned the status and legitimacy of the proposed new centres (Rossington and Unity/DN7) in the absence of clear evidence. No further comments on part b of the question have been received.
Question 8 (a): The Council should ensure that upgrades to the A1(M) and M18 are progressed by Highways England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of responders (77%) agree with the statement made.

The majority of the comments focus on the A1 (m) improvements which have received strong support to (i) improve connectivity and (ii) relieve congestion. However, whilst there is support many people are of the opinion that the impact on the Green Belt should be kept to the minimum and that improvements should not necessarily by default be the precursor to further development in the A1 corridor.
Question 8 (b): Major new road schemes should be progressed to improve accessibility to and from isolated communities, facilitate development and reduce congestion on the strategic highway network. Of the following schemes which do you think should be prioritised in the Local Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Dualling of the A630 Westmoor Link (from junction 4 of the M18 motorway to Wheatley Hall Road\Thorne Road) to unlock housing and employment land.</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A link road between the A1(M) and A19 in north Doncaster to open up land to employment and housing and reduce stress on the wider network.</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bypasses on the A635 (Barnsley Road) to improve access to Barnsley and ease traffic congestion within Hickleton and Marr.</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments 109 answered question 169 skipped question 263

Clearly the A635 by-pass is the favoured scheme and has received a significant number of comments in support. There is concern about congestion in Marr and Hickleton, the increasing numbers of HGV’s en-route to and from the distribution warehouses in Barnsley, increased pollution in the villages and the rising number of fatalities. The A630 dualling is also supported to unlock land for development.

The A1(M)/A19 link road does receive a degree of support from both individuals (over 50) and organisations including The Highways agency, and Natural England. However it also attracts a number of negative comments from both individuals and organisations including 3 Parish Councils and the Joint Rural Parish Council. The negative comments focus on the incursion into the Green Belt, Flood Risk, the impact the link would have on the already busy A1 (i.e. more bottlenecks), and the fact that the East of the Borough is already well served by road links and that there is little evidence that this link is needed.
Question 8 (c): Do you have other road schemes that should be prioritised in the Local Plan (please give suggestions).

This question has prompted a very low response rate (14%). The majority of the responses suggest local highway improvements rather than major schemes. No single idea receives more than one comment. They include:

- improvements to the Stripe Road junction in Tickhill.
- the opening up of the ‘old’ North Bridge in both directions/
- the general improvement of all existing roads (re-surfacing etc.)
- a link road from the M18 to Stainforth
- improve the A638 between Doncaster and Bawtry
- an alternative Northern Motorway route around Doncaster.
- an Armthorpe by-pass
- the dualing of the ‘Tesco-B&Q’ link road at Balby Carr.

Question 8 (d): New rail schemes should be progressed to enhance Doncaster’s role as a gateway to the Sheffield city region and improve connections to the high speed rail network. Of the following schemes which do you think should be prioritised in the Local Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A new rail station to serve Doncaster Sheffield Airport, with links to Doncaster and Sheffield rail stations and junction improvements.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further improvements to Doncaster station to increase passenger and freight capacity on key routes.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct rail connections between Doncaster and Barnsley.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tram links from Sheffield and Rotherham to Doncaster.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 150
skipped question 282
A new Airport Rail station and further improvements to Doncaster Station are the clearly supported. Numerous comments stress the importance of a station at the Airport to enhance connectivity and improve economic opportunities. The other options, a rail link between Doncaster and Barnsley and Tram links do not receive much support. The Tram option has promoted several negative comments. Some suggesting that ‘electrification’ between Doncaster and Sheffield is more important. Several comments say that any alternatives to road transport should be supported.

**Question 8 (e): Do you have other rail schemes that should be prioritised in the local plan (please give suggestions)**

- A new rail station to serve Doncaster Sheffield Airport, with links to Doncaster and Sheffield rail stations and junction improvements.
- Further improvements to Doncaster station to increase passenger and freight capacity on key routes.
- Direct rail connections between Doncaster and Barnsley.
- Tram links from Sheffield and Rotherham to Doncaster.

This question has gathered a very poor response rate (9%). Of the comments made the most popular suggestions are for a rail stations at Askern and Finningley. Other suggestions include: upgrade to Thorne South Station, improve connections throughout the Borough with possibly a ‘light railway’ or using Colliery lines, direct link to Lincoln, improved links to Manchester and Manchester Airport, improved Doncaster to Sheffield connectivity, and a station in the south of the Borough.
Question 8 (f): New or additional bus routes (including bus priority and/or further park and ride schemes) should be provided to improve accessibility between settlements. Please let us know which bus routes/schemes should be prioritised in the Local Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question has a very low response rate (12%). The comments suggest numerous improvements to specific routes. There is a lot of support for the improvement of services to rural areas in general and several requests for improvements to the South of the Borough for Bawtry, Tickhill, Austerfield, Blaxton and links into Doncaster. There are also calls for a comprehensive Bus priority scheme throughout the Borough. However that is balanced by calls for no more Bus priority schemes or Park and Rides as they are a “waste of money”.

Question 8 (g): Greater emphasis should be given to cycling and walking. Of the following measures which do you think should be prioritised in the Local Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New off road greenways and leisure routes (e.g. along waterways and green corridors)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cycleways adjacent to roads</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On road cycle lanes</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater priority at junctions for cyclists and pedestrians</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More cycle parking</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 (g) Greater emphasis should be given to cycling and walking. Of the following measures which do you think should be prioritised in the Local Plan.
There is a degree of support for all of the options presented in the question. New off road Greenways and leisure routes and Cycleways adjacent to roads are the favourites. The comments received are supportive of the encouragement of cycling in terms of sustainability and the health benefits. In general, improved routes/networks and cycle path provision are supported. Some comments stress that currently cycling is dangerous on many Doncaster roads and any options that make cycling safer and reduce the interaction between Car and Bike must be given top priority. Several responders make the point that Doncaster is ‘flat’ and therefore good for cycling. One comment suggests that Doncaster introduce ‘Boris Bikes.’

Question 8 (h): Please let us know which new cycling and walking routes should be provided (please give suggestions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question received 48 comments (an 11% response rate). There is general support for additional and improved cycle and walking routes. There are calls continuous routes North/South and East/West throughout the borough and linkages for all villages on the Trans Pennine Trail. There are numerous single requests for individual cycle routes throughout the borough including: Thorne to DN7, Southern villages into Doncaster, Wadworth-Tickhill, Doncaster-Worksop A60, South of Doncaster Town to lakeside and the Town Centre, Barnburgh, and High Melton into Doncaster, Rossington to Doncaster and the A638 into town. Several comments suggest that liaising with cycle clubs and associations is a must when planning any new routes or schemes.

Question 8 (i): Greater emphasis should be given to managing traffic movements to reduce accidents and improve air quality. Do you agree or disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 157

skipped question: 275
The majority of responders (73%) agree with the statement. Key comments include:

- Promotion of co-ordinated road repairs and digging between utilities companies,
- Greater restrictions on HGV’s in terms of speed and weight limits
- The reduction in the number of traffic lights.

It is also suggested that the current infrastructure is “fragile and needs focus” and that any new developments (Housing/Employment) should carefully consider the impacts of increased traffic on the environment. Several responders disagree with the statement and there is a fair proportion of ‘don’t know’. People who disagree comment that: there are too many traffic lights, it is impractical to plan for this in such a short plan period and that the question is unfair in that it covers too many things. Some of the ‘don’t know’ comments also express the view that they didn’t fully understand the question.

Question 8 (j): In order to improve the transport network, please indicate what other measures or proposals you think could be introduced and prioritised relating to for example car parking, managing speed and reducing pollution, lorry parking etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fairly low response rate with 64 comments (15%). The main concerns are:

- Provision of more lorry/coach parking and rest areas, particularly in the Balby Carr/Woodfield Way area.
- More car parking (especially in the Town Centre, near DRI and the Rail Station).
- Reduced car parking charges (this could help re-vitalise the Town Centre)
- Reducing the number of HGV’s on ‘A’ roads.
- More ‘Park and Ride’ schemes.
- Air quality and noise monitoring in residential areas.
- Introduction of more 20mph speed limits in urban areas.

Comments are also made about ensuring the resilience of the transport infrastructure to the impacts of climate change and more particularly flood risk.
Question 9: How should we ensure enough minerals are available for development and also protect resources for the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Ensure no development proposals take place on any mineral resources of economic value.</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Identify land or areas with minerals of low or no value that are appropriate for development to take place.</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ensure potential developers identify the economic value of the mineral, and the environmental acceptability feasibility of extraction prior to development.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
- 38 answered question
- 131 skipped question

The main comments from the responses received are:

- Happy with the general direction of travel with DMBC minerals policies
- Concerns about the effect fracking has on the land
- Mineral extraction should be treated with great care and sensitivity and should not disturb residents or wildlife, it also should not be at the cost to the local community or Green Bet
- Extraction should only be carried out by compliant operators
- Previously quarried land having had the minerals extracted should be looked on more favourably for development. This type of land may not be classed as Brownfield but it is certainly not Greenfield.
- Disagree with approach a and b; considered to be unsound and does not reflect the policy of the NPPF. DMBC’s policies in relation to minerals safeguarding areas must
be aligned with the broader objectives and policies of the Local Plan such as meeting the objectivity assessed need for housing in Doncaster. Agree with c; consider it compliant with NPPF and consider the approach will enable the extraction of mineral deposits from safeguarded sites where this is viable and environmentally acceptable, prior the development of sites for other long term uses.

- It is important that, in meeting the assessed development needs of the Borough, the area's mineral resources are not sterilised.
- The Plan should seek to avoid areas of high environmental value, expectation that there is sufficient evidence to be provided, through the SA and HRA, to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected.
- Where minerals underlie the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Defra ALC system) it is particularly important that restoration and aftercare preserve the long-term potential of the land as a national, high quality resource.
- Reclamation to non-agricultural uses does not mean that there can be any reduced commitment to high standards in the reclamation. Such reclamations require equal commitment by mineral operators, mineral planning authorities and any other parties involved to achieve high standards of implementation.
- Minerals have become a bit player despite the fact that minerals underpin housing and other development and Doncaster contains minerals of national importance.
- Mineral developers need to provide accurate transportation proposed and provide additional access for traffic movements.
- We do not need to ensure availability of minerals within the Borough. This is something that can be sourced from any private supplier.
Question 10: How should we best meet specialist housing needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) New gypsy and traveller sites in countryside locations should be in the form of larger well-laid out sites (10 or more pitches) rather than a larger number of small sites (for example for just one family each)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The requirement for a proportion of affordable homes on new housing developments should be flexible to reflect what the development can afford having regard to other development contributions (e.g. education and open space) rather than risk the development being made unviable and so not going ahead</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Houses in multiple-occupation should not be allowed to concentrate in particular areas</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) New bespoke student accommodation (e.g. a student village) should be provided</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 10 (a): New gypsy and traveller sites in countryside locations should be in the form of larger well-laid out sites (10 or more pitches) rather than a larger number of small sites (for example for just one family each)

- The Council’s attention should be drawn to the Inspector’s Interim Findings on the Maldon Local Plan, which raised significant concerns regarding that Council’s treatment of Gypsy and Traveller site allocations.
• New gypsy and traveller sites in countryside locations should be in the form of larger well-laid out sites (10 or more pitches) rather than a larger number of small sites (for example for just one family each).
• It should be noted that gypsy and travellers sites are categorised as highly vulnerable development within national planning practice guidance. Allocations for these sites will need to be subject to the sequential test. Such development should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3 and only permitted in flood zone 2 where the exception test is passed. Local planning policy should be developed to reflect national planning guidance.

Question 10 (b): The requirement for a proportion of affordable homes on new housing developments should be flexible to reflect what the development can afford having regard to other development contributions (e.g. education and open space) rather than risk the development being made unviable and so not going ahead

• It is important that the Council are flexible in regard to Affordable Housing requirements, whilst still remaining focused on delivering such homes. There are often innovative ways of delivering Affordable housing requirements such as the multi-site, cross-subsidy model. We would also add there is sometimes the option of delivering Affordable Homes outside of S106 Agreement. Affordable Homes delivered in this way demands higher values as they can attract different grant and funding streams for Registered Providers.
• There are a number of factors such as Section 106 contributions and potentially the Community Infrastructure Levy in the future, which when combined with providing affordable housing can impact upon the viability of delivering development. It is therefore important that these competing factors are acknowledged by the Council and that flexibility is given in terms of the level of affordable housing that is required and that these are realistic.
• By creating or locating future housing sites in just a few locations and the City Centre in my opinion will not be successful. National House Builders will only build in places where there is a market demand. Please do not go down the route that Leeds have done by allocating thousands of plots in the city centre that remain undeveloped because people do not want to live there in the numbers they have estimated. If you want Doncaster to thrive and expand you need a balance which is not what options 1 and 2 do but what 3 would do.
• The need for affordable homes is an important consideration as part of the overall housing provision. In order to achieve affordable homes sites must be viable and deliverable. If the sites that are allocated are skewed towards brownfield sites then the targets will not be met. On this basis the allocations should include sufficient green field sites released on a non-phased basis to ensure that the industry can deliver affordable and market homes early in the plan period, and to speed up the delivery rate of homes in the Borough
• The proposed development sites for housing, employment and mineral extraction should be selected to avoid impacts on the natural environment.
• It is important that the targets and thresholds set within any affordable housing policy are realistic and based upon identified needs and economic viability. The HBF supports a flexible approach as set out within option B. This is also consistent with the NPPF. It is important that in utilising such an approach unrealistic targets are not set within the policy as this will simply slow development as all new schemes would need to be negotiated to a viable level.
• The requirement for a proportion of affordable homes on new housing developments should be flexible to reflect what the development can afford having regard to other development contributions (e.g. education and open space) rather than risk the development being made unviable and so not going ahead.
On affordable housing the local authority could include an ‘up to’ target for affordable housing, subject to viability assessments.

We agree that the level of affordable housing needs to be flexible and responsive to reflect what the development can actually afford to deliver, having regard to other development contributions such as education, open space and other abnormals such as infrastructure (highway, drainage, etc) and thus be proportionate and viable.

agree with point (b), in that affordable housing provision on new housing sites should be flexible to reflect what the development can afford, having regard to other development contributions (e.g. education and open space) rather than risk the development being made unviable and so not going ahead. This is particularly important given the pressing need to deliver housing. It is also important for previously developed sites, to help them come forward for development and in a timely fashion.

Recognises the need to address both market and affordable housing need. However it is important Local Plans are deliverable and that the cumulative impacts of obligations and policy burdens do not render schemes unviable. It is therefore appropriate for targets to be flexible and subject to economic viability as promoted in the NPPF.

A flexible requirement for the proportion of affordable homes in new developments to reflect what the development can afford, having regard to other development contributions.

The recognition at option (b) that a flexible approach to affordable housing provision and delivery will be taken. A flexible approach will ensure that development sites can contribute to affordable housing need, whilst not being rendered undeliverable. Such a policy approach should be supported by the necessary evidence which considers (amongst other matters); individual market areas, the current housing market position; and the costs of developing a range of sites (such as previously developed sites where significant preparation work may be required).

The rapidly growing elderly population will have special requirements. If DMBC does not already do so they should in future require developers/builders to ensure that all houses and flats are built to flexible “Lifetime Homes” standards - ordinary houses and flats which incorporate 16 design criteria that can be universally applied to new homes. They should also ensure that 10% of new homes are built to fully wheelchair accessible standards. Both of these approaches are endorsed by, amongst others, the Royal College of General Practitioners. We agree that the approach to affordable homes should be flexible, that houses in multiple occupation should not be concentrated in particular areas, and that the viability of a student village should be explored.

**Question 10 (c): Houses in multiple-occupation should not be allowed to concentrate in particular areas**

- There needs to be clear evidence that this is the case before it can be counted in the Council’s five-year supply of housing.
- Houses in multiple-occupation should not be allowed to concentrate in particular areas.
- The SHMA highlights a shortfall of 3,704 units of specialist housing for older people in Doncaster (using national guidance). Not sure that this is fully considered as part of the questioning?

**Question 10 (d): New bespoke student accommodation (e.g. a student village) should be provided**

- The consultation document notes that ‘a new student village would not just help support Doncaster’s growing higher education offer but should also help reduce the pressure on the existing housing stock including HIMOs’
- New bespoke student accommodation (e.g. a student village) should be provided
Question 10 (a): New gypsy and traveller sites in countryside locations should be in the form of larger well-laid out sites (10 or more pitches) rather than a larger number of small sites (for example for just one family each)

Some of the responses who agreed with (a) commented:

- Brownfield site should be identified where possible. The green belt should be an absolute last resort. All members of the community should be treated equally and should comply to planning law. No special treatment.
- This is a difficult subject my personal opinion is that we should not develop to attract people of this lifestyle to the area. They have to be provided for but need to understand to values of others.
- Also verify traveller status. Too many so call traveller have home here or elsewhere in the country. No development of these site in the greenbelt.
- Locally residents have expressed concern about enforcement, which is considered to have failed this community. We object to traveller sites being permitted where no one else would be allowed to build; it is difficult to see why they should be far out in the countryside.
- G&T community prefer smaller sites. Doncaster has a higher proportion of G&T sites than anywhere else in Yorkshire. The sites appear to be sited close to the motorway network giving an adverse opinion of Doncaster for motorway users. As you travel down the m18 and m180 you will need to pass 3 G&T sites giving a negative opinion of the eastern side Doncaster as once was the case if you used the junction 3 link road prior to the development of the site. Sites seem to be located in certain areas of Doncaster if there is a need should the new sites not be located in areas that do not already have a site?
- I assume it would be appreciated by the gypsy and traveller communities to be located together rather than being forced to disperse. Then they can have better access to infrastructure.
- Positive discrimination here...single plots become residential development on the cheap and a way of increasing personal wealth. Always preferential treatment...large well managed only with appropriate rent and taxes
- Thorne and Moorends already have significant provision, and new provision should be limited to ensure there is an appropriate local balance.
- Disregard for planning is a blight on our communities stringent enforcement is needed

Some of the responders disagreed with (a):

- Larger sites would lead to greater separation and ghettos
- Improve facilities on existing sites but no more sites
- Large traveller sites would I feel adversely impact on the rest of the local community more.
- Having visited all sites around Doncaster and seen the disgraceful, rubbish and burnt out cars etc to the lead up to the sites I believe larger sites should be avoided
- No-one wants traveller sites near their homes. Larger sites especially so. The anti-social behaviour which sadly accompanies these communities wherever the locate is best mitigated by restriction to micro-sites. Actually, they need not be located primarily in countryside locations at all. Why not on the edge of commercial sites where the quality of life of the residential would not be affected. Still micro sites though.
- This council already provides more than most authorities.
- Larger sites will have a greater potential to change the nature of the area.
- I strongly believe there should not be any facilities for the travelling community as they are parasites who do not put anything in to a community only ill will and heartache.
- Travellers are travellers and should not be encouraged to linger. Larger sites are more likely to give rise to social problems.
• This is proving unworkable. You are not delivering small private sites. You are failing to provide choice of location, tenure, size as required by NPPF. On appeal Inspectors are rejecting large sites due to visual impact. This is not what many GTs want. There is choice for the settled community and GTs deserve the same. Why make your policy hard to meet when there is such a pressing problem and you are failing to address this?

• This aspect needs much better control and very careful consideration. We already have our ‘fair share’ of these in Doncaster

• Why should such sites be in countryside locations?? Social exclusion! Would the council seriously consider identifying individual sites in open countryside?

• I would not expect anyone to organise housing so I can live with my friends and family. We all live separate lives finding the best homes we can afford. I see no need for a site I believe in integration.

**Question 10 (b): The requirement for a proportion of affordable homes on new housing developments should be flexible to reflect what the development can afford having regard to other development contributions (e.g. education and open space) rather than risk the development being made unviable and so not going ahead**

Some of the responses who agreed with (b) commented:

• Not all development are appropriate for inclusion of affordable housing and more focus needs to be made on providing this on mass rather than trying to 'fit it in' as neither side gets the best deal.

• Affordable housing should be considered on a site by site basis, subject to development viability as there is a need to support the development of a broader housing mix in Thorne and Moorends

• the basis of open space provision is a good bench mark for but I think this is sometimes too narrow with not enough flexibility with the setting of the terms with developers, communities sometimes do not benefit

• Provided that "Afford" does not include the ability of landowners and developers to make obscene profit.

Some of the responders disagreed with (b):

• Affordable housing enables balanced communities and if a lack of facilities makes it non-viable then the site is not appropriate for development.

• Comment - local need for affordable homes will never be achieved on the back of market housing. We suggest that the Local Plan specifically allocates land for homes to rent/shared ownership.

• Affordable housing should be priority across the borough along with sufficient education and medical needs to meet the needs increase.

• The decision on whether social housing would affect viability should not be left in the hands of the developers

• Affordable homes would not be built if this requirement was removed. Developers should liaise with DMBC to meet minimum requirements.

• Developments should take account of ageing population. Developers should be required to take into account special needs of older people in housing design

• Housing developments should be suitable and in proportion to the local environment and support conservation of the area instead of being flexible to reflect budget. Building houses to reflect budget of developers will surely affect the value of current properties in the area. Houses should reflect the current properties in the area.

• Low-cost housing is a priority as there is a shortfall of council-owned houses to rent. Developers should have a good level of ‘affordable’ houses in their housing plans

• This needs to remain a part of the develop plan with the possibility of allowing developers to transfer affordable housing to a secondary site they are also working on
within Doncaster. I.e. if they don't want to build 20 affordable homes in the development in Bawtry they could exchange it for 40 additional affordable homes at a site in Hayfield.

- Developers need to be encouraged to build the type of developments that are considered appropriate for the location. They will always want the easy, high profit margin, options.
- If anything the proportion of affordable homes should be increased, developers seem to want to label a development to be of affordable housing while doing the absolute minimum possible and still maximising their profit. It may well be unpopular but what exactly is wrong with the old "council house" estate model?
- Any agreement not to require the provision of affordable housing due to viability concerns should be an exception to policy not a flexibility built in to the policy to be exploited.
- The requirement for affordable homes in any new development should reflect the local need for affordable homes. NPPF requires local authorities to meet the need for both market and affordable housing; in our view meeting one without meeting the other is contrary to NPPF and perpetuates the accumulating shortfall in affordable housing. The granting of permissions for market dwellings may not always require a direct proportion of affordable provision, but it should be proportionally linked to the rate at which affordable need in the same part of the Borough is being met.

**Question 10 (c): Houses in multiple-occupation should not be allowed to concentrate in particular areas**

Some of the responses who agreed with (a) commented:
- HIMOs around the areas between Thorne Road and Beckett Road towards Town Centre seem to have caused a high concentration of anti social behaviour, people with drug problems and prostitution
- It is desirable for development of all levels to be in concentrated form as some people wish to live in these types of developments or if fulfils affordable housing requirements better.
- community tension is created by this occurring but licensing is the issue
- There is a increasing need for old people, and young people single accommodation. If this can successfully be met in Multiple Occupancy that's fine.
- There are too many of these already and it increases the potential for inappropriate landlords (and in some cases tenants too)
- They should be spread around to avoid an over concentration of population.
- There appears to be an increasing need for this type of housing and should be controlled in a professional and legal manner
- This type of housing needs strict regulation and inspection.

Some of the responders disagreed with (c):
- The increased numbers of Houses in Multiple Occupation ("HMOs") are in part created by the lack of housing available to groups such as single adults on a lower income. As such, HMOs meet a specific housing need. Where concentration occurs this is likely to be in locations suitable for this accommodation type, areas which benefit from good public transport links near to employment provision. Policy should seek to support the provision of such facilities but deal with any land use impacts appropriately without restricting the supply of much needed accommodation.
- Define ‘concentrate’ and justify why not.
Question 10 (d): New bespoke student accommodation (e.g. a student village) should be provided?

- Providing there is provision of first class education opportunities attracting students into the area
- This is only appropriate if the education facilities warrant such accommodation but appropriate provision must be made for the aspirational expansion of the education establishments.
- With the rider that it’s proper maintenance be provided for or it will turn into a ghetto.
- Fantastic idea to encourage students to study in Doncaster!
- Of course this would be dependent on the increases in the Student population in Doncaster.

Some of the responders disagreed with (d):

- I understand that the majority of students attending Doncaster College live locally so perhaps the demand for this would be quite low?
- Doncaster College provides a service across all age ranges so a Russell Group English approach to accommodation is old-fashioned and inappropriate
- If the college expands there may be a need to provide student accommodation like of Towns and Cities
- Why? Where? How does this square with housing requirement figures? Why single out students? Why not have a closed community for pensioners? Who will provide it? Can this be a justified policy of restriction?
- Does current information about further education support this measure?
- Yes, if there is demand. What's happened to the accommodation at High Melton?
- Where is the evidence of a need for bespoke student accommodation? For where? Which educational establishment?
Question 11: Please let us know your preferred option. Please select in order of preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1st choice (Preferred)</th>
<th>2nd choice</th>
<th>3rd choice</th>
<th>4th choice</th>
<th>5th choice</th>
<th>6th choice</th>
<th>7th choice (Least Preferred)</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Core Strategy Approach</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Doncaster &amp; Main Towns Focus</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Greater Dispersal Strategy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Option 4: A New Settlement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Option 5: A Low Growth/Environmental Protection Strategy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Option 6: Total Dispersal Strategy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Option 7: please specify in comments box</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ comments included:
- Option 1 is an approach that has been fairly recently tested at Examination and found to be the strategy that best meets the borough’s needs.
- An option which combines 1 and 2 is probably ideal - a thriving Doncaster town centre but also see the opportunity for excellent mixed use development at Lakeside and on the waterfront.
- Growth should be focussed on Doncaster Main Urban Area; dispersal could jeopardise the future of Doncaster as a whole.
The differences between the three retained Options are perhaps somewhat contrived but all three plan growth in Thorne and Moorends and this is welcomed.

A mixture of options 2 and 3 is preferred with an emphasis on reducing movement of people to employment.

9 parish councils/meetings and the Joint rural councils sent letters making the following comments:

- 4 support option 1 (with 1 of these also supporting the FARRRS corridor and 1 specifying they did not support the A1-A19 link road.
- 3 support option 2 (with 1 specifying that the 3 rejected options are rightly rejected)
- 2 don’t specify a preferred option but 1 rejects the A1 corridor and the other doesn’t feel there is sufficient information to make a choice but doesn’t support the A1-A19 link
- The Joint Rural Councils prefer a hybrid of Options 1 and 2 (strategic employment approach of option 1 and the housing approach of option 2

2 elected members favour option 3 because of its greater dispersal and A1-A19 link; 1 elected member prefers option 1. Letters from individuals also varied but with an overall clear preference for option 1

- 28 letters (using a similar template) were received supporting Option 1 and rejecting the idea of an A1 development corridor
- 7 other letters similarly supported option 1 and rejected the A1 corridor; 1 of these supported the A1-A19 link
- 1 supported option 1 and agreed with the rejection of options 4, 5, and 6
- 1 expressed the view that options 2 and 3 should be rejected
- 3 supported option 2
- 2 supported option 2 for housing and option 1 for employment
- 1 supported 2 or 3 but rejected option 1
- 1 opposed option 3 but said there was insufficient information to determine between options 1 and 2
- 1 did not specify a preference but opposed the A1 and the A1-A19 link
- 1 said option 1 or 2 or 3

Letters from landowning/developer interests also show variation

- 4 support option 3 and 1 supports a variation of option 3
- 1 supports a merger of options 2 and 3 (focus on the MUA but with objectively assessed need for each of the lower tier settlements being addressed)
- 1 supports option 2 and 1 expresses general support for 1 or 2
- 1 supports option 1 and another offers qualified support for option 1
- 1 is unspecific except to emphasise that the main focus must be on the Doncaster Main Urban Area
- 1 supports the rejected option 6 (Total dispersal) so that small villages without services may get some development
- 1 expresses the view that the options presented are not all the realistic options available

To summarise these responses, option 3 (or a variation of it) is supported by 6; option 1 gets support or qualified support from 3; option 2 received support or qualified support from 2:

Selby borough council considers that option 2 appears to have the most benefits but note that option 3 would do most to support rural services; the Environment Agency expressed some support for the rejected low growth/environmental protection option but acknowledge the need to plan for growth
Question 12: Do you think that we have considered all reasonable options for the locations of growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that we have considered all reasonable strategic options?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 157

**Skipped question:** 128

General comments responded to include:

- DN7 project area is treated with sensitivity; location, works required and loss of green space, potential flood risk and will lead to migration away from the area if not dealt with carefully.
- Research needed to dis-regard High Melton and Sprotbough for future growth.
- Answers and opinions will not be taken account of.
- Delivery of projects to be sustainable to communities.
- Careful consideration is needed before opening up A1/A19 for future development following improvements planned.
- Balby/Edlington and Hexthorpe should be considered for future growth.
- Upgrade existing stock.
- New settlement option maybe required.
- Thorne needs more to assist growing population.
- Brownfield sites should be fully considered.
- Council has considered reasonable options and these appear satisfactory.

These comments were made by 32 respondees and generally made by individuals with the exception of 2 Parish Councils. 45 additional comments were made, however; some of the comments were general comments which are recorded below in Question 13.
- Without a Green belt review and commitment to an OAN at this stage, the answers cannot be answered accurately.
- The Council need a flexible approach.
- The assessment currently underpinning the options is considered not sound and underscores Mexborough as a sustainable settlement and hence the proportion of growth that can be accommodated there.
- No due consideration has been given to supporting rural communities through small scale growth.
- General comment on Landscape Character Assessment and Study dated March 2007 and its continuity between Doncaster and North Yorks.
- No mention of targets for Renewable Energy on sites identified for employment.
- A low growth/environmental protection strategy would be a preferred option. Environmental concerns need to balance alongside social and economic concerns to ensure that the borough’s growth needs are achieved in the most sustainable way.
Question 13: Do you have any other comments about the Local Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General comments received included:

- Do not destroy villages by overcrowding and destruction of Green belt land
- Welcome public events to discuss proposals further
- Hayfield Green is specified as a separate area but it does not exist and the area has no community provision. Locally it should be considered to be combined with Auckley Parish Council (with Hayfield Green). Peel does not deliver anything to the area and Local Authority forgets this area.
- More focus needed to town centre – articulated in Vision, Aims and Objectives but not translated in reality
- Please listen to local views. The Council need to do more publicity to enable local people to voice concerns and the consultation needs to be managed better particularly with Councillors and Parish Councils.
- Green Belt Review need to allow consideration for ‘white land’ or safeguard land to meet needs beyond plan period.
- “Local Plan” but not local appears to be a “Borough Plan”. No mention of Neighbourhood Plans.
- Little guidance given and little time allowed allowing responders to fully consider impacts and respond accordingly. No glossary to understand terminology.
- Why start a Local Plan with the Local Authority has a Core Strategy?
- Serious concerns on the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Online survey issues and difficult to access, would be easier to understand on paper.
- Robust Gypsy and Traveller Assessment is required.
- Thank You DMBC.
- Progress the plan quickly to allow everyone to know what can/cannot be done.
- Local Authority should allow introduction of well managed flowers to rural verges to increase biodiversity and ecology.
- Rural villages should have limited on their roads (tonnes) to limit heavy vehicles destroying them.
- Rural emphasis is needed with small scale housing/infill.
- SHLAA need to be done independently (do not trust a group with house builders on it)
- Local Plan needs to support, recognise and protect community and cultural facilities.
- The authority need to consider SuDS policy.
- Need to renew street lights (LED) to reduce crime.
- Local services need to be kept updated when growth is planned for areas such as schools, shops, health clinic, transport links, parking and public transport.
- Early consultation can be an effective way of alleviating issues and concerns and wish to be kept informed/consulted further on the development of the Local Plan.
- Other issues do need addressing within a Local Plan such as; energy minerals including coal and conventional and un-conventional hydrocarbons; PEDL Licences and MSAs identified on policy maps and future development is undertaken safely and reduces subsidence and other hazards.
- Lack of publicity and limited time period of consultation to enable responding adequately.
• The Issues and Options document is very brief, and includes little context information and no detail on how the options have been identified and selected and what has been considered during this process. Without this information, it is difficult to identify a preferred option and it is not possible to know whether all reasonable options for the location of future growth have been fully considered.

• OAN not robust and object
• Need to use NPPF to address requirements of Local Plan.
• “Thank you for consulting”
• Paper copy required as interactive plan difficult to navigate and impossible to print.
• Documents were found to be perplexing.
• Important to allow consultation responses to be received in paper form.
• Internet access and issues of use
• Need to look at significantly increasing level of growth in areas around the airport and associated EZ
• Waste of money to re-do a process that had only just concluded and to find that this original proposal has been seen as "not fit for purpose" and the Doncaster people find themselves devoid of a plan for yet another 18months or so.

145 responders left general comments. Some of the comments left for Question 12 were also generalised. Therefore, in total the above views were made up of ; 7 Parish Councils, 2 Councillors, 26 Developer/Agent (14 of which from the same agent), 9 consultees and 100 individuals and 1 neighbouring authority.
Summer Consultation 2015 - Team Doncaster Response
Team Doncaster Workshop - Doncaster Local Plan
Wednesday 15 July 2015

Team Doncaster is the strategic partnership for Doncaster. Immediately prior to the Summer 2015 local plan public consultation a Team Doncaster workshop was held on 15th July 2015 at The Hub, Doncaster to consider the two public consultation documents:
- Vision, Aims and Objectives
- Issues and Options

The Workshop was a follow-up to the workshop held in February 2015 and had been requested by the Team Doncaster Board in June.

Attendees were divided into three groups facilitated by planning officers. Two separate workshop sessions considered the two documents in turn.

Full notes of the workshop are attached together with a summary of main points, list of attendees and the workshop agenda.

Main Conclusions from the Workshop

The Vision and Objectives are on the right lines but need more emphasis on people and should squarely build on what Doncaster is good at. We should aim high, stressing our potential as a destination in our own right rather than as part of a region or corridor but we should not pretend to be something we are not. Logistics, rail, Lakeside, CCQ/ town centre/ Waterfront, the airport and south-east growth corridor are all cited as things to build on. Whilst there is no clear Strategic Option preference there is evidently a great deal of pride in Doncaster Town as the focus for the borough and a belief that with the right investment it could be so much better; there is a pressing need to improve its environment and night-time economy. At the same time there is a clear desire to also spread investment around the borough to aid regeneration and provide local housing opportunities and local (including small-scale) employment opportunities to many of Doncaster’s communities. There was some support for this to include the better serviced villages. Neither Green Belt nor Flood risk were seen as reasons to compromise our vision but market realism is necessary for both housing and especially large-scale employment investment.

Internal transport infrastructure needs (especially road links and better bus services) are seen as crucial. Schools capacity is a concern. A greater mix of housing is required to address affordability, first-time buyers, aspirational housing (to support inward investment) and the ageing population. More could be made of existing and potential water features. The feedback from the workshop was very positive and attendees were clearly energised by the issues discussed and the potential of the local plan process to address them.

Summary of Main Points:

Vision
- Vision basically OK but needs to emphasise more the importance of education and skills and better capture the cultural offer of the borough
- Need to stress our north-south connectivity and mustn’t underplay our role in the SCR – we are a regional force in our own right.
- We need to better sell the borough particularly to our graduates so that they return
- We should aim to be as good as we can not just better than our neighbours

Objectives
- Objectives should be shorter and make more reference to people especially families and young people; to health and to the issue of an ageing population
• Needs an economic sector focus on something we are good at such as logistics or rail (HS2); need reference to digital inclusion
• Need to highlight the diversity of our communities
• It is perhaps overly ambitious to aspire to be a centre for excellence for combating climate change
• New jobs need to be taken up by existing residents.

Options
• Some support for each of the three Options. Option 1 was seen as a good longer-term strategy to deliver infrastructure. Option 2 was felt to be the best way of making Doncaster town a more attractive place and so encourage investment across the borough (and there was support for higher housing growth in the main urban area than the top of the range set down). Option 3 was seen as offering the “best of both worlds” – support for Doncaster and a greater level of dispersal to other places
• The rejected New Town option makes sense in terms of avoiding Green Belt and flood zones but would not help existing settlements in need of growth & regeneration.
• We should spread homes growth and development around the borough
• The growth corridor is the south-east of the borough so people must be able to access these opportunities
• Land (including that in flood zones) is an asset; we can’t afford to simply direct development away from such areas; we need flood resilient developments; and use the management and creation of water features to help make attractive places to live.
• From a building industry perspective the best location for new homes is the west of the borough where there is the issue of green belt; the east and especially north-east is less attractive and there is the flood risk issue.
• A green belt review should target growth areas. We do not need to take out large areas but some areas do not fulfil green belt functions
• Villages are not sustainable places for large scale growth but some small schemes in the better served ones would be justified
• If we over-develop places such as Bawtry and Tickhill they will lose their identity; Armthorpe and Edlington are growing; we need to help other communities grow development is needed in the north-east such as Thorne

Economy
• Need to emphasise small as well as large businesses but recognise that we are a nationally recognised logistics centre.
• Lakeside could be a rail cluster, but need to be careful we don’t ruin the area’s residential offer in the process.
• Can’t make employers go to places they don’t want to so it’s about connecting people to the employment opportunities and getting the spread right across the borough, including smaller local sites, but inevitably some areas will get no new employment
• Need to recognise the rural economy and support rural businesses

Infrastructure
• Need better infrastructure – roads and bus/rail services; more local rail stations; affordable internal bus links are very important to young people
• We need to put the infrastructure into places to encourage new attractive places to live like we did at Lakeside; these could be built around existing or new water features, golf courses or in locations with good access to existing attractive centres
• The A1-A19 link would greatly improve connectivity and make the east side of the borough a more attractive place for homes growth
• Developments need to facilitate better cycle routes; our waterways are an asset that needs exploiting; the Trans Pennine Trail needs to be made more inviting.
• There is an schools capacity issue now and over the next few years.
• A1(M) congestion is an issue and must be improved;

**Town Centres**
• Doncaster Town Centre (and other centres) must be emphasised. We should aim high in terms of the image of Doncaster we are trying to create
• Doncaster Town Centre has a poor environment and its evening economy is tired and lacks diversity; Bawtry is a good example of a good evening economy
• The Town Centre must have more urban living and a restaurant/theatre offer
• The environment around Doncaster station needs significant improvement. CCQ is excellent but let down by Waterdale shopping centre which should be redeveloped; Waterfront could be an excellent university campus but needs to be done really well; Lakeside and Bessacarr need centres

**Housing**
• We need more affordable homes and a better mix of homes
• There are not enough homes for young professionals or middle-management and this undermines investment; many homes will attract only local people
• More lifetime homes are needed (but not be appropriate for starter homes)
• From a building industry perspective high density apartment-type schemes are not appropriate because of the large supply of existing low cost terrace homes
• Gardens are becoming too small for families.
• Empty properties must be brought back into use
• A Town centre retirement village would be good
• Less attractive sites could be packaged with the more attractive ones